

COMMUNITY BOARD 7/MANHATTAN MINUTES

Full Board Meeting Minutes

December 3, 2019

Community Board 7/Manhattan's Full Board met on Tuesday, December 3, 2019, at Fordham University in the district. Chair Mark Diller called the meeting to order at 6:32 pm after the Secretary confirmed the existence of a quorum.

Chair's Report: Mark Diller

Minutes from the previous Full Board meeting were **approved**.

Vote: 30-0-0-0

Two changes to the minutes from last month: update resolutions that were voted on in October; correction with respect to reference to Extell to clarify that certain buildings referenced in the minutes are Extell and some are not.

Elected officials' reps have agreed not to speak tonight so that we have more time for the public to be heard. Each person will have one minute to speak.

Senior Resource Fair: CB7 and Electeds from northern part of district along with many partners. 12/11, 1:30-3:30 at Children's Aid at Frederick Douglass. Members of the Board please volunteer. Fresh Direct donating 17 cases of water. (Thanks to Roberta and Amy for organizing.)

New application for Church at 1 West 96th to be turned into new home for Children's Museum of Manhattan— this will come before us next month.

Shelter on West 107th Street – Eviction of all of the women has happened; starting to move men into the shelter. CB7 is forming a CAB to work on making sure that the shelter is properly run and welcomed to the community.

Applications to Community Board: Current members, remember to reapply. Applications also open to the public.

Captain Malin

Overall, crime is down, especially property crime.

Some disturbing trends. On-street robberies – 22 robberies (and 15 on-street robberies) in the last 56 days; same time period last year was 9. 9 of those 15 have been by packs of juveniles. None of these kids live on the UWS – some of them go to school at MLK campus. We're doing directed patrols. This is happening all over Manhattan. Most juveniles are released to their parents.

There have been some high profile incidents in the last couple months that aren't actually that concerning because they aren't part of a pattern.

Next Community Council Meeting is Monday, January 27th.

Catherine: Is this really a trend if it's just for the past couple months. Malin: Could be that it's not a trend, but we have to wait and see.

Jeanette: Are they are primarily targeting other kids? Malin: A couple adult victims, but primarily other kids.

Set up a corridor from 72nd Street train station to the school. Working with the principals at MLK and encouraged the principals to tell the parents. Youth officer has constant dialogue with the school.

Andrew: If the group goes into the subway, is description shared with Transit division? Malin: Yes.

Madelyn: Police cars on the premises at certain hours of the day, providing security for seniors. PS 86 – getting engaged with the youth and asked Police Officers to come join so they can get to know the cops. Kids need to see cops as human beings.

Malin: Don't want to comment on politics, but is concerned about bail reform.

Community Session:

Rita Hudes

Deliveries stop during work and school hours because children are in harms way from delivery trucks, especially when they pass school buses. Taxi stops by bus stops and train stations, rather than having taxis cruising around the city. Storefronts should not be empty more than nine months.

Zachary Campbell, AMNH

Excavation and foundation work underway. Contractors installing underpinning for adjacent buildings. 10-20 construction vehicles per day at the site. Sign up for eblast.

Carrie Casselman, PS 166 Parent

Expressing support for G&T programs in their current form and concerned by SDAG advisory group recommendations. 1. D3 has already shown it can implement diversity programs without top-down mandates. 2. Eliminating G&T increases appeal of charter and takes more kids out of public school system. 3. SDAG ignores TAG young scholars program. 4. SDAG offers no alternatives outside of zoned schools.

Lawrence Lee, G&T Parent at PS165

Parent with two children in G&T at 165. G&T program was important in our family's decision to stay in the city. G&T classes at 165 are diverse. Families from 4, 5 & 6. Concerned about SDAG proposal to eliminate programs. Should look into ways to expand access into existing programs. Asking CB7 to investigate the impact of eliminating this program in our district.

Elie Chiha, D3 Parent

Parent with child in G&T in D3. Concerned about SDAG proposal to remove G&T. None of the SDAG members were there to represent G&T programs. Asking CB7 to investigate the impact of eliminating this program in our district.

Michael Gonzalez, Columbus-Amsterdam BID

Publication of new 12/19 guide; publishing list of 25 local nonprofits and CBOs in the neighborhood with wish list on website to see how best to help them. Bloomingdale Neighborhood History group having talk tomorrow night.

Tatiana Kineva, Freelance reporter from Sweden

Doing TV piece about bike wars in NYC. Needs to talk to someone against bike lanes.

Business Session:

Land Use Committee, Page Cowley and Seema Reddy, Co-Chairpersons

Joint with Housing Committee, Louisa Craddock and Melissa Rosenberg, Co-Chairpersons

Resolution Re:

1. **266-270 West 96th Street** (Broadway-West End Avenue.) Application #C200140PPM to the Department of City Planning by NYC Housing & Preservation for the disposition of one city-owned property (Block 1243, Lot 57, the former MTA site) to allow the construction of a 23-story mixed use, mixed income building, as well as community facilities.

Missed a technical issue with giving notice, so it's possible that our vote will be out of compliance. We will hear the presentation, debate and vote tonight. Then, we will revisit the vote at this month's Steering Committee meeting as long as there is a Quorum at that meeting, to ensure that it is in compliance after giving the proper notice.

Presentation from Applicant:

Melissa Otten, Senior planner for Manhattan Planning Division, along with Fetner Properties

Project has come before the Board three times. Currently in ULURP.

Site is an assemblage of three lots – one city-owned and two privately-owned (Salvation Army and NAACP buildings). 23-story building. 171 units. Ground-floor community space.

Only land use approval needed is the disposition of the city-owned lot.

Carol Rosenthal, Partner at Fried Frank – Represent Developer.

City-owned site has been unused and vacant for over 25 years. Former substation.

Building is completely as-of-right. Complies with all rules and regulations.

Made to look like an UWS building with brick and stone.

Studio – 3 bedrooms. 68 affordable units; 103 market-rate units.

50% - 130% of AMI

Voluntarily being put into the Brownfield Cleanup Program

After this vote, will go to BP's office, City Council, etc.

Public Speakers:

Alan Romer, 732 WEA

Remarks entered into the minutes. Building is not congruent with the neighborhood. Tower will be substantially taller than anything else on the block. Many residents will face a brick wall, cast shadows, etc.

Robert Bornstein

Waste of a green resource, could be a conduit to electrical site on the Hudson River.

Jane Thompson

Living at 736 WEA. Feeling besieged by all this construction around. Urge board to take the Brownfield issue terribly seriously. For 10 years we have known it is a toxic site. Issues with water, chemicals in the ground, etc. The health and safety plans may appear adequate, but only belligerent diligence and vigilance will ensure a non-deleterious situation.

Seamus Barry

Member of 32BJ for 28 years. Speaking on behalf of union to express support for this project. 32BJ supports responsible development that creates good jobs at prevailing wage. Fetner has made a credible commitment to pay prevailing wage. Support building affordable housing. More than 6000 32BJ members that live in and work in CB7 and support the proposal.

Hilda Chasonowitz

Live at 97th and WEA. Survived a crash at 96 and WEA. Consider what's happening on the entire block, not just this lot.

Page, Land Use:

There is an engineering firm monitoring the Brownfield

Only Land Use issue is the sale or disposition of the property to the developer. We want everything at CB7.

We are aware that this entire block is under construction for a period of years. This is unusual and hard on the neighborhood. Ask the Developer to form a Community Construction Coordination Committee. This is a bus layover and

work at the Boat Basin is going to push even more traffic to this intersection.

Melissa, Housing:

Public Asset so we are concerned with creating the greatest public good. Want to ensure some units are set aside for formerly homeless individuals and families. Asking them to do outreach to local CBOs to let people know about the affordable housing and help with applications.

Board Discussion

This is a bus layover – where will the buses go? They will work with DOT to accommodate this.

Ensured that this property does in fact belong to the city.

Micro-units: are these as-of-right under changes to the building code or is this a special case? They are getting a waiver from HPD to do the micro-units.

Half of the affordable units are studios. How many are micro-units – we don't know. Rep: Mix of AMI hasn't been finalized yet.

We do not know how much the city is selling the property for, but we assume \$1. Shelly: the deal is for affordable housing.

Rich: why does it have to be so tall? Concerned about 96th street in terms of safety. Can DOT do an assessment? Page: Hard to predict how this will go, but it will need to be a coordinated effort among the whole city. There was a downzoning years early, limited height to this level. So this height is as-of-right.

Committee: what incentive does the developer have to respond to concerns from the community if there are no conditions upon them? Seems developer could just ignore concerns.

Outrageous that 130% of AMI is considered affordable.

Sara: Should be building more housing in dense urban areas if what we are concerned about is climate change.

Madge: What percentage of the lot is the city-owned land? If it's 50%, then why isn't 50% of the space affordable?

Ira: Construction Impacts: this project is about 15% of the FAR of the projects in the area. Before a building permit is issued, developer has to work out transportation and other logistical issues.

Richard: This is the best use of this space. If this site were sold alone, it's unlikely anyone would buy this – even for \$1 – to build 100% affordable housing. This is the best way to get affordable housing built here. 130% of AMI is about \$140,000/year – this is straining the definition of affordable.

K.: Will the affordable units be distributed throughout the building? Yes.

Mark: vigilance on Brownfield program – this is needed, but doing this through the Brownfield program is our best way to have this vigilance.

The Resolution to Approve was Adopted.

Vote: 38-1-0-1

Business & Consumer Issues Committee, Linda Alexander and Christian Cordova, Co-Chairpersons
Resolutions Re:

New application to the SLA for two-year liquor license:

2. **2745 Broadway** (West 105th Street) Glenda Sansone – Entity to be formed.

The Resolution to Approve was adopted. Vote: 41-0-0-0

3. **Renewal Unenclosed Sidewalk Cafés:**

- **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.
- **573 Columbus Avenue** (West 88th Street.) Renewal application #2054416-DCA to the Department of Consumer Affairs by Bodega 88, LLC, d/b/a Bodega 88, for a four-year consent to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café with 6 tables and 12 seats.

The Resolution to Approve was adopted. Vote: 41-0-0-0

Transportation Committee, Howard Yaruss, Chairperson

Resolutions Re:

4. Request for Study on Curbside Usage.

Howard presented the resolution: making it clear that this resolution is asking only for a study.

No such thing as “free parking” – the curbs are part of the infrastructure of every city. Great reduction in curbside parking has already happened. This has led to significant increase for number of cars driving around looking for parking. 30-74% of all cars driving around are looking for parking. Who really benefits from taking away parking? The landlords and people who own parking garages.

Branch

Lived on UWS for about 50 years. Interested in reducing congestion. Draconian for everything to fall on the residents. Whatever you do, you should make neighborhood better for residents, including people who have to use a car to make a living. Don't want to see the UWS totally change from what it is.

Natalie

We see this resolution as the culmination of a concerted anti-car, anti-pedestrian campaign that is being waged. There are special interests behind this. The city is biased and cannot make an objective evaluation. Call for a citywide referendum on parking.

Molly Tran, Streetopia UWS

Physician, public Health professional, mother of young child. Few public health problems that can't be linked to cars and how we built our environment around them. Worry that my daughter will be hit by a car on the way to the park. Just because we gave a massive subsidy to the auto industry in the form of free parking, doesn't mean we need to keep making that mistake over and over again. Cars are killing us and we have to fix it.

Burton

Lived on UWS since 1982. Vast majority of that time parked on the street like thousands of others. The thought of losing this privilege has made things harder.

Grasso

Parking is subsidized by all of our tax dollars. To suggest that car owners are rich is a fallacy – rich car owners park in garages. Drive to get to my mother who lives in assisted living. With congestion pricing something needs to be done. Address that issue, address delivery trucks double and triple parking, tow some of these trucks, etc. Parking garages are being turned into luxury housing – no available parking. Residents need protection and equity. Blanket metered parking is not the solution.

Kevin Fagon

For the resolution. Speaking on behalf of 76% of UWS residents who do NOT own a car. Concerned that the individuals in the room and on the board do not represent the 76% of UWS residents who do NOT own a car. Resolution is calling for a study, it's relatively weak.

Tag Gross (with ceded time)

Born and raised on the UWS and lived here for over 60 years. Only one point of view being presented. Founded Common Sense Streets. Pro-neighborhood solutions. Over 1100 members. Something this important should be widely broadcast and discussed. Value diversity, consideration of others, and the common good. 30% of households on UWS own cars – people using them on daily basis are reverse commuting to areas without mass transit. UWS car owners are not contributing to traffic or safety issues. Untrue that free parking encourages car use over mass transit. UWS car owners use mass transit and bike, walk, etc. There are many things in this city that are free, whether we choose to use them or not. Anyone who could afford to park in a garage, would. Major accidents that cause death and serious injury are by people traveling through our neighborhood. DOT tested loading and unloading zones and they failed. 76% of population does not ride a bike. Asking committee to vote no, or limit the resolution specifically to a study of residential parking permits.

Chelsea Yamada

CB7 is ahead of other boards in terms of pedestrian safety. Please continue to be a leader. Metered parking can act as a neutral tax. Loading zones for small businesses, lovely places to sit. Would we have the same debate if we were debating other objects from our private living rooms?

Charles Gross

Ridden 1600 miles on a Citibike. Not in favor of protected bike lanes. There is a world outside the city that transit cannot take you to. Cannot take my mother-in-law shopping by putting her wheelchair on a citibike. Cars are a nuisance, but sometimes you have to use them. Improve mass transit by demanding that politicians give up their cars and use mass transit.

Lisa Orman

Seem really afraid to study something. We've lived with our curbs the same way for 70 years – that's a lifetime of the status quo. In the coming years we need to change our habits. Can't keep clinging to a status quo that is unhealthy for our kids, community, etc. We all suffer from the negative effects of too much driving. Vast majority of curb is dedicated to free car storage. Ecommerce has skyrocketed, micro-mobility, etc. Massive curbside needs that have nothing to do with car storage.

Leonard Daniels

Conservative Republican, live on UWS. Out of work. Own a car with over 170,000 miles. Permit parking – won't be able to get parking spaces. If you're concerned about safety, fix the roads. If you're concerned about pollution, add more parking, so people won't have to spend so much time looking for a space. If you need to go to areas without mass transit, you need your car.

Warren Winter

Residential Permit Parking would be a first great step. So many New Jersey plates on our streets during the day – no spots. They're proud that they come here and park and don't pay for parking downtown.

David Vasser

Neither need nor desire an automobile. Raised our kids without the benefit of a car. Given the pollution, the physical menace, the consumption of space, the noise, the visual blight – let's redesign our streets for the coming generations. This isn't about us, it's about our kids and those who come after. 14th Street Busway has worked – very little traffic from that.

Board Discussion:

Jay: To sell this resolution as only asking for a study is disingenuous and misleading because of the language of the resolution itself. I own a car, have not driven it within the city for 20 years. The “facts” that are stated are clearly biased. Taking away parking exacerbates economic inequality. To ask the City of New York to do a study is an exercise in futility. The Mayor, Speaker, etc already have plans to eliminate parking throughout the city. Offering a resolution to eliminate the third bullet. Seconded.

Paul: Don't trust the city to assess and analyze anything to do with cars. The inequality is that only people who can afford expensive garages can own cars.

Barbara: Agree with Jay. This is premature. We should see what happens with congestion pricing. We should work on residential permit parking.

Richard: Agree with Jay's amendment. Third bullet point pre-decides the point that you want the city to study. Only conclusion an objective observer can derive is that there are too many cars and too much parking.

Howard: Friendly Amendment: eliminate the third bullet point.

Robert: Support Jay. This is a non-resolution. Cannot ask the city to present an argument against its own long-term vision – Vision Zero. Should consult independent organization like RPA. This resolution should be withdrawn. Let's drop this matter. It's not complete enough. This is not worthy of a vote.

Klari: Will support the request for a study. The first two bullet points are reasonable premises to support requesting a study. Did attend the forum. Beneficial for CB7 to affirmatively insert ourselves into the conversation. Other Friendly Amendment: CB7 takes no position at this time as to whether there should be any particular change, but we request the study.

Howard accepts the friendly amendment.

Ken: Rachel Weinberger from RPA was one of the participants in the forum and is one of the city's foremost experts on parking. She is the one who says that the availability of parking is one of the main determinants in car ownership and car usage. Resolution does not talk about eliminating parking at this point. I did not join this board to just hold onto the status quo at all costs. If we're going to make progress, we need to be willing to question the status quo.

Meg: Support the resolution. Ask for additional information. Need contextualized analysis with more detailed recommendations. This resolution does not preclude CB7 from asking other groups to provide their recommendations as well.

Rich: Cruising for parking causes congestion, crashes and pollutions. Seems reasonable to at least explore if there's another way. Confident that our current system is not best possible solution. NYC drivers spend 107 hours/year looking for parking. Cars account for 1/5 of US emission. Global temps are rising. 30 people killed since July 2012 just in our district. Our children and grandchildren have been leading the climate change protests begging us with power to deal with climate change.

Christian: To say just asking for a study is disingenuous. The resolution implies that we need a study to eliminate parking. “Free” parking should also be eliminated. We could study to optimize use of curbside space. Using more deliveries nowadays, some curbside space will need to be allocated for that. Incentivize electric cars.

Andrew: My family owns a car. It makes life a lot more convenient. One of the concerns is the bullet points and the language. As a city, we need to look at the way we use our public space, including our streets. What is the most efficient and effective way to utilize our curb space to be the most benefit to the most people in our community? If you can't

afford parking, it looks like an attack on you. More inclusive language would be better. This is clearly an issue that we need to address.

Doug: Studying this is an important thing. Necessary to ask for a study. We may end up rejecting the findings of the study. I'm all for it. Removing the third paragraph makes it a lot more palatable for everyone. We need to represent everyone in the entire district whether they are car owners or not. Friendly amendment: in second paragraph, change "to create" to "for". Howard accepts this as a friendly amendment. Congestion pricing is coming, and it's very germane to our neighborhood because the line is within our district.

Sheldon: Respect committee's attempt at putting together a resolution. People feel that many words are biased. The largest increase of people in our district are Seniors. So we have to be concerned about Seniors especially. Tearing apart the resolution is not constructive. Motion to refer back to committee to take into consideration things that have been said. That's a procedural motion that doesn't need to be seconded and needs to be voted on immediately. Will defer until everyone has spoken.

Steve: Supportive of Shelly's motion because there have been so many motions that I don't even know what I'm voting on at this point. Need to strip this down and make it simplified. People take umbrage at "free parking" – pointing out one kind of parking. This is why there is skepticism.

Catherine: Thank committee for a resolution calling for study. Think that this would be more persuasive if more objective. Present free parking as one of the items to be investigated, among others. Everybody here cares about the neighborhood, its future, if we have kids or not.

Jeanette: Number of issues with this resolution. Calling for study of free parking. Need to clarify what it is that we're asking the city to study. How are the city's policies affecting our neighborhood, our city streets? The city will look at the larger regional level. Nobody on the UWS is commuting to Midtown in a car.

Louisa: Read a lot of studies, and the broader they are, the less you learn from them. What is important is what is about to happen to our neighborhood and that is congestion pricing. That is what we want to study. Look at places that already have this and what are the problems that came up and how did they deal with them?

Andrew Albert: Two changes: Largest MTA capital program in its history and congestion pricing. We're on safe ground if we ask both DOT and the Precincts for their plans on what congestion pricing begins and what it will mean for our neighborhood.

Ira: Can we work on this for another month and come back with something that's really good. We do need to do something, we do need a study, but it needs to be the right study.

Peter: Let's get on with doing these studies as quickly as possible.

Roberta: I don't want to see this fail. It needs to be rewritten and not sure we can do that tonight. Would hate to have to go through this whole evening again.

Amy: Two things here. How we use our curbs. How is congestion pricing going to affect our community? Both should be studied. Needs to be a baseline before we can say that congestion pricing creates a massive change. Think that this should go back to committee to rewrite.

Mark: Support resolution in whatever form that the will of the board is to phrase it, because we are being responsive to community's request to study congestion pricing and to study residential permit parking.

Ethel: Tonight's discussion is maddening but also good. We aired a lot of good points. This is a series of value statements which are rhetorical and which do not help what we want a study to be about. Loaded value statements. We want the study to be neighborhood-oriented. Could list a few priority points that we want to have studied, for example the effect of changes in deliveries and the use of trucks in our neighborhood. We need to go back and bring a new resolution forward. Cannot amend this resolution. I think we can pass this, but we should focus more – less rhetoric, more focused.

Jay: Shouldn't have used the word disingenuous – shouldn't have cast aspersions on the committee. Difficult in the next few minutes to fashion a resolution with all of these good points. Support returning this to committee.

Howard: Helpful discussion. We see these problems on the street. We don't know enough to craft the solutions or to ask the kind of nuanced questions. If we go back to committee and come back with a list of nuanced questions, sure that you would have more things to criticize. More information is better than less information. We don't want to try to address these problems in a vacuum. It's imperfect and doesn't have nuance.

Motion to send this resolution back to committee, with reference to the minutes and the discussion. Motion Passed.
Resolution will be sent back to committee.
Vote: 28-10-0-0

Transportation Committee is meeting a week from tonight.

5. **46 West 74th Street, ICL** (Columbus Avenue.) Request by The Institute for Community Living for a "No Parking" zone in front of 46 West 74th Street.

The Resolution to Approve was adopted. Vote: 28-0-4-0

6. Adding physical barriers West 97th Street and West End Avenue, Cooper Stock Way, to this day-lit spot to ensure that motor vehicles are not able to park there.

The Resolution was adopted. Vote: 30-0-1-0

7. A plan to identify the 10 most dangerous intersections in our district and protect them using curb extensions. Inclusion of "curb extensions" on voting sheets was in error.

The Resolution was adopted. Vote: 30-0-0-0

8. **"No Standing"** zones:

a. Central Park West between West 62nd and 63rd Streets.

The Resolution to Approve was adopted. Vote: 31-0-0-0

b. West 62nd Street, Central Park West – Broadway.

The Resolution to Approve was adopted. Vote: 31-0-0-0

c. West 63rd Street, Central Park West - Broadway.

Sara: The reason for this is that if you're coming from the South this is the only place to unload (you can't turn onto 62nd and you can't unload on CPW).

Steve: The issue is that there are always exceptions for reasons to have more no-standing zones. I'd like one in my building too. There are a million reasons why everyone wants loading zones. I will vote against it. At some point we have to stop just giving more loading zones.

Shelly: Two is enough. Not everything is in front of our building. This continues a precedent of providing more and more loading zones.

Ken. The M10 bus goes along this street. People double-park and block the bus.

The Resolution to Approve was not adopted. Vote: 15-12-5-0

Preservation Committee, K Karpen and Michele Parker, Co-Chairpersons

Resolutions Re:

9. **5 West 63rd Street** (Central Park West.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to legalize a rooftop unit/sound barrier.

The Resolution to Approve was adopted. Vote: 26-0-0-1

10. **344 West 89th Street** (Riverside Drive.) Application #LPC-19-41426 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a rear yard addition.

The Resolution to Approve was adopted. Vote: 26-0-1-0

11. **4 West 90th Street** (Central Park West.) Application #LPC-20-01388 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for legalization of windows, doors, facade treatment, and the removal of the areaway fence.

This item was withdrawn.

Present: Mark N. Diller, Barbara Adler, Jay Adolf, Andrew Albert, Linda Alexander, Richard Asche, Steven Brown, Elizabeth Caputo, Cindy Cardinal, Joshua Cohen, Christian Cordova, Kenneth Coughlin, Page Cowley, Louisa Craddock, Catherine DeLazzerio, Robert Espier, Lolita Ferrin, Sheldon J. Fine, Paul Fischer, Julian Giordano, Amy Hyman, Madelyn Innocent, Audrey Isaacs, K Karpen, Doug Kleiman, Blanche E. Lawton, Sara Lind, Ira Mitchneck, Klari Neuwelt, Michele Parker, Jeannette Rausch, Seema Reddy, Andrew Rigie, Richard Robbins, Madge Rosenberg, Melissa Rosenberg, Katie Rosman, Peter Samton, Meg Schmitt, Roberta Semer, Ethel Sheffer, Polly Spain and Howard Yaruss. **Absent:** Natasha Kazmi, Douglas McGowan, Jennifer Nitzky, William Ortiz and Susan Schwartz.

Parks & Environment Committee Meeting Minutes

December 16, 2019

Committee Members present: Klari Neuwelt (“KN”), co-chair. Elizabeth Caputo (“EC”), co-chair. Ken Coughlin (“KC”), Cindy Cardinal, Natasha Kazmi (“NK”), Susan Schwartz (“SS”), Barbara Adler (“BA”). Absent: Jennifer Nitzky

Non-Committee Members Present: Mark Diller (“MD”), board chair, Julian Giordano (“JG”), Douglas McGowan (“DM”).

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 pm by co-chair KN.

Riverside Park. Presentation by the NYC Department of Parks & Recreation on the planned dredging and reconstruction of the West 79th Street Boat Basin Marina.

Nate Grove (“NG”), Senior Manager, Citywide Marinas for the New York City Department of Parks & Recreation (DPR), and Stephen Frech, Senior Project Manager at the design firm of Moffat & Nichol, presented pre-Schematic (Conceptual) plans for the dredging and reconstruction of the storm-damaged marina at the 79th Street Boat Basin. Julie Melzer, Project Manager for NYC EDC, and Seth Goodwin, Nate Grove’s deputy, were also present.

The current marina at the Boat Basin accommodates a mix of transient vessels and vessels that are permanently docked and lived in by year-round residents (“live-aboards”). The marina’s infrastructure has sustained damage from a variety of sources, including storms and the wood borer.

The proposed project will cost a total of \$89.2 million, of which \$62 million will be used for construction. Funding will be shared by New York City Mayor’s Office (\$60.9 million) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (\$28.3 million). Outreach about the proposed project has been made to stakeholders, including visioning sessions with Boat Basin users.

The project’s goals are to:

- Reconstruct the storm-damaged marina to meet current climate resiliency design guidelines
- Enhance navigability of the basin via increased water depths and restored debris and ice protection
- Deliver utilities, accessibility, safety and security that comply with modern codes and standards
- Expand the number of boating berths to address the current 780+ person, 14-year waiting list
- Upgrade the dockhouse to comply with the full expanded facility program

Under the proposed early (pre-Schematic (Conceptual)) design, as per the slide presentation, the current five docks would be expanded to nine, and the marina would extend significantly farther south, beyond the “Classic Playground” to the south of the ballfields. The current 116 boat slips would be increased to 190. In addition, as the marina is currently inadequately protected, a new fixed pier with timber wave screens and ice protection would extend the length of the marina’s western side. The existing A-Dock would also be extended under the proposed project. Each slip would have a sewage pump-out as well as hookup to the City’s water and electric systems. The slips would be connected to the city grid “in every sense.”

The existing dockhouse would be rebuilt and moved two blocks south, adjacent to 77th Street, at “D-Dock”. The structure would be enlarged and elevated to 18.33 feet above mean high water, such that it would block views of the river from the promenade area adjacent to it. The building would be LEED certified and feature a green roof. The existing sea rail along the promenade would be retained and the rails in the reconstructed marina would match those in the newly refurbished A-Dock.

Under current plans, Schematic (Conceptual) Design will be complete by April 2020, Preliminary Design by November 2020 and Final Design by June 2021, with construction to start in either October 2021 or May 2022 due to the intervening in-water moratorium on river construction so as not to interfere with fish breeding.

Total construction time is uncertain, but the hope is that the dredge and pile construction could be accomplished in six and a half months. Construction of the new marina could take another six months, but this is just a guess.

How much of the proposed project will actually be built is also uncertain, and the general plans presented to the committee were described as “aspirational.” The presenters said that after the dredging and pile construction is completed officials will know better what can be accomplished with the remaining funds. The biggest variable is the cost of dredging.

The project must receive the approval of the NYC Public Design Commission.

Those interested in receiving updates on the project can send an email to boatbasin@parks.nyc.gov

Committee/board member questions:

KC: Will construction require closure of any section of the waterfront Esplanade, as was the case during construction of A-Dock? A. This is up to the construction manager, but it should not require closure because all the construction should be from the water side.

KC: How many vessels now docked at the marina are lived in year-round (the “live-aboards”)? A. 10.

KC: Where will they go during construction? A. To the extent they will have to move, they will either temporarily moor north or south of the marina or DPR will help them relocate during some or all of the construction.

KC: What is the project’s design life? A. Nominally, 50 years but probably more like 80 years.

BA: How will the live-aboards get to shore when moored; using a dinghy? A. Don’t know yet. They may get relocated.

SS: How much larger will the new dockhouse be than the current one? A. The original dockhouse was 400 square feet, later enlarged. Don’t know the exact square footage of the proposed one but it would be about 4,000 square feet, including the new deck, compared to the current 1,000 square feet footprint.

SS: What is the largest year-round boat in the marina currently? A. About 80 feet.

NK: What will be the project’s connection to the Rotunda construction? A. Electrical goes through the Rotunda. It would be nice to also connect the sewer to the Rotunda. Trying to coordinate with Rotunda construction; think that is starting in the fall of 2020. Regarding construction, “No part of the Park will be used for staging” (NG).

KN: How will workers arrive at the site? In cars? Important that no worker or other vehicles park in Riverside Park. A. Don’t know. Construction manager will decide. Will keep this in mind.

NK: Will rates for the marina’s users go up once the project is completed? A. (NG): Rates will not rise specifically due to the project. When it comes to raising rates at some point in the future, the site will be looked at like any other site. NYC manages the Marina; it is not a concession. We don’t need to monetize everything we do, and we are not held to a return-on-value.

DM: Is struck by the disparity in the increase in space allocated to the marina (300%) versus the much smaller percentage increase in the number of slips. A. The reason for the increased space is to increase navigability. The largest slip is now for a 52-foot vessel; will go up to 70 feet in the proposed plan.

KN: Where will the live-aboards be located once the project is completed? A. At G-Dock or north, close to the dockhouse.

DM: Will the public have access to the long dock running the length of the new marina’s west side, just as the public currently has access to A-Dock? A. Yes, there will be public access to at least a portion of it.

DM: Will there be any other use of the newly reconstructed Boat Basin? A. No, it will be used only for slippage.

MD: Does the PDC need a recommendation from the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC)? A. The site has been altered too much to be subject to LPC.

JG: Any changes to the railing along the promenade? A. No, there will be changes only to those railings that are seaward of the promenade.

Community comments/questions:

Bill Lewis, Boat Basin resident: This is a marvelous project. Thought this would never happen. Will live-aboards still be allowed in the new marina? Will you allow more? It would make sense financially to add to the numbers, and it would make for a safer environment. A. (NG): "We don't see any change in the way it's running so far." The site will be friendlier to year-round dockage. Will look to maximize usage.

BL: His boat is 83 feet. What will happen? A. You will get a bigger slip.

BL: So you're not kicking me out? A. (NG): "No. It is Parks' policy to renew."

Ira Gershenhorn: Any plans to make restoration of oyster beds or other environmental restoration a part of the project? A. Points to the green roof on the dockhouse. Otherwise no, but could look into other forms of restoration.

IG: Will the wave screen be treated timber? A. Yes.

IG: Will there be kayak storage on the docks? A. The Rotunda will have storage for private kayaks.

Hal Dorfman, seasonal boat owner: Notes that he almost lost a boat at the Boat Basin due to the lack of navigable depth. Loves project. This is fabulous. This project will encourage tourism.

Ed Bacon, Boat Basin resident: Suggests DPR consider issuing a winter-only permit. Thinks there is a lot of demand for live-aboards among the 780-person waiting list.

Gloria Weiss, Boat Basin resident since 1986: Believes that the dwindling number of live-aboards is not only due to attrition but also to City policy, the way permits are given out. She can't believe the facility couldn't be filled with live-aboards. Expresses concern about the number of transients and "mega-yachts" the reconstructed facility will serve. Will it serve the people of the Upper West Side? (In response to KC's follow-up question later in the meeting about whether DPR still welcomes live-aboards and would welcome more, NG said that the Boat Basin must serve a variety of uses, including educational vessels that want to dock and that it involves balancing special events with more normal uses. He said that under Mayor De Blasio, there has been no intentional encouragement of attrition.

KN: Echoes the hope that the expansion of the docks will serve the broad community.

KN: Will the wave screen be submerged? A. Partially submerged one foot below mean low water.

KN: How will the wave screen timber be treated? A. Will use ACQ treatment, no arsenic.

KN: Is this the only FEMA money for Riverside Park? What about other projects between 59th Street and the Cherry Walk? We have waited years for the post-Superstorm Sandy FEMA money. A. The FEMA money is dedicated to this project. (Geoff Martin of DPR): There is more FEMA money for other projects in Riverside Park. KN: It would be good to get more information on those projects at our next meeting.

KN: Brings up the issue of the free kayaking program's at 72nd Street's suspension in 2016 when the dock it was using lost a piling. Wants to put on the table that restoration of the free kayaking program should be a part of this project.

KN: Raises the concern that A-Dock (the "Public Pier") is currently closed to the public for many months during the winter and suggests that there is no reason why it should not be open year-round and closed only on days when ice and snow make closing advisable, especially given that it was recently restored and fortified at enormous public expense. We want to resolve this without waiting for the multi-year construction project to be finished.

KN: Will A-Dock be open throughout construction? A. Don't know.

A discussion then ensued among committee members and board members about whether a resolution from the committee is needed at this time or would be advisable. NG said that they will be meeting with PDC in late spring, but a resolution is not needed for that meeting. He expects to be returning to the committee with another, more detailed presentation sometime between late spring and the fall of 2020. KN opposed doing a resolution, saying the committee should hold off on a resolution until we have a more specific and final design. MD said that a resolution would be an opportunity to say something about what the committee would like them to consider re: the aspects of the project we

care about, such as the future of the live-aboards and the kayak dock. It would allow us to put our imprimatur on this. KN proposes writing a letter rather than doing a resolution that would have to be put before the full board, and this appears to be the consensus of the committee. EC says we could craft a letter with our current concerns and ask that the presenters return to us ASAP. KN will draft the letter and solicit further comments from committee members prior to sending.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm.

PRESERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

K Karpen and Michele Parker, Co-Chairpersons

December 12, 2019 6:30 PM

The Preservation Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Thursday, December 12, 2019 at the District Office, 250 West 87th Street, in the District. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm by co-chairs Michele Parker and K Karpen.

The following discussions were heard and actions taken.

Re: 56 West 85th Street (Columbus Avenue – Central Park West). Application for a rear yard extension with a greenhouse at the rear yard level.

- The applicant's property is in the Upper West Side/Central Park West Historic District.
- The subject building is a townhouse with a basement, 4 full stories and a small rooftop addition, built ca. 1886-87 by architects Thom & Wilson

Presentation by: Paul Gregory, architect

- Applicant's building is a townhouse with an existing L extension covering approximately half the width of the rear façade on the east side of the building, and extending from the garden, parlor and second floors.
- The building immediately to the west also has an L extension on the east side of its building.
- The rear façade of the building including the L extension is faced in common red brick. There are two columns of punched windows with stone lintels and sashes on the ground, parlor and second floors, with three columns of smaller punched windows on the third and fourth floors. The ground floor of the L extension consists of a door to the rear donut garden flanked by short, thin punched windows.
- All of the windows on the rear façade are 1:1 double-hung aluminum windows.
- The main rear façade of the building is approximately 40' from the rear lot line; the existing L extension is 27' from the rear lot line (but pre-dates the 70% lot coverage zoning requirement).
- The proposal is to infill the space to the west of the existing L extension with a one-story common brick extension that will extend to a distance of 30' from the rear lot line, or approximately 10' from the main rear façade.
- The extension will fit between the applicant's L extension and the matching L extension of the neighbor to the west.
- The applicant also seek a greenhouse that will extend to a distance of 24' from the rear lot line, or approximately 6' past the one-story infill. The applicant claims that the incursion into the required rear yard conforms to zoning as the greenhouse is characterized as a temporary structure and a permitted obstruction.
- The greenhouse will be composed of sliding glass doors in the rear, with a pair of skylights set into a metal frame roof. The side walls of the greenhouse will also be in common red brick. There will be no access to the roof of the greenhouse.

RESOLUTION to **approve** as presented.

Committee: 4-0-1-0; non-committee 2-0-1-0

Not yet calendared for a public hearing.

Re: 4 West 90th Street (Central Park West). Application LPC 19-41331 to legalize the installation of windows and a door, and painting the façade without Landmarks Preservation Commission approval.

- The subject building is in the Upper West Side/Central Park West Historic District.
- The building is a townhouse that was originally constructed ca. 1888-89 by architect Gilbert A. Schellenger. The building was significantly altered ca. 1926 by the removal of its front stoop and its brownstone façade surface, the addition of a penthouse, new fenestration and other changes, all by architect Ralph M. Karger.
- The resulting building retains nothing of its original character, and no longer resembles the remaining townhouses in the original grouping of 4.
- This application was presented at the November meeting of the Preservation Committee. The project is being re-presented in order to include issues not specifically identified in the November presentation.

Presentation by: Benjamin Jeon, architect.

- At the time of the November Preservation Committee meeting, there were no adequate images of the appearance of the original door. Since then, the Staff at LPC found pictures of the door as it existed ca. 1984.
- The main door as of 2009 was a replacement metal frame with large glass panels. The metal was a bronze color. Infill with a tall rectangular door and a side fixed panel and narrow transom.

- The LPC Staff also uncovered photographs demonstrating that the color of the front façade ca. 1980 was painted to resemble common red brick (the actual color is unknown).
- The front façade also includes a bronze-colored sign indicating the name of the rental managing agent for the building. The sign had never been approved by LPC.

Committee Comments and Questions:

- The previous resolution adopted in November adequately considered the request to legalize the second-story windows, front door, and removal of the areaway fence. Although not part of the application at that time, the Preservation Committee resolution also determined that the color of the paint on the front façade was not appropriate.
- The Committee finds the sign on the façade to be minimally appropriate given the severely modified condition of the front façade.

RESOLUTION to:

- (a) **approves** the application with respect to the replacement of the second floor windows, the installation of a new main entrance door and related infill, and the placement of a modest bronze-colored sign denoting the name of the managing agent on the front facade as minimally appropriate to the character of the Historic District; and
- (b) **disapproves** the removal of the areaway fence and garbage enclosures, and **disapproves** the painting of the façade a light beige color, as not appropriate to the character of the Historic District; and CB7 calls for the restoration of a black metal fence to define the front areaway and for the front façade to be painted a color more appropriately in harmony with the brownstone townhouses in the remaining grouping on the block.

Committee: 5-0-0-0; Non-Committee Board Members: 3-0-0-0.
Not yet calendared.

Re: 361 Central Park West/1 West 96th Street. Application by the Children’s Museum of Manhattan to construct rooftop and other additions, replace stained glass and other special windows, alter entrances and replace doors, install signage, and excavate at the cellar.

- The building is an individual landmark.
- The structure is a Beaux Arts Classical style church building designed by Carrère & Hastings and constructed in 1899-1903. The Exterior facades are composed of granite.
- The building is owned by the Children’s Museum of Manhattan (“CMOM”), which seeks to adaptively reuse the building as its main programming and exhibition space following exterior and interior renovations.

Presentation by: Leslie Boushara – CMOM Deputy Director of Education and Exhibitions.

- Has been with CMOM 26 years, currently in senior leadership.
- CMOM was founded in 1973 in response to a lack of arts programming for children, especially in the public schools.
- CMOM welcomes over 350K visitors each year to its current main programming and exhibition space on West 83rd Street. Over 50K visitors each year are given free admission through a program to serve low income patrons.
- CMOM has outgrown its current space, and is thrilled to remain on the Upper West Side. CMOM enjoys deep roots with local schools, including PS 9, PS 87, PS 333 (Manhattan School for Children), Success Academy and others. CMOM offers special programs for children with disabilities and with serious illnesses such as cancer, including through partnership with the District 75 Mickey Mantle School.
- CMOM has produced 5 decades of award winning programming and fun exhibits, including through collaborations such as the recent effort with Barnard College. An example is a recent exhibit on Muslim cultures.
- CMOM partners with City Agencies including the Department of Education, the Administration for Children’s Services, the Department of Homeless Services, among many others. For example, CMOM offers programs at 36 Shelters across all five Boroughs.
- A partnership with the Department of Corrections enables currently incarcerated moms to be reunited at CMOM with their children for shared activities.

Presentation by Jane McIntosh – CMOM Chief Advancement Officer.

- CMOM is working with children and families on how to help children grow and develop.
- Current location has physical constraints. Interferes with cutting edge programming and exhibits.
- Over a decade search for a new location. Came to the Church with excitement because of its beauty, permanence and location on the Upper West Side.
- The current space is rented – a move to owned space would be a culmination of the evolution of CMOM’s mission and statement of commitment to the community.
- This location is ideal in that it is proximate to mass transit, upper Manhattan, and Central Park.
- CMOM is currently engaged in a \$200MM capital campaign, and has raised \$60MM so far.
- As part of the process, CMOM’s executive and design teams have already met with neighboring residents, including at 370 CPW, 7, 12 and 22 west 96th Street, and other neighbors.

Presentation by Sylvia Smith and Steve Melky – architects with FX Collaborative.

- This project presents an exciting opportunity for an exemplary adaptive reuse of this individual landmark.
- The challenge is to transform a singular purpose-built facility and into another community service purpose.
- Former use – turn of the century community place of worship; Future use - a place of wonder for families.
- Carrère & Hastings believed in architecture's ability to effect and support a social vision.
- CMOM charged its architects to energize the interior space of this building as a safe place for children.
- The interior would go from a place of contemplation and meditation to one of dynamic interaction.
- New use will positively impact children and families.
- FX Collaborative's other adaptive re-use projects include 41 Park Row, the Statue of Liberty Museum.
- CMOM will bring new life to a valued landmark.
- Project Goals include celebrating the building as it is transformed from one with an internal focus to one that engages the city beyond.
- The goals include preserving and enhancing a relationship between the old and the new.
- Thoughtful preservation while adapting to new uses and observing environmental and current building codes.
- The existing building is an imposing structure. It is truly monumental in context – when first constructed, it dominated the roof lines of neighboring townhouses. Today it bears a different relationship with neighboring apartment buildings.
- Hastings' design evolved during the project. The original approach was to build a smaller building clad in brick, in which most community spaces would have been in basement.
- The Congregation wanted a granite exterior to achieve stature and permanence. And they didn't want the Sunday School children in the basement. This added floors and height to the proposed building.
- Today, the granite shell defines the building. The proposed project would not interfere with the stone shell except to clean it. Unlike the previous proposal from a different owner a few years ago, there are no new windows, louvers or other openings proposed for the granite shell.
- While the interior of the structure and its relationship to the exterior are architecturally significant, Charles Petrel's plaster interior was removed by the previous owner prior to CMOM's involvement.
- The barrel vaulted and chambered ceilings in the main spaces remain.
- Poetic and beautiful space – the oculus windows on the north and south facades are a counterpoint to the large lancet windows below, and bring light to the auditorium.
- CMOM seeks to respect the character and quality of the space as it adapts it for its programming and exhibitions throughout the building.
- The building itself will become a part of the exhibition experience.
- Will be excavating additional floors below the existing basement to create additional exhibition space.

Proposed Modifications to the Building:

Main Entrances.

- The desire is to make museum more welcoming, beginning with ADA-accessibility.
- The existing condition includes several granite steps up to the three entrances on Central Park West (the number of steps increases as one moves north due to the slope of the sidewalk).
- Rather than install significant ramps on the exterior of the façade, the proposal includes accommodating ADA access by re-working the interior floor slab to meet the grade of the sidewalk.
- The result on the CPW elevation will be to remove the granite stairs on all 3 main doors, of which 2 will be used for entrance and 1 for exit.
- The existing walnut doors will be removed and replaced with bronze-colored metal frame doors with large glass panels. The new doors will be taller to extend to the new grade openings.
- The removed walnut doors will be mounted in the interior space of the museum as decorative and instructive elements, with explanatory signage as to their original significance.
- In addition to ADA access, the larger glass doors will provide more transparency and light.
- The bronze "X" pattern transom over the center main entrance on CPW will be retained.
- A similar treatment will be used for the walnut door on the West 96th Street façade, which is already at grade.

Stained Glass Windows.

- The existing condition includes a 2-story tall rectangular stained glass window above the main entrance on the CPW façade, and three large lancet stained glass windows on each of the north and south facades. The CPW large window depicts Jesus and Mary Magdalene in Paradise, and the lancet windows include flora-motif stained glass borders with opaque glazing and stained glass medallions in the center (many with religious iconography).
- The proposal is to remove all of the stained and opaque glass, and to install clear glass windows that retain the bronze muntins, mullions and separations of the existing window frames.
- The purpose of removing the large stained glass windows is to bring into the building more light and a connection to the City, particularly views of Central Park across the street.

- The elimination of the large CPW stained glass window also relates to the architectural plan for the building, as the proposal calls for the addition of a new floor in the middle of the rise of the window.
- Q; Would it be possible to retain the ornate stained glass with the floral motifs that currently frame the large stained glass windows on the north and south facades.
- A: It would be technically possible, but does not fit the program. The use of religious iconography is inconsistent with the new use of the building.
- Retaining only a portion of the stained glass would not be cohesive and would appear out of place.
- CMOM and the design team have spent a lot of time meeting with the stained glass community, seeking to find a group who would adaptively reuse the removed stained glass. Those efforts are ongoing.
- Due to their condition, if the project were to keep the stained glass, it would be necessary to install an outer layer of glass to protect the aging and vulnerable windows. The result would be to lose the appearance of the detail of the stained glass from the exterior, as those on the outside would not be able to see the texture and read the subdivisions or appreciate the images from the exterior.

Rooftop Additions.

- The proposal includes adding a floor above the existing top floor. This would include removing a light ceiling connected to a skylight on the top of the pitched roof.
- The new room to be added above the current top floor will be a performance and programming space that will replace a significant portion of the sloped terra cotta tile roof. The new top floor performance space will be flanked on the south by a loggia – a glass-enclosed walkway with views of the Park and the City beyond. The roof of the loggia will be a partially paved/partially glass walkway that leads to the shoulders of the tower from which the granite steeple/spire rises.
- The performance space will have a taller than average ceiling height.
- The performance space is NOT currently envisioned as a party or a catering space.
- The proposed loggia will provide open City and Park views, which will be a boon especially for children visiting the museum who have no access to such vistas from their homes or schools.
- The proposal also contemplates two large, rectangular enclosures for elevator over-runs, stair bulkheads, and HVAC and other mechanical equipment. The enclosures are to be constructed of sound-baffling material to lessen the noise impact of these rooftop additions and mechanical equipment on the neighbors.
- The result of these rooftop additions will be to cut into the terra cotta sloped roof line on the south side, leaving only a few feet of the existing visible roof line above the cornices.
- The mechanical enclosures will be situated on the north side of the roof, with the bulk of the enclosures rising in the northwest (or farthest interior) corner of the structure.
- The total height of the elevator over-run enclosures will be 40' and 26' respectively above the roof line – the taller structure is to accommodate an industrial capacity freight elevator considered essential for a museum of this size and nature.
- To address concerns that the large glass expanse of the performance and loggia space will cause light pollution, the design team is examining potential shading systems that could be incorporated into the glass walls.
- Elevator and stair bulkheads rise to the west of the new performance space. Necessary for huge freight elevator. Total height 26' above for one elevator and 40' for the highest point.

Visibility.

- The proposed changes to the main entrances, the replacement of the stained glass windows, and the various rooftop additions will all be fully visible from multiple angles on Central Park West, West 96th Street, and within Central Park.
- The original design of the granite shell and steeple/spire includes very strong horizontal lines in the composition of the church – these horizontal lines wrap around to the CPW façade.
- As a result, the rooftop additions will be set back from the heavy cornice line to the extent possible.
- The elevator and stair bulkheads and the mechanical enclosures on the west end are also fully visible from CPW and West 96th Street and from within Central Park.

Other Design Aspects.

- An existing garage door in alleyway to the west of the building between the church and the neighboring apartment building will be replaced with new bronze doors.
- The project calls for the removal of existing sliding metal security grates in the areaway between the existing balustrade on West 96th Street, and installing in new grates. Existing gaps in the balustrade will be infilled with material replicated to match.
- Lighting – there will be no flood lighting of the exterior façade – targeted accent lighting is under discussion.
- Interior lights will be angled so as not to spill onto the sidewalk or public way or be aimed at residential neighbors.
- Modest lights on the footpath on the rooftop terraces will be necessary and will also be angled away from the neighbors and the public way.
- The current hours of CMOM are 10-5, except 10-7 on Sundays.
- Signage – the CMOM name and address will be etched into the glass on main and side entrances.

- Removable banners hung from the main façades and over the inscription on the south façade are contemplated, and will be attached via stainless steel pins.

Community Comment and Questions.

Pastor Terry Starks – Fresh Start New Beginning Church

- Pastored this church from 2007-2010. The congregation was in residence in the building as a tenant.
- The successor congregation that occupied the Church building “exploded” and was unable to sustain its occupancy. Fresh Start New Beginning through Pastor Terry asked to purchase the church building nearly a decade ago, and was turned away.
- The successor congregation made a bad decision and sold the building to a residential developer.
- No church was given the chance to purchase the building.
- Pastor Terry and members of the Fresh Start New Beginning congregation testified at the Board of Standards and Appeals to oppose the conversion of the building into residences under the previous owner’s proposal. The BSA told developer to call the Pastor, which never took place.
- The church building should be used as a church, and we should not be talking about changes to the building.
- The proposed changes to the building are only being made because of the bad decision to sell the building away from its church use in the first place.

Deborah White – Fresh Start New Beginning Church

- It is inappropriate to mutilate the church building. Doing so will irreparably damage its character.
- The proposal will change the church into a peculiar stone box.
- The result will be a monument to short-sightedness. Return this building to house of worship.

Atmeric Lepe - 360 CPW

- Will see the enormous changes to the façade and roof from homes across West 96th Street.
- The building should stay the way it is.

Karen Young

- The influx of over 350K visitors per year – about 1000 per day - to this residential neighborhood is not sustainable.

Elizabeth Kellner – 105th Street and Manhattan Avenue

- Owner of a brownstone in a Historic District.
- Used CMOM for kids – will for grandchildren.
- Do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.
- This building will not be used as a church again. We need adaptive reuse.
- Urge CB7 to support the project.

Richard McElhiny – architect

- Has worked on landmark buildings. Lucy Moses award winner.
- Pleased that CMOM is moving into the community.
- Glad to see the sensitivity to the shell of the building.
- The proposal will radically reconfigure the roof of the building in an unfortunate way.
- The designation report speaks to the roof line and emphasizes the importance of the roof profiles to the character of the building. The substantial “lid” telegraphs the solid within.
- The current proposed design shatters the roof and erases it as a compositional element, leaving only a weak lip along the edge,
- The additional height of the proposed rooftop additions minimizes the spire.
- Must reexamine the massing to re-envision the character of this landmark.

Deborah Blank

- Roof additions are boxy clumps plunked on roof that are visible from the public way.
- The massing violates the architectural integrity of the building next door at 7 West 96 – the setbacks of the next door building start at the roof line. The proposed new rooftop clumps and mechanicals block the setbacks, implying that setbacks begin higher up.

Gloria Knowles – retired NYC school teacher; Fresh Start New Beginning Church Member.

- Holds certificate in museum education.
- This building links the past to the future. Our children do not have the chance to see that kind of history.
- Loss of the past cannot be recovered.

Darlene Booth – 50 West 97th Street

- The Fresh Start Church was a safe haven. All feasted upon the beauty of the building.
- Allow it to remain a church. Can’t find religious institutions.

Clay Williams – 7 West 96th Street

- The mechanicals will impact the light for those who live on the 10th floor.
- Letter from NYC Audubon Society re concern for birds that use neighboring buildings as nesting places. Many of these birds are migratory, and are insectivores. North America has lost 27% of birds in recent years.
- CMOM – roof could be a chance to see these birds.

Alyssa Vitrano

- Architect residing in an adjacent building.
- The proposed roof diminishes the tower – the sheer bulk of the proposed additions reduces the building to a mini skirt. Mock-ups look different from higher floors.
- Light from the glass rooftop structures glass will be a glowing orb in the middle of residential neighborhood. Visitors will stare at the windows of the adjacent apartment building.

Rod Chay

- The proposed development will forever change this corner.
- Excited about museum but the historical aesthetic will be completely destroyed.
- Rooftop addition is the most problematic – it dramatically changes the composition.
- Putting a top hat on an historic structure. New addition extends above existing top point of roof.
- Retaining historical proportions should be goal. Individual landmark - deserves protection.
- Excited that CMOM will occupy the building, but it is incumbent that CB7 and LPC protect landmarks from being permanently altered.

Dan Cohen – CB9

- Dismayed at design – the rooftop additions are a take-out dinner tray slicing off a portion of the roof.
- The community fought to protect what was originally a church from a developer trying to convert to condos.
- Dismayed that the Fresh Start church did not get a chance to purchase and restore the building to use as a church.
- FX is a great architecture firm – why would you propose this.
- Appreciate all that CMOM brings to the community. Pleased that the building is being maintained.
- Gotta do better than this.

Susan Simon – 370 CPW

- Founder of CPW neighbors association and a Landmark West member.
- Founded org in response to the previous unthinkable attempt to make condos out of the church.
- The interior of the former church has already been destroyed.
- Trying to force square peg into a round hole.
- Ecclesiastical nature of landmark is more suited to a museum as closer to its mission.
- Thought that CMOM would be a wonderful fit and would be sensitive to the landmark.
- The Neighborhood Association's opposition to the last proposal made CMOM's ownership possible.
- The proposed designs are inappropriate to the landmark.
- Changes – hodgepodge of intrusive additions. Some less than 20' from residential buildings.
- Removing Stained Glass is inappropriate to integrity of the individual landmark.
- The magnificent roof line will be lost to a glass modern box smack in the center of the roof.
- The rooftop additions compromise the steeple. Should not put a walkway for children on a roof.
- Stained glass executed by Hermann Schlatterhorn. Per Alice Frelinghuysen – allowing the removal of stained glass would cause irreparable harm to the building. Similar to the abysmal proposal to change the NYPL.
- CMOM must do better than this.
- Submitting letter from Charles Warren – architect who has written extensively on Carrère & Hastings.

Letitia Bolden – Fresh Start New Beginning Church member

- Emotional topic. History is not a chance to turn a landmark into a monopoly. Emotional because the building is a physical object with a soul that is being fought over. Not the right fate for this building.
- Mother's funeral in this church in 2013.
- The building should be a church – it is hard enough to preach the Gospel in a world more concerned with cool sneakers. Terrible loss.
- Fought for succession rights to rent stabilized apartments. Churches should have succession rights.

Arnold Blank – 7 West 96th Street

- Knew changes would be coming – but expected CB7 would not permit a gross obtrusive structure to be built.
- Height on roof would increase by 25%. Too much.

Jacquiline Steinach

- Should only remove the religious aspects of the stained glass.
- Entrance should not be modified. Concern for the loss of the current copper roof structure.

- Excited for CMOM to come to the neighborhood.

Peter Arndtsen – Neighbor

- CMOM would be an important addition to our neighborhood – supports the project.
- High concentrations of elderly and youth north of 96th street – a neighborhood that has been ignored by the City for years – would welcome a world-class operation in our neighborhood.
- CMOM is an important that organizations that can bring cultural possibilities to our youth and our neighborhood.
- The redesign has been approached with sensitivity and high class materials.
- This is a tremendous opportunity to open up a building that has been closed up for its entire existence.
- Will join other individual landmarks protected in the neighborhood - Youth Hostel, Cathedral, St. Michael's.
- The redesign will also benefits birds – chimney swifts.

Vernetta Smith - Fresh Start New Beginning

- The Church is holy ground. God's house must remain – not tampered with. Keep family together.
- Pastor Terry can continue God's work.
- Removing the doors and stained glass and changing volume of the roof is blasphemy.
- Not God's plan to make these changes. Museum just trying to make profit.

Page Cowley – Landmark West

- While a member of CB7, speaking for Landmark West.
- Legacy of Arlene Simon – designating churches
- Initially thought CMOM's use would be the best use ever.
- Current CMOM site is actually the former Holy Trinity Chapter house.
- Spoke with Charles Warren – architect who chronicled Carrère & Hastings – disapproves of this plan.
- Carrere & Hastings looked to Christopher Wren.
- Scale of the interior is blown to smithereens – 2-3 story connectors
- Grass terraces are not needed across from Central Park. Glass gets dirty and will be unsightly.
- The excavation is troubling – must be a better way. Concern for latent damage and need for underpinning.
- Concern for the stacked volume on the roof and the loss of the lay light feature.
- Encourage not to look at large Civic buildings for inspiration.
- British solved the problem of religious iconography in stained glass by using pocket doors that would enable the owner to slide the stained glass windows away and back out as appropriate.
- Also stained glass windows would need supportive exterior glass treatment or framing to support if retained.
- This design reflects a good start by good architects, but the proposal still needs a lot of work.
- Caution re excavation – angle of influence too close to subway tunnel – MTA may object.
- Don't want to say no to CMOM to this use – but there must be a gentler way.
- This eviscerates the human scale – just too much.

Committee and Board Comments.

Jay Adolf:

- Appreciates the difficulty of updating vs appropriateness of changes.
- Toured the building.
- Sad that interior had been decimated by a previous owner.
- Affection and support for CMOM - wants them to stay in our neighborhood. Happy to have an occupant for adaptive reuse about which we feel positive. Prior attempt to convert to residential was ill-advised.
- CB7 advised in connection with the residential proposal that no other churches were interested in the property.
- 3 issues:
 - (1) Relocating wooden doors is a reasonable trade-off to achieve required accessibility changes.
 - (2) Roof additions are massive and totally out of synch with character of the church building. Architects could do better - the scale of the rooftop additions must be reduced.
 - (3) Stained glass – felt equally strongly in last proposed project.
 - Within the building, the only remaining artistic element is the stained glass – the rest of the interior has been gutted.
 - The last residential developer also proposed to remove stained glass due to Code requirements plus the lack salability of apartments that contained religious iconography.
 - Feel strongly stained glass should be retained in situ.
 - Visual feeling from the inside is so much greater than the outside.
 - Don't understand why the stained glass could not be retained along with an explanation of the history – religious iconography is part of the building's heritage.
- Inscriptions on the sanctuary interior should be retained to keep the original spiritual feeling of the building.
- Can't support – not appropriate.

Peter Samton:

- Respects FX Collaborative as architects and friends. Could do much better especially with respect to the roof.
- Trying to cram too much into the roof – top-heavy building with walkway and performance space.
- Need to do less up on top and preserve some of the existing roof, which is a powerful element. Only preserving 3-4 feet of the current roof slope. There is a whole new city on top – too much.
- Doors – ok to take away the steps for ADA access. But 11' tall doors are too out of scale for children.
- Mechanical and elevator bulkheads on the roof are huge. The engineers need to try harder to reduce.
- Turning its back on the neighbors by obscuring their view of the church.
- Stained glass should be retained.
- Interior plan below the roof is reasonable.

Madge Rosenberg:

- The rooftop addition should be lowered, and the mechanicals and elevator bulkheads should come down.
- Should preserve some portion of the skeleton as a demonstration for children.
- Could not understand the roof .
- Removal and repurposing of the doors is good – should keep the stained glass windows.

Paul Fischer:

- Concern that workers on the project be paid prevailing wages. Prior owner did not pay prevailing wages and the asbestos removal was done badly years ago.
- Built the elevator shaft at West 83rd – all for this change.
- If we disapprove this, this won't be a church.

Ira Mitchneck:

- Wanted to applaud project and CMOM.
- Can't approve as appropriate. Lot of changes to this design are necessary.
- Use of Tamany Hall rooftop glass structure actually defeats there argument, as it is totally inappropriate.
- The volume and changes to the rooftop is the largest objection.
- The rooftop performance space doesn't look like space for children – it looks like a party space for adults.
- Generator need not go on the roof. Can go in the cellar. As can the elevator machine room.
- Some addition to the roof space is possible, but not this extensive.
- Stained glass in pocket doors is a good solution.
- Resolution should say what we would like to see.
- Not sure excavation is good, but if can put mechanicals there, would be worth it.

Mark Diller:

- The neighborhood has already lost beautiful houses of worship such as Shaare Zedek and Congregation Habonim. Others like West Park Presbyterian cannot afford the required maintenance and have permanent scaffolds. Concern that without adaptive reuse the same fate will befall this building.
- The entrance doors are similar to a solution at St. James Church on Madison Avenue – appropriate and innovative.
- The stained glass, while beautiful, is a feature of the interior of the building, not the exterior. The framing muntins and mullions are exterior features, but not the imagery.
- Government per the first amendment cannot and should not require religious iconography to be retained. What if a synagogue or a mosque had purchased the building – surely we could not require them to retain Christian imagery.
- The rooftop additions are massive, and CB7 should encourage the design team to revisit and reduce the volume and bulk to the extent possible, including exploring new solutions.
- But in the overall context, it is not appropriate to question the programmatic needs of an institution such as a museum. Whether the solution is appropriate is the only question, so concerns about how the volume on the roof will be used are not a basis to disapprove.
- While a challenge, on balance the proposals are minimally appropriate and should be approved lest this building be lost.

Jay Adolf:

- Disagree – windows should be treated as an exterior element.
- Agree that CB7 should not judge the program needs – just the solutions as translated into architecture.
- Reducing the elevator bulkheads is a solutions that should be explored and revised.
- Suggestion – the Preservation Committee should do as LPC often does – take no action and invite the applicant to return with a revised proposal. LPC often takes no action, offers recommendations and suggests further work with its Staff. The Committee should do the same.
- This is a good solution here where we want to approve CMOM's use, but the design needs changes.
- Would require that the applicant be amenable to coming back with revisions.

Michele Parker:

- Agree replacing wood doors is appropriate.
- Stained glass – agree are interior elements, and adding an exterior support mechanism would further render the windows an interior element. The inscriptions inside the building are also interior elements and not appropriate to require be retained.
- Cannot force CMOM to retain religious images – they would lose patrons if retained.
- The roof changes are too much – Hard to see how the roof fits into the rest of the building.

K:

- Excited about prospect of CMOM using the space.
- Agree that the roof is over the top – needs work.
- Stained glass – would be eager to see it repurposed with an educational/historical function.
- Doors a little shocking but appropriate.
- Jay’s suggestion is a good one – give the applicant a second chance.
- Calendared at LPC on 1/14/20

Mark Diller:

- Need a resolution in hand in case CMOM declines to return to the Committee in January. Cannot have CB7 silent on this application.
- From the Committee’s comments, it would appear that a protective disapproval resolution is in order, which can be tabled if CMOM returns to the Committee in January.

RESOLUTION – To **disapprove** as presented with respect to (a) the proposal for removal of the stained glass windows, and (b) the proposed composition of the roof structures (performance space, loggia, mechanicals).

The “whereas” clauses to include expressions of support of CMOM and the desire to make this project work and hope that museum will complete this project.

Committee: 5-0-0-0; Non-committee Board members: 2-2-1-0.

Present: K Karpen, Michele Parker, Jay Adolf, Madge Rosenberg and Peter Samton. **Chair:** Mark Diller. **Board Members:** Page Cowley, Paul Fischer and Ira Mitchneck. **Absent:** Susan Schwartz.

Adjourned: 10:25 pm.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Howard Yaruss, Chairperson

December 10, 2019

Meeting called to order 7:00 pm

Howard Yaruss introduced the Executive Officer of the 24th Precinct, Captain Alexandra Sarubbi-Barcia.

Mark Diller gave a brief overview of the Community Board, including that the committees develop resolutions for adoption at the Full Board meetings

1. Discussion of 10 intersections in District 7 with highest number of crashes.

STREET	AVENUE	2017-2019 CRASHES	2017-2019 INJURIES
WEST 60 STREET	BROADWAY	72	12
WEST 81 STREET	CENTRAL PARK WEST	63	14
WEST 66 STREET	AMSTERDAM AVENUE	43	15
WEST 72 STREET	AMSTERDAM AVENUE	67	10
WEST 79 STREET	AMSTERDAM AVENUE	42	7
WEST 96 STREET	BROADWAY	53	14
WEST 97 STREET	AMSTERDAM AVENUE	38	12
WEST 96 STREET	CENTRAL PARK WEST	34	15
WEST 88 STREET	BROADWAY	27	15
WEST 100 STREET	CENTRAL PARK WEST	26	15

2. **West 97th Street Greenmarket** (Amsterdam-Columbus Avenues.) **Application by Greenmarket/ GrowNYC to the Mayor's Street Activity Permit Office for a permit to hold a greenmarket on Fridays on West 97th Street.**

RESOLUTION to **approve**, *Committee: 9-0-0-0. Non-Committee Board Members: 3-0-0-0.*

3. **Riverside Drive** (West 72nd – 73rd Streets.) Petition #81-4711846 for a new revocable consent by Sullivan Group Design, LLC, to construct, maintain and use a proposed snowmelt system, stoop and walled-in area with gate, hatch, stair and planted area on and under the east sidewalk of Riverside Drive. Mark Sullivan presented the plans for the snowmelt system, stoop and walled-in area.

James Parker from 5 Riverside Drive explained that Landmarks had approved an addition on the top of the building which CB7 had rejected. He also explained that the area in front of the building is heavily trafficked at multiple times during each day.

Lori Gabriel: it is a dangerous corner

Rich requested that the resolution be broken into two parts.

Resolution to permit a stoop and walled in area with a gate;

Committee: 2-3-4-0.

RESOLUTION to **disapprove**, *Committee 3-1-5-0.*

RESOLUTION to **approved** snowmelt system, *Committee: 6-2-1-0. Non-Committee Members: 5-0-0-0.*

4. Deputy Inspector Timothy Malin introduced Sergeant Giancarlo Rodriguez. Sergeant Montgomery has a new job with Manhattan North. Roberta commented that Captain Sarubbi was honored last night at the Neighborhood Block Associations annual event. DI Malin reported that Brinks armored van struck an 83 year old woman at 61st and Broadway. The incident is being investigated by the DA's office because the woman is in critical condition. He reported

that in 2019 collisions are down 16%, injuries are down 8 1/2%, pedestrian injuries down 9.2% and bike injuries are up 4%. They have written 20% less summonses. Bike summonses are only 3% of the total. They are getting more cops in March.

5. Revisions to the request for a curbside study.

Mark - the vote will be tonight and the resolution won't go to the Board until February because he wants to meet with groups of people and get a consensus not a mere majority.

Howard explained the revised resolution and turned it over for audience questions and comments:

Paul Schreiber: against resolution

Leonard Daniels - need parking spaces

Valerie Babson - great idea to study

Charles Gross - wants non-biased study

Steven Tuross - doesn't want to lose parking

Lori Gabriel - needs to park on street

Clara Boyd - fears lots of biases

Barbara Rice- times change, we banned cigarettes, and there are adverse health and climate effects from cars

Ira Gershenhorn - a study will provide more information

Beth Orum - represent group that doesn't drive, free parking is not a public right

Christine Paloner - needs to commute and free parking

Ed Simon - resolution is biased

Jane Lamar - residential parking will be good

Burton Joseph - not much cruising takes place

David Vasser - wants study, loves to bike because it is eco-friendly

Stephanie Campbell - needs car and wants free parking

Abraham Palerazi - artist, can't afford to lose parking spot

Scott Rodimaker - appreciated residential parking permits, wants side street parking

Rick Simone - worried about contesting pricing and losing parking

Michael Lenahan - parents with disabled children need parking

Josh Pinkerton - favors study, wants to eliminate pollution

Lorin Kerr - concern about bias and delayed traffic

Lisa Orman - likes new resolution, favors a study, CB7 needs to represent the entire community

Bill Light - parks on street, concern with quality of life

Mendy Haskel - wants study, problems with double parking

Steve Ikrod - supports study, not fair the way parking is allocated

Brad Taylor - commented Board

Dee Reese - supports resolution, look to global leaders

Sam Kern - supports study, want residential permits

Ann O'Shea - supports study, terrified to ride a bike

Steve Gallagher - car owner, supports study, doesn't want Board members to belong to Transportation Alternatives

Jeff France - e-commerce use public space

Reed Ruby - supports study, public space is owned by all

Mark Friedman - thinks resolution is biased, money is mentioned 5 times

Henry Rinehart - supports study, improve business climate because businesses need walk-in traffic

Gloria Powell - want outside group to do study

Deborah Kayman - curbside space has changes, traffic has been slowed

Rick Nelson - shrink space by fire hydrants, wants more parking

Peter Frishauf - supports study, look at best practices in other cities

Board Discussion:

Sara - members have reached out to businesses

Barbara - wants to wait for congesting pricing. Said resolution is disingenuous.

Roberta - pleased with dialogue and involving community in a forum and two committee discussions. Likes the revised resolution

Julian - great to have input from large group, pleased to be able to hear people's experiences. We need the study

Rich - worried about congestion pricing and people cruising to find space

Doug - supports study want to be objective and better informed

Elizabeth - resolution is trying to encourage working together

Ken - our streets are dysfunctional. 9,500 spaces on UWS

Howard - the City controls the streets and is our option for a study

Jay - appreciated collegiality, there will be subliminal biases, but it is better. Mark should not hold meetings outside of the committee, it is a dangerous precedent

Mark - residential parking will require legislation. He does not agree with Jay about outside meetings

Paul - the bike lane on Amsterdam Avenue is on a truck route - trucks cause asthma, fix is in

Andrew - while City is not interested in residential parking it may change its mind once congested pricing is in place

Josh - agree with Jay about meetings being public

Howard accepted changes to the resolution

RESOLUTION approved, *Committee: 9-0-0-0; Non-Committee Members: 3-3-0-0.*

6. Develop policy for consideration of requests for curbside access to residential buildings.

Board discussion: size of building 40 or more units, block association approves or petition signed by people on block, NORC, no fire hydrant, no unique traffic conditions

Resolution approved, *Committee: 8-0-0-0; Non-Committee Members: 3-0-0-0.*

7. A proposal to support the Improving Helicopter Safety Act of 2019.

Ken reported on the Legislation which will ban all tourist and non-essential helicopter traffic in Manhattan.

Rich wanted to amend the resolution to ban news helicopters - it failed to gain support

Resolution approved, *Committee: 6-0-0-0; Non-Committee Members: 3-1-0-0.*

8. Update on the Central Park Bike Lane

Colleen Chattergoon reported that 1st phase is completed. They put a curb extension at 61st Street. The 2nd phase will begin in the spring and signal changes in Phase 1 will begin this winter

Present: Howard Yaruss, Andrew Albert, Elizabeth Caputo, Joshua T. Cohen, Ken Coughlin, Julian Giordano, Doug Kleiman, Sara Lind and Richard Robbins. **Chair:** Mark Diller. **Board Members:** Barbara Adler, Jay Adolf, Mark Diller, Paul Fischer, Jeanette Rausch and Roberta Semer. **Absent:** Meg Schmitt.

Meeting adjourned 10 pm

Youth, Education & Libraries Committee – Community Board 7/M
Minutes – December 19, 2019

The Youth, Education & Libraries Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Thursday, December 19, 2019, at the District Office, 250 West 87th Street, floor HC, in the District. The meeting was called to order at 6:35 pm by co-chairs Blanche Lawton and Steven Brown. Committee members Paul Fischer, Julian Giordano, Madelyn Innocent and Amy Lydon and non-committee Board members Mark Diller, Lolita Ferrin, and Doug McGowan participated.

The following topics were discussed.

Discussion with Sydney Renwick, Associate Director for Government & Community Affairs at the New York Public Library, on the state of libraries in the system and specifically how the branches in the CB7 District compare with other sectors relative to attendance and programs.

Presentation by Sydney Renwick, Office of Government and Community Affairs, NYPL:

- CB7 Branch Libraries (1,061,744 visitors to branches in FY 19):
 - Bloomingdale:
 - 137,779 visits in FY 19
 - 13,113 program attendees in FY19
 - Performing Arts
 - 354,762 visits in FY 19
 - 30,129 program attendees in FY 19
 - Riverside
 - 289,380 visits in FY 19
 - 38,578 program attendees in FY 19
 - St. Agnes
 - 279,823 visits in FY 19
 - 39,380 program attendees – FY 19

- Gearing up for the Census 2020 – there will be programming to support a complete Census count at the branches.
- Will provide computer access to facilitate library users completing the Census form online, as well as assistance with paper Census forms.
- Targeting hard-to-count Census populations.
- Each branch will have a Census kiosk to facilitate completing the Census.

- Branch libraries assist with IDNYC renewals. The cards of the first cohort of IDNYC recipients expired recently.
- All branch libraries can process IDNYC renewals via online resources; Grand Central and Kingsbridge (Bronx) have HRA staff available to facilitate and assist patrons with questions.
- IDNY cards can be used as library cards.

- Community Partnerships:
 - Family storytime at Children’s Aid (Frederick Douglass).
 - Teen writing – originated at Bloomingdale branch library, currently relocated to the Columbus branch during the renovations at Bloomingdale.
 - Book discussion groups at St. Agnes.
 - Therapy Dogs at Riverside – children aged 6-12 can read aloud to a dog – great for struggling readers. The Therapy Dogs are named “Tugboat” and “Moxie.”

- Also knitting, tech help.
- Jajaira Mejja – Bloomingdale Programs:
 - While Bloomingdale is closed, programs have been relocated.
 - Storytime has been relocated to Children’s Aid at Frederick Douglass Center. Thanks to Amy Hyman, CB7 YEL member and Center Director of Children’s Aid.
 - Participated in the 24 Precinct Back-To-School backpack give-away.
 - Participated in the Jewish Home Senior Fair.
 - Still maintaining their relationship with local schools.
 - The Bloomingdale website is active even during the branch renovation.
- Jennifer Zarr – St. Agnes Programs:
 - Harry Potter party – the series maintains its popularity.
 - Aaron Kim – Cat on the Bus – author reading/visit.
 - STEAM club – one way in which St. Agnes is building programs to attract an older child audience.
 - Young children book clubs.
 - Spanish bi-lingual storytime on Wednesday after school.
 - Mylibrarynyc.org – visited with the Rodeph Shalom school to facilitate using library resources.
- Anne-Marie – Reading and Writing Group (volunteer)
 - Bloomingdale youth librarian has been relocated to Columbus branch – 10th Avenue between West 50-51st Streets.
 - Existing youth programs at the Columbus branch are not well-attended.
 - Program is geared for ages 12 and up.
- Kimberly Spring - NYPL Bookmobile Program:
 - NYPL has been using bookmobiles since 1930s – phased out in the 1980s.
 - NYPL is now using bookmobiles in areas whose branches have been closed for renovations.
 - The bookmobile will be visiting Children’s Aid at Frederick Douglass.
 - Patrons and community members can request the bookmobile to be a part of an event or program initiative.
 - The Bookmobile is being re-introduced this year.
 - Services available includes circulating materials (include call-ahead with order filled and place on reserve/hold).
 - WiFi availability has been an issue.
- Upcoming bookmobile times at Children’s Aid on Mondays and Fridays.
 - Columbus-Amsterdam BID will help publicize the availability of the Bookmobile.
 - Ideas for additional sites include the 24 Precinct and Trinity Lutheran on West 100th Street. Also PS 75 and PS 165 are available (and are accessible sites).
 - Can find the location of the bookmobile @nypl on Twitter – also nypl.org/bookmobile.
- Capital and Expense Budget Needs:
 - Bloomingdale Library
 - Reconfiguration of the interior to create a dedicated teen space and update the existing restrooms on the second floor.
 - Teen space will require new walls and upgrades to the electrical, power/data, lighting and other services.
 - Blanche: Capital needs should include the reclaiming and use of the basement space at the Bloomingdale branch.

- Nearly the entire footprint of the building is currently raw space that would need to be renovated to be used as programming or public-facing space.
 - Currently used by the facilities management team.
 - Included in CB7's District Needs Statement for the most recent several years.
 - A: CB7 should seek funding from Participatory Budgeting.
- CB7 Comments and Questions:
 - Natasha:
 - Q: The use of Participatory Budgeting may be limited in scope and in the amount of funding available.
 - A: Existing capital requests were generated by internal NYPL, not from Community Board or community initiatives.
 - A: Can still seek to add this project to the capital needs of the NYPL.
- Paul:
 - Q: Who is using the Bloomingdale basement?
 - A: Used for storage of materials for facilities management. Not finished for public use.
 - A: Also will use the basement as storage and staging area for Bookmobiles.
- Julian:
 - Grew up using the Riverside branch; now uses the branch libraries to tutor other students.
 - Concern that teens' use of branch libraries is falling – curious how to reverse that trend.
 - A: NYPL seeks teen participation by outreach on social media. Interested in feedback from teens on the most effective means to conduct outreach.
 - There are Youth Leadership Councils at various City agencies – such as the Chancellor's Youth Advisory Council. May be an opportunity to engage youth for the libraries. Many coordinated with NYC Service.
- Doug:
 - As parent of young daughters – appreciate the resources.
- Catherine:
 - Q: How many bookmobiles are available in the system?
 - A: There are currently 3 – one each for Staten Island, Manhattan and the Bronx.
- Steven:
 - Q: Does NYPL track online resource usage?
 - A: Track visits and program usage and circulation, but not necessarily online usage.
 - A: Also track usage of e-books. Will continue to monitor usage.
- Peter Arndtsen – Columbus-Amsterdam BID:
 - Struck by difference in usage between branches. Bloomingdale has active youth programming and participation. It appears that Riverside and Columbus branches do not enjoy as active a youth participation.
- Thad Krupo – Riverside Branch, NYPL
 - Youth actually do use the Riverside Branch, especially at 3 pm immediately after the teens left the several high schools in that area. Appearance of light usage is time-sensitive.

Presentation by Meisha Allen – Ryan Center Reading program

- Americorps member – Community Resource liaison.

- Reading program available at the Ryan Center on West 97th Street.
- Reach Out And Read – provides free books to children after each visit to the Ryan Center. Books provided by Scholastic and All About Books, but will welcome donations from the public as well.
- Seeking facilitators for the program with other language facility.
- Suggestion to work with tutoring programs at Sts. Paul and Andrew (West End Avenue at West 86th Street) and at St. Michael's (Amsterdam Avenue at West 99th Street).
- Prescriptions for reading – medical professionals support the use of the library.

New Business:

Discussion with District 3 Parents Responding to the School Diversity Advisory Group's Recommendation to Eliminate Gifted & Talented Programs.

Carrie Casselman:

- Mother of 2 daughters – one in the G&T at PS 166; the other a pre-schooler
- Concern relates to the second School Diversity Advisory Groups (“SDAG”) report released in August 2019.
- Recommendations in the report focused on increasing school diversity.
- Experience has shown that parents support the goals of the SDAG reports to increase equity and access and enhanced diversity in admissions and enrolment.
- The August 2019 SDAG report recommended eliminating all G&T programs throughout New York City.
- While the report recommends adding enrichment and increased rigor in all schools throughout the system, there are currently no real alternative programs or plans in place.
- SDAG recommends elimination of G&T in a near term – 0 to 3 years.
- CSD3 includes significant G&T opportunities, including at the Anderson School, PS 166, PS 163, PS 165 and PS 191 (PS 191 has a 3rd grade entry point; the others admit students starting in K).
- PS 166 has 2 sections of G&T – about half the sections.
- SDAG employs a top-down approach.
- Does not include sensitivity to the perceived Charter School “drain” (and resulting resource drain) – eliminating G&T would not address that issue.
- The SDAG report also does not recognize the potential for an impact on the housing market from the G&T proposal. Eliminating G&T as a choice locks enrolment into geographic catchment areas, so that more students would be forced to use their zoned public schools. Since different elementary schools in CSD3 have widely different performance statistics, the real estate associated with the perceived higher performing schools could command higher prices at the expense of schools on different points in the school performance spectrum.
- The opportunity to expand G&Ts exists – there used to be many more sections and more schools offering G&T curriculum.
- Far more students qualify than are placed in G&T.
- There is high demand in CSD3 for accelerated G&T as well as enriched G&T. It is an opportunity that could be harnessed. In CSD3, Anderson is the example of accelerated G&T.
- Anderson admissions typically requires a test score above the 97th percentile (typically above).
- District-wide admissions typically requires a test score above the 90th percentile.
- Current District G&T is not flexible for changing schools or programs.
- CSD3 has uneven school performance in general education classes.

- Having high performing schools throughout the Upper West Side would be a benefit to building a sustainable community.
- Q: Does the parent community place equal value in the accelerated vs enriched G&T approaches?
- A: Each has its audience.
- A: Principals select the curriculum for each school. Citywide principals collaborate for a common Citywide curriculum, although one is not mandated by Tweed.
- A: District G&T curriculum is on the same track as that school's general education curriculum, but at a deeper depth and with more involved assignments and work expectations.
- Q: Are District G&Ts undersubscribed?
- A: Some are; others have waiting lists.

Albert Tom:

- 4,000 students are eligible for Citywide G&T seats; only about 200 will receive an offer of admission.
- Citywide G&T – DoE does not impose a single curriculum on the 5 Citywide G&Ts – the principals collaborate on their own.
- Each school shares its experiences and best practices with the others.
- TAG – a Harlem Citywide G&T – now is more in line than in past years with other Citywide G&T curriculum.
- District G&T – students need to have greater than average stamina to keep up with the homework.
- There are no Citywide G&Ts in the Bronx or Staten Island – D3 is lucky to have so many great programs close at hand.
- The SDAG report correctly notes the performance of subgroups of color and wants to fix that result. This is exactly the correct motivation. The issue is the means to that end.
- Report does not proceed from an education theory or practice – it is a sociological response rather than a curriculum response.

MND

- Concern that the 8 Specialized High Schools, whose lack of diversity has been so much in the news of late, was in fact much more diverse a generation or more ago, at a time when there were far more G&T programs in non-affluent neighborhoods.
- Uncertain whether there is a causal relationship between the elimination of G&T programs in the Bronx, Brooklyn and other locations and the decline in diversity at the Specialized High Schools, but it is at a minimum worth investigating before taking steps to eliminate rather than re-introduce these programs.

Lawrence Lee

- Admissions to G&T had been based on multiple factors including recommendations and other subjective factors.
- Mayor Bloomberg changed G&T admissions to rely much more heavily on test scores. Enrolment in G&T s in the Bronx and Brooklyn then dwindled.
- The growth of Charter Schools occurred around the same time. The Charter School alternative may have filled some of the demand previously directed to Outer Borough G&T.
- Lawrence Lee
- PS 165 is at the north end of CB7's District.
- The 3rd grade G&T class has 14 children, only 2 of whom are white.
- G&T are maligned for lack of diversity, but that is not always the case.
- Seeking a great education for one's kids is not any different for families of color – all G&T families are enrolled because they actively sought out that program.

- Families from the community surrounding PS 165 who are of color are enrolling in other choices than public general education. The walk from drop-off to the subway includes many local residents with children in religious and private school uniforms heading to the subway.
- Charter schools enroll children of color with greater success.
- Because all families want the best education for their children, parents will go where they perceive the best opportunity for their children.
- Booker T enrolls many families whose children attended Charter Schools for elementary years.
- Charter parents often feel public schools failed them, and do not feel free to express that sentiment other than by voting with their feet.
- Compounding this problem is the perception that there are no college-track high schools in our District. [NB: Hunter Science HS at MLK; Frank McCourt at the Brandeis Campus; Special Music School; etc.]
- Carrie Casselman
- The SDAG recommendation could impact the Upper West Side in a profound way.
- Would like to see a movement to expand G&T and expand access.
- Rhetoric around the SDAG is that equity and diversity are incompatible with G&T.
- TAG is contrary to the narrative that these are incompatible.

Committee Questions and Comments:

- Doug:
 - Q: How would a Citywide G&T like Anderson admit students if G&T were phased out?
 - A: No specifics were included in the SDAG recommendations.
- Catherine:
 - If CB7 were to take this up, would want more clarity on SDAG report and its approach.
 - SDAG had access to information not available to the public.
 - Group worthy of respect – would want to hear from those who are involved in the four programs.
 - Intrigued by access – and be more thoughtful about access.
- Steven – CB7 YEL will begin a process to engage on this issue.
- Julian – parents presented the issue both cogently and appropriately.
 - CB7 should develop an informed perspective.
 - A great way to have community input – without shouting matches and such.
 - Should be working in community toward a consensus.

New Business continued –

Paul

- There is an imbalance in PTA fundraising – some schools' parents raise more than \$1M when others have no resources.
- Chancellor at PS 163 Town Hall visit responded positively to the idea of PTAs being required to contribute 20% toward a general fund.
- Would like to bring a resolution to the full Board.
- Steven – need to plan research and meetings to hear from all stakeholders as a means to move toward considering such a resolution.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 pm.