

FULL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

November 3, 2021 at 6:30pm via ZOOM

Steven Brown, Chairperson

Present: Barbara Adler, Jay Adolf, Andrew Albert, Linda Alexander, Richard Asche, Kristen Berger, Steven Brown, Elizabeth Caputo, Courtney Clark Metakis, Joshua Cohen, Christian Cordova, Ken Coughlin, Page Cowley, Louisa Craddock, Mark Diller, Beverly Donohue, Robert Espier, Sheldon Fine, Paul Fischer, Miranda Goodwin-Raab, Amy Hyman, Madelyn Innocent, K Karpen, Natasha Kazmi, Doug Kleiman, Blanche Lawton, Ira Mitchneck, Klari Neuwelt, William Ortiz, Michele Parker, Seema Reddy, Andrew Rigie, Richard Robbins, Madge Rosenberg, Peter Samton, Susan Schwartz, Roberta Semer, Ethel Sheffer, Polly Spain, Benjamin Wu and Howard Yaruss. **Absent:** Daniela Alvarado, Rosa Arenas, Catherine DeLazzerio, Audrey Isaacs, Sara Lind, Jeannette Rausch, Melissa Rosenberg, Meg Schmitt and Erana Stennett.

The full Board of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Wednesday, November 3, 2021, on the Zoom online platform. Steven Brown called the meeting to order at 6:33pm after the Secretary confirmed the existence of a quorum. He noted that the chat has a sign-in form for members of the public who wish to speak. He announced that there are 13 items to be voted on and that he will pause before each vote to allow the public to speak.

Public Safety Session

Report from Captain Zuber, NYPD 20th Precinct:

- He recently attended a Zoom meeting with the BIDs representing businesses in the precinct. They are concerned about the homeless on the streets. The NYPD is not the primary agency charged with addressing this issue. They offer services and the homeless are free to decline. He urged restaurants with outdoor seating to secure the area with a door where possible.
- Concerning the shooting at 71st and Broadway, the two individuals involved knew each other and happened to run into each other at this location. An innocent bystander was wounded and has recovered. The investigation is moving along well.
- Property crime is a problem, particularly larceny, shoplifting from stores. They are making significant numbers of arrests of the same people over and over. Within a few hours they are back out on the street. The issue is that the prosecutors treat multiple thefts by the same individual as separate misdemeanors, not charging grand larceny, a felony which requires theft of a value greater than \$1,000 and is treated more seriously by the courts. The officers are doing their job.

Report from Deputy Inspector Yoguchi, NYPD 24th precinct:

- Robberies are increasing in Riverside Park, particularly between 8:50 PM and midnight.
- There has been an increase in stealing from residential mailboxes, especially checks. He recommends on-line banking to avoid being victimized.
- Monday night, there was a shooting at Douglass Houses. Detectives have made a lot of progress in their investigation.
- There were two arrests in the August shooting incident.
- Last week shots were fired at 91st and Amsterdam and they arrested an individual with a gun.
- There has been an uptick in package thefts. Based on data about when these thefts occurred, officers changed their work hours to catch an individual around midnight.
- One individual on Broadway who exposed himself was arrested.

Captain Gallager of the Central Park Precinct was not available to attend.

Steve Brown then recognized members of the public and the Board to ask questions.

- Erica Gerson: How can the Community Board bring elected officials to the table to address the catch-and-release of criminals? Can more cameras help?

Captain Zuber: Cameras are worth their weight in gold. They provide the ability to go back in time. There is a method to get NYPD cameras, but they rely heavily on private cameras. Since there are legal issues for companies, they require subpoenas to provide videos to the PD.

D.I. Yaguchi: The funding for cameras in the parks comes from the City Council. Punishment that can be handed down to criminals is not up to the PD. Bail reform is a State issue. He was providing anecdotes to give the Board an understanding of what the PD faces.

- Courtney Clark Metakis: Crimes need to be prosecuted. It is crazy to hear the public safety report. She has encountered people on public transportation who make her uncomfortable to travel with her children.
- Peter Samton: Amsterdam and Columbus Avenues have delivery vehicles parked on both sides, leaving only a single lane for traffic. Bicycles speed on the bike lanes at 30 mph. Accidents are waiting to happen. Cars are parked repeatedly at hydrants and they don't get tickets.
D.I. Yoguchi: The PD will try to step up enforcement on double parking on Amsterdam Avenue.
Captain Zuber: The PD is trying to get bikes on the one-way bike lanes and cars at least moving in the same direction.
- Susan Schwartz: The intersection at 71st and Broadway is known as the "bowtie of death". Bikes are creating dangerous conditions for pedestrians. This needs to be looked into urgently.
- Captain Zuber: The PD is scrambling to catch up with the explosion of E-bikes on the streets. Deliveries increased with on-line food services during the pandemic. The cramped space on the streets has led to sideswiped cars.
- Madelyn Innocent: As a NYCHA resident, she is embarrassed at the shootings in public housing. As a Community Board member, she asks why and where these events are going on. NYCHA residents have experienced these problems for decades, and now they are spilling out to the neighborhood. The PD report is hurtful to Douglass Houses.
- Kristen Berger: Please explain what a desk appearance ticket is?
Captain Zuber: It is like a summons. It used to be for a more limited list of offences. If an arrested individual does not appear before a judge on the assigned date, a warrant is issued for arrest.
- Jay Adolf: For restaurants to place doors on outdoor eating areas to prevent use by the homeless, the areas would have to be fully enclosed which is against regulations. Past practice of the community board has been to disapprove fully enclosed sidewalk cafes. Would the PD support banning e-bikes from bike lanes?
Captain Zuber: That is not a PD issue.
- Klari Neuwelt: A couple of years ago we were told that the 72nd Street and Broadway corner was a crime site for kids coming from out of the community, robbing people and escaping via the subway. Is that still the case?
Captain Zuber: Incidents have occurred around the dismissal time from schools on the Martin Luther King campus. With the full reopening of schools, the PD is returning to pre-pandemic stationing, increasing police presence. The recent shooting incident doesn't have anything to do with the site. It is just where these two individuals happened to run into each other.
- Rich Robbins: There have been more traffic fatalities in the district than in any recent year.
D.I. Yaguchi: We have a dedicated traffic team, but it is short-staffed at this moment. The statistics are troubling. There is an effort underway to focus on these safety issues.
Steve Brown noted that this topic is on next week's Transportation Committee meeting and suggested that representatives of the PD might wish to attend.
- Robert Espier: There are cable TV channels dedicated to showing video from street cameras. Would this be a useful tool?
Captain Zuber: Traffic cameras are useful. Any and all cameras are very helpful.
- Doug Kleiman: I attended the BID conversation mentioned earlier. Alarming crime statistics were cited.
Captain Zuber: Many arrests are of the same people repeatedly. Grand Larceny incidents are up (thefts of property valued at \$1,000 or more) and petty larceny incidents are down. If a threat is involved, that turns it into a robbery.

Steve Brown thanked Captain Zuber and D.I. Yoguchi for attending.

Business Session

Transportation Committee: Howard Yaruss and Andrew Albert, Co-Chairpersons

Resolution Re:

1. **2642 Broadway 3rd Floor** (West 100th – 101st Streets.) Renewal application #B01743 to NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission by Two-Way Black Cars & Radio Group Transportation, Inc. for a renewal of their For Hire Base Station License. Andrew Albert announced that the renewal application involved no changes. The committee vote in favor was 10-0-0-0.

The vote to approve was taken by a show of hands. The motion passed, 39-0-0-0.

2. DOT to develop street safety for current outdoor dining.

Howard Yaruss: In many cases, with open restaurants, we have a bike lane going between the sidewalk and restaurant seating in the street, in effect, a bike lane through the middle of a restaurant. This resolution asks the DOT to come up with a safer plan for this configuration. We are only requesting the thoughts of the DOT experts on how this configuration can be made safer.

Jay Adolf: I agree 100 percent with Howard's statement. However, the resolution reads, "Community Board 7 calls on DOT to develop solutions to address the issue without sacrificing either the physically protected bike lanes or outdoor dining." I offer a friendly amendment to remove the phrase starting with "without". We pay a lot of taxes for a lot of experts, and we should not tell them what their study should reveal. If Howard accepts the friendly amendment, I will support the resolution.

Howard Yaruss: The goal is not to cut out uses but to see if it is possible to increase safety and have the same uses. If it is impossible, they will tell us. Then we can think about what to cut. Anything that diminishes that message goes against the intent of the committee.

Rich Robbins: I love the protected bike lanes and I love the open dining. I am very concerned that we effectively have a vehicle lane going through restaurants and that we will have fatalities soon. I had proposed that DOT initiate short term actions as soon as possible and study the issue longer term. That language was removed in committee. I urge everyone to support the resolution.

Ken Coughlin: This board voted overwhelmingly in favor of protected bike lanes and overwhelmingly in favor of Open Restaurants, so I support the resolution as written.

Barbara Adler: I took the minutes at the committee meeting. We had quite an argument, but the language we all agreed to did not include this final phrase.

Susan Schwartz: Howard frequently says we should listen to the experts. I think it is inappropriate to tie their hands. I would like to hear from the experts without constraints. I will vote against the resolution as currently written.

William Ortiz: I was at the committee meeting. I second Jay's friendly amendment.

Richard Asche: As a procedural matter, Howard rejected the friendly amendment, so someone would have to make a motion to amend the resolution he presented. On the merits, I agree with Susan and Jay. Having restaurant seating in the street was intended to be temporary. With DOT developing longer term regulations, the proper resolution is to ask DOT to study the problem, period, without any preconceived notions.

Louisa Craddock: We are asking for a study with two major factors off the table. Regardless of what happened at committee, we should not give the DOT parameters.

Maria Danzillo: I would like to ask a process issue about how long members are allowed to stay on a committee. Meeting after meeting, the same people are arguing the same points--cars are bad, bikes are good. Are we driving toward eliminating cars from the streets? The question is when we can have an open discussion about sharing the streets without preconceived ideology? Steve Brown responded that the process question would be proper for the Community Session later.

Richard Asche proposed an amendment to the resolution eliminating the phrase, "without sacrificing either the physically protected bike lanes or outdoor dining" So that the resolution reads "Community Board 7 calls on DOT to develop solutions to address the issue." Jay Adolf seconded the amendment.

Rich Robbins strongly urged a "no" vote on the amendment. The board overwhelmingly voted in support of the protected bike lanes and also in support of outdoor dining. This should not be a way to get rid of either.

Andrew Rigie: At multiple meetings we have had these conversations about outdoor dining and bike lanes. As it concerns outdoor dining, the City is developing an outdoor dining program that should consider all these varying uses and how outdoor dining and other uses will interact. It will be helpful when the City does release its plan, if we can comment on the specifics, rather than making a statement prior. It is doubtful that we will get a response from DOT before they release their entire program, at which time we can comment on what they are thinking.

Roberta Semer: I am concerned that, with 2 exceptions, everyone who has spoken on this issue was at the Transportation meeting and took part in the extensive discussion there. I urge committee members to work it out ahead of time rather than at the Full Board meeting.

Ken Coughlin: I just want to be clear that if you vote for this amendment, you are contemplating pitting restaurants against bike lanes, and we don't want to do that.

Howard Yaruss: It is risky to be implying that we might be pulling a lifeline from many restaurants. To open the idea that increasing safety requires reducing seating is a really bad idea. Let's see if there is a safer configuration without reducing restaurants or bike lanes or putting a dagger in the heart of restaurants trying to survive in this environment.

Jay Adolf: With respect, asking DOT to study the issue without constraints is not putting a dagger in anyone. It doesn't change anything the Board has voted on previously. It is calling for a study and not supporting any elimination. It calls for them to come up with solutions that they deem to be appropriate. We are concerned here with safety. It acknowledges that bike lanes adjacent to open restaurants create a dangerous situation that needs to be addressed. If DOT feels it is necessary for safety, reductions to restaurant seating on some part of some street or relocation of some bike lanes would be called for and we shouldn't be saying they can't do that.

The vote on the amendment was 23-12-0-0. The amendment passed and the vote on the amended version was taken: 30-4-1-0. The resolution passed as amended.

3. Feasibility of restaurant street seating on the westside of Columbus Avenue.

Andrew Albert: Currently, restaurants on Columbus are asked to take down structures every day for rush hour cleaning. This resolution asks that DOT suspend rush hour regulations as long as the City allows the current temporary restaurant rules to stay in place. The resolution passed 7-0-2-0 in the committee meeting.

Jay Adolf: I will vote against the resolution. These structures are supposed to be temporary. While moving them could be inconveniencing, not one of these restaurants have shown up at the committee or full board meeting. DOT is where the expertise resides and they have determined that using the lane for cars during the rush hour is the best solution to the problem, based, I suspect, on health and safety reasons. The busiest times of day are determined by DOT and we should not advise them otherwise.

Ken Coughlin: The resolution is not open-ended, rather only until the current emergency outdoor dining regulations end. It is three hours in the morning only. With current rush hour rules, we have a de facto situation that is dangerous where cars could run into structures. This puts restaurants at a disadvantage. During the pandemic, we have to make sacrifices and drivers can make this very small sacrifice.

Doug Kleiman: Helen Rosenthal has written a letter, which I have requested, on this topic. While the structures are technically temporary, it is not feasible to remove them daily. The seating is not on rollers. Restaurants have reached out to us and to other elected officials and I think we should support them.

Steve Brown: What did DOT give as a reason for the rush hour requirement? Andrew Albert: They did not say. They just said they would look at the issue.

Andrew Rigie: This is an attempt to get DOT to come and see if an exception can be made. Daily removal of dining structures is not feasible. It is a big issue for many restaurants in that area.

The vote on the resolution was 32-3-2-0. The resolution passed.

Housing Committee: Louisa Craddock and Melissa Rosenberg, Co-Chairpersons

Resolution Re:

4. Resolution in Support of the Mitchell-Lama Omnibus Bill (A.7272/S.6412) enacted by the New York State Assembly and the New York State Senate.

Louisa Craddock: The resolution is In support of a bill sponsored by Linda Rosenthal to protect Mitchell-Lama residents who wish to remain in the Mitchell-Lama Program. The bill outlaws proxy voting and requires 6 open meetings per year. The vote threshold for dissolution of a Mitchell-Lama project is increased from $\frac{2}{3}$ to an 80% vote and it prevents a new dissolution vote for 5 years after a failed vote. In committee, we agreed to support the bill 7-0-0-0. Two non-committee

members voted yes. The bill passed the legislature but was not signed by Governor Cuomo. We want to endorse it as offering protections to residents.

Steve Brown noted that Linda Rosenthal spoke in favor of the bill at committee.

Jay Adolf: I looked at the bill. Privatization of Mitchell-Lama is a contentious issue in the City. The law provided low-rate mortgages. When the mortgage expired, the building could go private. The law includes a prohibition of using funds to advocate for privatization. When one is privatized, there are restrictions on sale price, but it can be a financial advantage to tenants who can sell their homes for a lot more than they paid. When a building is converted, tenants stay under rent stabilization. I have serious reservations about the bill because it is changing the rules in the middle of the game.

Robert Espier: Mitchell-Lama needed up-dating. The option to refinance was built into the program.

The vote on the resolution was 30-0-6-1. The resolution passed.

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

Resolution Re:

5. 2701 Broadway (West 103rd Street.) New applications to the SLA for two-year liquor licenses by Shree Sethiya, Inc. d/b/a Aangan Restaurant.

Linda Alexander: This is an application from a restaurant that has been around for 12 years. It is only a change in ownership.

6. 300 Amsterdam Avenue (West 74th – 75th Streets.) New applications to the SLA for two-year liquor licenses by HBM UWS, LLC d/b/a Miriam.

Linda Alexander: This is an application for a new restaurant from a seasoned restaurateur. It will be an affordable Mediterranean/Israeli restaurant.

The vote on the resolution for both liquor licenses was 36-0-0-0. The resolution passed.

Elected Officials

Steve Brown congratulated Gale Brewer on her election to the City Council.

Borough President Gale Brewer: Gale recognized April Adams for her success in getting 35 elected officials from New Jersey and New York to sign a letter stating that we are sick and tired of tourist helicopter flights from New Jersey creating noise and pollution, sometimes every 15 to 20 minutes. Elected officials held an event at the West Side heliport to call attention to the issue. A helicopter came along and they could hardly breathe because of the fumes from the fuel. To the credit of Congressman Nadler, it is her understanding that if the infrastructure bill passes, then no non-essential helicopter flights will be permitted over a city with a population greater than 8 million -- i.e., New York. 311 complaints have tripled on this issue since last year.

I would like to thank the Columbus Avenue BID for having the open streets. However, the traffic backs up at the Green Market when the street closes. A small suggestion is for the NYPD or DOT to ensure that there is an agent there to redirect traffic away from Columbus when the green market is in process.

I am working on the garbage situation at the new grocery store in the 60's on West End Avenue.

It is my understanding that the Attorney General will make available \$256 million City-wide in January from the Sackler family settlement for drug treatment and prevention. There will be a board of some kind to direct spending. I want to be sure that these funds go to needs that are real.

There are a lot of challenges related to public safety. Captain Zuber explained how shoplifters are released and are back at it the same day. I am working to get midtown court open again.

Because of increased enforcement, there is less activity now from the "door openers" who ask for money and hang out at establishments at 95-96th Streets on the west side of Broadway. These individuals are not homeless and they make at least \$100 a day.

The next redistricting hearing is scheduled for November 10. District lines are likely to change drastically and may end up being drawn in the Assembly and Senate.

It is not clear what will happen regarding the Open Meetings Law after the current law making virtual meetings legal expires on January 15. We have purchased an OWL for each community board to facilitate blended meetings. Every other Tuesday at 2:00 we hold a forum on either the vaccines or on where the money is going in terms of our future. April Adams has put in the chat details on the next Community Leadership training series. Dec 12 we will have our last town hall meeting on Manhattan futures at John Jay.

Assemblymember Linda Rosenthal: Thank you for voting for the Mitchell-Lama bill; I am positive it will be helpful. It hasn't been delivered to Governor Hochul yet. We are talking to the Lieutenant Governor, who is doing a lot of the housing work, and are hoping for a good outcome.

We celebrated the Governor's signing of my bill with Senator Hoylman on untraceable ghost guns. The law bans sale and possession. Sales of ghost guns have proliferated during the pandemic; the law closes loopholes, providing a new tool for law enforcement. I have another bill about micro-stamping guns for next year that I am working on with all the local and national gun groups. I talked to Captain Zuber right after the shooting on 71st Street. The new mayor has promised a focus on public safety and hopefully we will have better news starting in January.

Sanitation left the Upper West Side out of their plans to resume composting, despite the interest of many buildings, then reinstated it. Now, they have delayed the restart in this and a number of other neighborhoods because of staff shortages due to vaccine resistance. When their staff shortages end, we will commence composting pick-ups. I have written to Duane Reade on 72nd Street -- they have a lot of garbage on the sidewalk. I have requested that Sanitation do an audit and speak to businesses that are not doing their part to keep sidewalks clean. We now have a garbage can at 79th and Amsterdam after I requested one.

Brooklyn Fair opened and promised to be affordable. Let me know if there are any concerns.

I have another bill with Senator Brian Kavanaugh that has not been delivered to the Governor yet but that is very important. Mayor DeBlasio finally raised the value of the CityFHEPS housing vouchers up to 100% of the fair market rent. The State bill will raise the value of the state voucher from 85% to 100% fair market rental. We had an event with housing advocates and advocates against domestic violence. Domestic violence has increased in the last year and a half. Without these vouchers, we can say to victims of abuse "leave your abuser" but they will have nowhere to go. We need the Governor to sign it to keep those on the brink of homelessness in their homes and to give the homeless a chance to find a home.

Other announcements: Shred Day is November 14, Sunday 10-2 in front of my office. We are holding a Rat academy on December 4. If you know anyone who needs a mammogram, call the office; we have slots left for the December 8 mammo-van.

Assemblymember Richard Gottfried: The Governor signed my bill on permitting tenants to sue in small claims court. Having property in the City will give jurisdiction to the City in cases of absentee landlords. Previously, if the landlord did not have an office in the City, the court did not have jurisdiction.

Now that children 5 years old and up are eligible for Covid vaccine, I am cosponsoring a bill introduced by Jeff Dinowitz from Riverdale adding Covid vaccine to the list of vaccine mandates for going to public school. Public school vaccine mandates have been a powerful public health tool.

Gale Brewer briefed you on helicopter issues. I attended the press conference at the heliport a week ago. With Brad Hoylman, I am introducing a bill to get the heliport out of Hudson River Park. All of Manhattan will benefit.

Business Session Continued

Preservation Committee K Karpen and Michele Parker, Co-Chairpersons

Resolution Re:

7. 143 West 72nd Street (Amsterdam – Columbus Avenues.) Application #LPC-20-00052 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a full-width rear yard addition on the third and fourth floors with the addition of a Juliette balcony on the new proposed rear facade, new fenestration, and the removal of common brick and recladding the rear facade in stucco; and the addition of a fifth floor with rooftop stair and elevator bulkheads.

Michele Parker: We are asking the Board to disapprove the application because it is inappropriate to the character of the historic district. The building was built in 1883 and later drastically modified in muted art deco style. They are asking for retroactive approval for an added fifth floor, a rear extension and covering the brick with stucco -- work that was already completed -- plus new work to add a green roof and remove the fire ladder. The Committee voted to disapprove the application.

The board vote to disapprove the application passed: 32-0-2-0.

8. 6-16 West 77th Street (Central Park West.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to enlarge and alter an existing penthouse on the eastern portion of the roof.

K Karpen: This application was approved by a vote of 5-0-3-0 at the Preservation Committee. We received a number of written community comments, which were circulated to Board members. The building is on West 77th Street immediately to the west of the New York Historical Society. K. Karpen then walked the Board through a series of slides of the proposed work, which evokes the Glass House. The proposed penthouse is in contrast to the rest of the district but a majority of the committee felt that the design had merit.

Steve Brown called on a number of community members who had signed up to speak first. Board members would be able to speak afterwards.

Eric Krebs: I cared for the previous owner of the penthouse during the end of her life with Alzheimer's and am intimately familiar with the four apartments that were woven into one during her lifetime. The current apartment was not well thought out because it is an add-on. I have looked at the plan and I think it is extraordinary. We should be looking at the future of architecture, not the past. Right outside my window is the Hearst Tower, a modern tower sitting on an historic masonry base, an emblem of what NY can be in the future. I am strongly in favor of this. It is exciting and beautiful.

Jonathan Weiner: I've been a resident of the building for over 2 decades. It is a cooperative built in 1927-8. Many of you who have gone past the building recognize it as an understated but gracious structure, on a beautiful block. The current board has not taken a formal survey of shareholders, but I'm of the belief that a majority of shareholders oppose the project, including about 10 former members of the co-op board. The current board has not voted on this project yet. Quoting from our building's alteration agreement, we all share a concern for the architectural integrity of our building. We have followed these norms for many decades. The current project crashes through these norms and is of great concern to us. Using the 3 criteria for evaluating changes to landmarks: 1. Is it visible? Yes, it is quite visible from the neighborhood. 2. Does it preserve? When you demolish a penthouse, you are not preserving anything. 3. Is it contextually appropriate? The answer is clearly no.

Cristiana Pena: I'm speaking on behalf of the project team. The Landmarks Committee vote speaks to the responsiveness of that body to the many members of the community who attended last month and testified enthusiastically in support of this project. Some of those committee members cited that testimony as influential in their decision. For the record, supporters include:

- Paul Goldberger, resident of the Beresford at 211 Central Park West and architectural critic
- David Klafter and Nancy Kestenbaum, residents of West 90th Street at West End Avenue for 23 years

- John Phufas, on behalf of the Board of the Beresford at 7 West 81st Street / 211 Central Park West
- Ryan Israel, resident of the Astor Apartments at 235 West 75th Street
- Tim Barefield, resident of the Park Belvedere at 101 West 79th Street
- Beverly Dolinsky, resident of West 77th Street
- Evan Bakst, resident of 225 Central Park West
- Irwin Cohen, resident of 146 West 57th Street
- Louise Mirrer, N-YHS
- Frances Halsband, architect and resident of 6 West 77th Street
- Paul Hilal, resident of the Majestic at 115 Central Park West
- Susan Solomon, resident of the Beresford
- And many others, including beyond the UWS community.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak to you prior to your vote.

Frank Bloch: I am also a resident of the building which was built almost 100 years ago. The question before you is the architectural appropriateness of this project. It is a two-story hard-edged glass structure that would be plainly visible from many vantage points in Central Park and along Central Park West. For many of my fellow tenants, it is not appropriate and I ask that you not approve it.

Paul Goldberger: I am here both as a resident of 211 Central Park West and a former architectural critic of both the New York Times and the New Yorker. I am in strong support of the design by Foster and Partners of the penthouse. Contrary to what others have said, one of the great strengths of sensitive modern architecture is its integration of modern additions with historic buildings. It is a specialty of this firm. In 2015 I wrote a book called *Building With History*. It documented many of the successful works around the world by this firm that juxtaposed striking yet sensitive modern additions to historic buildings including Hertz. If the design for 6-16 West 77th Street had been complete at the time I wrote that book, I would absolutely have included it. Though it is small in scale, it holds the promise of being among this firm's finest pieces of work. It is a misconception that the only way to add to an historic building is to imitate the original structure. Foster has been showing us for some time that a light, modern, elegant structure can be respectful and deferential to historic context as much as anything that mimics older architecture. The existing penthouse is not distinguished, nor is it wholly original. Unlike the facade of the building, which is quite beautiful, the penthouse contributes nothing to the fabric of the historic district. The penthouse will enhance the rooftop view from elsewhere on the Upper West Side and it will be close to invisible from the street, so it will not diminish the historic image of this building from the ground level. On balance, it will enhance the neighborhood. I'm also speaking as a trustee emeritus of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and an ardent preservationist who welcomes this design as an example of enlightened preservation. I hope you will support the Landmarks Committee's recommendation to approve this application.

John Richards: I believe, along with quite a few of my neighbors on West 77th Street, that the project is both risky and inappropriate and should not be approved. The building is 92 years old. The vibrations and impact of completely removing the old penthouse and constructing a new one presents a serious risk to the infrastructure of the building. One possible result of the proposed work would be to cause many new leaks -- we have had quite a few in the past -- and damage to the building's common plumbing structure, both immediately during the construction and possibly later as well. It may also cause damage to the building's actual support structure, despite assurances of the construction firm and the architect. We have a sensitive building. It required extensive replacement of the building's vertical steel support columns only recently. As to inappropriateness, the building is part of a collection of historic buildings forming the fabric of the Upper West Side Historic District. Approving the destruction of the current penthouse and the imposition of a new structure with a very different aesthetic on top of the main building will compromise the look of the 1927 structure. More importantly, approving this structure provides a precedent of plopping down inappropriate structures on other historic buildings in the district whenever there is enough money on hand.

Paul Hilal: I'm a 25-year resident of the neighborhood. I lived in a roof apartment on top of a fifth-floor walk-up with a clear view of the pink penthouse and I still live in the neighborhood. I am a huge supporter of this design. I understand the concern that it doesn't match the building below but consider this: the facade of the building below is attractive on 77th Street, but most of the view people will see is from the park, and that view is not attractive. The Central Park West facade was not designed to be seen; it is not aesthetic. And it makes no sense to ask someone to build a penthouse that matches both the 77th Street facade and the side of the building. You can't; they are too different. So, what they did, which is so clever, they basically expanded the steel superstructures of the Upper West Side onto this building, preserving the proportions of the steel superstructures -- that hold up water towers, HVAC facilities, etc. Instead of having air between the steel struts, they have clear glass. That way they create living spaces where there is just air in a superstructure. The proposal is clever and the alternative would be cumbersome and unattractive, having one side match the facade and one side match the side of the building. I think this is brilliant, it's an enhancement, consistent with the superstructure and for that reason it doesn't shatter norms and is consistent with an aesthetic to which we have all become accustomed. The fact that it is somewhat visible is a big plus.

Mary Breasted Smyth: I am a resident of 16 West 77th Street. I feel that this proposal would create a dangerous precedent, especially for the historic preservation district. You know that the developers are dying to get into the West Side and build high rises. A few years ago, developers tried to raise the height of all the landmarked buildings all over the City. That was defeated. This structure is so glaringly contrasting with the style of our building that I feel that it is really inappropriate for us and disagree that it echoes the charming struts under the water towers. It looks like a house designed for Malibu or a restaurant pavilion by the waterfront. It can be seen from the park, from the street, from everywhere. We worry that this is going to become a precedent for changes all over our district. You know what the developers want. You hear about this pressure all the time. This is the most beautiful block in the City of New York perhaps. People walk through it every day on their way to Central Park. It is not just for the people who live here. This is a treasure of the whole City. It is right across from the Natural History Museum and it is right by the entrance to Central Park. It would be a crime to build this structure. We have no objection to Mr. Ackman renovating his apartment and the penthouse, but we do not want a Malibu House on top of our building.

David Schnadig: I have lived in the building at 16 West 77th Street for almost a decade with my family. It is crystal clear to me that this would be a massive improvement to the building and to the neighborhood. You started this discussion with a depiction of this pink stucco eyesore that sits on top of our building. This would clearly be a significant improvement. I would like to correct the misstatements by several other residents of the building so you hear a broader perspective. The Landmarks Committee approved this 5-0-3, a clear mandate to approve this. What you heard in response was a very small group of very vocal people who don't like change. You are hearing from a minority of the building, not a majority. There are many supporters of this project in the building, for all the reasons you have heard from extremely knowledgeable esteemed architects and designers, not just people who are against change. It is important to understand that this cannot be seen from everywhere, only several vantage points.

Steve Brown: About how many apartments are in the building? David Schnadig: About 90.

Roberta Gratz: I served on the Landmarks Preservation Commission for 7 years. We were scrupulous in ensuring that rooftop additions did not exceed a height that could be seen from the street. I have no fundamental objection to the idea of emulating Philip Johnson's Glass House and putting it on the top of a West-Side building but it should not be seen and it should not be so tall. There are levels to it and I assure you that you will now see a flood of roof-top additions that can be seen from the street and you will have a hard time ignoring this precedent. When I was on the Commission, this architect, Mr. Foster, came to us with a very arrogant proposal to expand the Breuer into the Whitney Museum, asking us to break all kinds of landmark rules and we said 'no.' The result was we got the downtown Whitney, which is 100% better. It is not reasonable to let this structure be as big and visible as it is. You will be opening yourselves up to a couple of years of heavy proposals.

Kenneth Mariani: I have lived in the building for 27 years and have been on the board multiple times and president of the board 3 times. I am opposed to this project. If anyone walked around the neighborhood while the mock-up was there, they would see that it is visible from the park and many different views along Central Park West. In terms of appropriateness, I ask you to think about the 2 major structures that surround us -- the Museum and the New York Historical Society. I draw a contrast with the expansion of the NY Historical Society, which was approved by CB7 and is quite consistent with the architecture of the Historical Society itself and does not look like a flying saucer landed on top of the building. It also creates enormous problems for the people who live in the building. It is a long construction project. You have heard about loads and stresses. Prudence dictates that, in a nearly 100-year-old building, you don't mess around with it.

Bill Ackman (owner of the project): I have lived on the Upper West Side since June of 1992 and am now living at the Beresford. For years, I looked from our apartment at this pink penthouse. It would be really helpful for this Community Board meeting to go back to the slide of the structure that is there now. There are a lot of things that have been said about the existing structure that are not actually true. The structure that is there now is not original. It wasn't originally pink; it did not originally have stucco, and the existing windows were not there. They were staff quarters that were not of the same quality as the rest of the building, it is a crumbling penthouse and the roof is not in good condition. But we love the site and we love the Upper West Side. My wife and I want to raise our new family here. Our approach was to build something additive to the neighborhood, but there was nothing we could do with what is there. The building over the years approved many changes to the penthouse. Almost all the people who have objected live in the building. I completely understand that people would prefer there not be construction on the roof. The alternative is to sell three separate apartments to three different owners each of whom would do something different. We wanted to do something special. That's why we hired Foster and Partners and Frank Scime Construction, the best contractor in New York who does sensitive, careful projects. The structure that we are building weighs less than the structure that is there. We are building a steel superstructure that will increase the strength of the building. It will be a material enhancement to the structure of the building and from an architectural and height standpoint, we are keeping the same height of the pink box and the piece above just envelopes the elevator overruns. It doesn't make sense to have this glass box and then have a brick elevator overrun on top. It is much less visible than the pink stucco box that is there now. We have matched the steel to the struts of the water tower. It is as minimal as can be. The reason why people are objecting, in my view, is not because of architectural integrity; it is because they would rather that there be no construction on the roof. No one will take as much care as we will. We want to live peacefully with our neighbors; we don't want them to be upset with us. That is why we hired the team that we hired. We have offered the building to modernize the elevators and the fire safety system. We have also committed that if and when the blue penthouse becomes available, we would replicate a smaller version of the one we are building to match the two sides. In terms of visibility, there was a study which was done and presented to the Preservation Committee. The structure is not visible from the front of the building, not when you are looking at the Historical Society, not from inside the park when the trees have leaves, but if you walk up Central Park West on the east side of the street and you stop about 45 feet north of 77th Street and you look up to the right, you will be able to see this. But it is much less visible than the pink stucco penthouse. We have stepped back the structure from the 77th St side and the Central Park West side

Peter Hoffman: The design of the glass and steel superstructure is an imposition on the prewar building profile and style. It is a gesture to the 77th Street block, the New York Historical Society edifice, the American Museum of Natural History Central Park West facade, the span of cooperatives south of the block -- the San Remo, the Dakota -- and north to the Beresford in a neighborhood where I have lived since 1975. Along the avenue and from a remove, the gesture would be noticeable, jarring, to the neighborhood residents and arriving out-of-town out-of-state and foreign visitors to museums and on the tranquil paths and glades of the park. The 6 West penthouse project and the Historical Society expansion project are creating upheaval among the 6-16 West 77th Street residents. At the October 14 hearing, the project team put forth by way of comparison the immodest Philip Johnson Glass House. As a Stanford boy, I passed by the Glass House on the bus to and from the New Canaan Country School. We children glimpsed the marvel. The Glass House and its outbuildings had rhythm. The immodesty of the penthouse proposal is disturbing. Its design used the 16 West building as

a support and strap for a platform temple to a titan. It is out of balance with the contours of Central Park and Central Park West. It has lost its rhythm. Visitors from all over the world visiting the park and the museums would find in their field of vision the Ackman aerie and wonder who let this happen and what possessed them.

Mark Diller: This was a very hard choice for me as a member of the committee. What I am wrestling with is the conflict between the beauty of the architecture and the standard of appropriateness that asks does this beautiful structure belong where it is proposed to be put. And I am adding to that the concern that we have fidelity to our precedents. With respect to precedent, there is a very similar structure that this Board approved four or five years ago on West 70th Street. It wasn't visible. And the question here is how you want to assess the visibility of this proposal because it is visible principally over secondary or non-fronting facades. It is better in my view to have a clean break from a design than to try to emulate it and fail. It comes down to whether this unduly calls attention to itself. In the late spring, we considered a shade structure on a Central Park West building that was brightly internally lit and constructed of white, reflective material; it was raised on a platform and even though it was only minimally visible from below it went out of its way to call attention to itself. I do find this penthouse design to be appropriate because it is not as intrusive as what we disapproved earlier on Central Park West and it is consistent with what we approved on West 70th Street. I believe it will not unduly call attention to itself, though I acknowledge it is a very hard question.

Madge Rosenberg: I am very much in support of it. There is something no one has mentioned: the Planetarium. The museum is gorgeous but the planetarium has enhanced it. Though the planetarium was controversial, it is an asset and people are very proud of it. We have also been encouraged by Landmarks to approve things that contrast and this does contrast in a very positive way. I'm thrilled that it is coming to the neighborhood.

Page Cowley: This is a difficult project to assess because the intentions seem honorable but in fact it would be a huge mistake to tamper with the structure and the purpose of this penthouse, the beauty of these two penthouses. They may be mismatched colors, but the reality is that this is the way this building type exists. You have the formal facade below, terra cotta, then a more modest architecture above. The terrace maintains terra cotta and there are planters and all sorts of wonderful details that happen at the top of the building that you can't have in other places. I also think this building was designated as a whole. Saying we will only save the bottom is not an approach to preservation. Masonry can be brought back and look just as beautiful as the day it was initially designed. I grew up in a penthouse on Central Park West. The view from inside an original cozy structure makes all the difference in the world. Landmarks made a good decision when they designated this building. It doesn't need to scream at you with modern details to look attractive; it has its own character. If you start adding things inappropriately then you have lost the purpose of our Landmarks rules and regulations. If approved, it will be open season on the upper parts, and everyone will be trying to create a different architecture that won't match and that will lose the character of what these buildings in the 20's and 30's was about.

Roberta Semer: I don't think it is appropriate. I am concerned about the dangers of construction. It is a dangerous precedent. The block is a brilliant block, very historic. I have heard from members of the building that they have had leaks, plumbing issues and elevator issues, and support structure problems. I'm concerned that move-ins and move-outs will be disrupted for a year while construction is happening, upper floors may not have access to the elevator for periods, It sets a bad precedent and disturbs other shareholders. There is a danger to the structure.

Jay Adolf: I voted in favor of this project at committee and I plan to tonight. I think it is forward looking, innovative and should be approved. I have been on the Preservation Committee since I joined this Board and spent 7 years as co-chair of Preservation. I learned a tremendous amount from the architects we have had (particularly Peter Samton) about how to treat modern additions to historic structures. The Landmarks Commission has approved many modern additions to historic buildings throughout the City. Every building in the landmarks district was approved as a whole but many have been added to. In addition to the one Mark Diller mentioned, we also approved a modern addition on West End Avenue and 85th Street several years ago. Landmarks policy for approving a modern addition to an historic building is that it be very distinguishable from the original building. I was also going to mention the Rose Science Building, a complete glass addition

to the Natural History Museum and the Gilder Center which this Board recently approved. I think the project is a perfectly appropriate, brilliant design.

Peter Samton: Nobody has spoken about the fact that this is a 2-story penthouse, which is quite visible. During my 8-9 years on the committee, we have not approved anything of this magnitude. I knew Philip Johnson quite well when I was President of the New York chapter of the AIA when we gave him a gold medal. He was both sensitive to historic architecture and a modernist. I also know Paul Goldberger and those who spoke in favor of this. I think they are missing the point. There is nothing wrong with putting a modern penthouse on a building, provided it is not so visible. This stands out and it will completely change the historic districts of the Upper West Side, not to speak of the whole City.

Richard Roberts.: I think you know that I am not in favor of additions, especially when they are for hedge fund billionaires, and I don't mean any offense to anyone. I respect what a lot of people have said both in favor and in opposition. I think the design is beautiful and an improvement on the pink box. I will be voting in favor.

Ken: I agree with Mark that it is not an easy call. I am inclined to vote for it. Beauty is beauty, no matter where it is. There are a lot of things on the tops of our buildings that are just utilitarian and look awful. I do question how sustainable this design is, given the solar gain; it will need a massive amount of air conditioning during the summer, though maybe that will be offset by less need for heat in the winter.

Bill Ackman: I'm married to a woman whose career is focused on sustainability; sustainability is important to us. The Foster team spent a lot of time on developing a roof cantilever that meaningfully reduces the amount of solar gain on the windows, using very special glass. We also have a large amount of space to put in solar -- something we have not yet gotten approved by the building. We would love to make this the first net zero apartment in New York City. Also, to manage bird issues, we are working with Christine Sheppard, bird collisions campaign director for ABC Birds. They are advising us on everything from what kind of plantings we should plant to things we can do from a sonic perspective to the design of the structure and the kind of shades you can use during migration season. These are important issues to us. On the point made before, the new structure is less visible than the current one. The original structure was never intended to be visible. It was built prior to the New York Historical Society's addition. The facade that faces the park was never intended to be seen. If it were covered by a lot line building like the Majestic or the Beresford, it wouldn't be seen. This is why the quality of construction is different and the use was for staff apartments.

Michele Parker: I want to clear up a possible misunderstanding. This application did not go before the Landmarks Preservation Commission yet. It will go before them on November 16. It was approved by the Preservation Committee at CB7. This is a very difficult application to hear. While I agree with Mark Diller and Jay Adolf, we have to consider what happens at the building board meeting. If they disapprove of this renovation, we are on uneven ground at best. How can we resolve that?

Bill Ackman: The application that went before CB7 was an application of the building approved by the board. The project itself is not going to be finally approved unless Landmarks and all the various approvals are obtained and the final version of the construction drawings are completed to the satisfaction of the building's engineers, but this has the full support of the board. We couldn't be in front of CB7 without that. For those worried about the building falling down, we cannot start construction until the building's engineers sign off on every element of the design and construction.

Steve Brown: Our purview is to vote on whether the project is appropriate to the character of the landmark district.

K, Karpen: I would like to advance this resolution on behalf of the Committee as we approved it by a vote of 5-0-3-0. It has been wonderful to hear all the input and to take it all into consideration. On balance, I am personally still in favor of this and I urge the Community Board members to vote in favor.

Steve Brown: It has been a spirited conversation. I, as Chair, would like to put into the record that it is not relevant or appropriate to reference someone's financial status as an applicant.

The vote on the application was 25-7-2-0. The resolution was approved.

9. 500 West End Avenue (West 84th – 85th Streets.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Window Master Plan.

Michele Parker: The building was built circa 1914. They are applying for a window master plan. They are looking to replace existing windows with single wide double-hung windows in conformity with the original design. It also includes an emulation of the original brick molds and frames that are a lighter-colored brown than the current aluminum frames and are believed to be closer to the original. The single stained-glass window in the lobby will remain in place and have a single pane of glass over it to preserve it. We approved this application as appropriate to the historic district and know that the LPC likes window master plans. We are asking for Board approval.

The vote on the resolution was 23-0-0-0. The resolution was approved.

10. 61 West 86th Street (Columbus Avenue.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to replace the store front.

K Karpen: This is a 5-story building built originally in the 1880's. This is a redo of mostly the first floor. The facades are currently a bit of a jumble. The idea is to unify the storefronts and expose an original limestone band above and use that to bring unity to the Columbus Avenue elevation. The Committee felt that it was a sensitive and thoughtful change to the building and would put the building more in the context of the historic district.

The vote on the resolution was 23-0-0-1. The resolution passed.

11. 1 West 88th Street, Trevor Day School (Central Park West.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for modifications of entryway to provide improved ADA access, including the creation of a sidewalk ramp and new landing, installation of an ADA lift over existing stairs and modifications to existing stair enclosures.

Michele Parker: The Trevor Day School filed an application to improve ADA access, They are installing a sidewalk ramp and a new landing and an ADA lift over the existing stairs and a modification to the crumbling basement stair enclosures. The building was built about 1967 of brick and concrete and the changes will light up the area better.

The vote on the resolution was 25-0-0-0. The resolution was approved.

12. 33 West 89th Street (Columbus Avenue – Central Park West.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for:

1. restoration of the front stoop and façade.
2. a full-width, full-height rear yard addition; and
3. rooftop additions including elevator and expanded stair bulkheads, a shade structure, and mechanical enclosures.

K. Karpen: The application is for a brownstone from the 1890's. They want to restore a missing box stair and basement plus add a full width extension aligned with the extension next door and a modest roof extension.

The Committee vote was 8-0-0-0.

The vote was 24-0-0-0. The resolution passed.

13. 311 West 102nd Street (Riverside Drive – West End Avenue.) Application #LPC-22-01899 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to enlarge an existing beveled-edge rear facade with a two-story, full width squared extension.

Michele Parker: We are asking you to approve this application. The committee voted 5-3-0-0. The main objection by some was that the rear extension was too boxy. The proposed windows are not too different from what you see in similar backyards.

Stacy Loren: I have been the co-owner of the home for 20 years. We love the block. We want to expand because we have 3 daughters in their 20's, soon to have sons-in-law. We just want to expand in keeping with what others have done in the

area. We think it will add value to the neighborhood and add privacy. We think that the windows we are instilling are more in keeping with the tradition of the house. We have kept the facade the same as the other facades on the block. We hope you will support us.

Eric Andreasen: I am the architect. This project is not visible from any public thoroughfare.

Mark Diller: The reason I voted against this in committee and intend to tonight is that the facade in the rear has a quite lovely, beveled effect. The proposal obscures the shape of the rear facade and the unusual character of this rear yard.

The vote was 14-7-3-0. The resolution was approved.

14. 360 Riverside Drive (West 108th Street.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for use of GFRC (glass-fibre reinforced concrete) in lieu of the original terra cotta in connection with certain ornamental detail restorations on the 6th floor facade.

K. Karpen: The application asks for approval to use GFRC to replace terra cotta on the facade. If the replacement is on the 6th floor or above, we are required to vote. The Committee approved the application 8-0-0-0.

The vote was 24-0-0-0. The resolution was approved.

Approval of minutes from previous full board meeting

The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

Community Session

Zach Campbell: A quick report on the Gilder Center project. We have established a site fence to perform renovations on the park. We are working with the Parks Department to salvage the materials in the area. We are also putting in protection for trees. We are almost at the top of the building with shotcrete. The facade material has not started to go on yet. We will continue to average 10-15 truckloads a day and 100 workers on site.

Kevin Williams from Senator Brad Hoylman's Office: As Assemblymember Rosenthal said, the Governor signed the Jose Webber Act on Ghost guns. There has been a 479% increase in ghost gun seizures. The act ensures that the parts will be serialized and traceable. We attended the press conference on helicopters with Gale Brewer and Linda Rosenthal. . The proposed legislation creates a cause of action -- a new tort -- for creating unreasonable noise, it bans helicopters from non-essential use in Hudson River Park, and it amends the City Charter to prohibit concession agreements with the tourism helicopter companies. Thanks to Steve Brown for raising the PSAL sports issue. We have sent a letter to the DOE on travel issues with the State Championships and the problems with spectators.

Joy Phelan: I would like to raise the issue of the Broadway and 72nd Street corner. I was on the corner with my daughter when the recent shooting occurred. Almost every afternoon, there are brawls there. It is a hub for delivery bicycles and some on the sidewalks have nearly knocked people down. I would like to put the issue on your agenda for future consideration. After the shooting, when there were two policemen on the corner, every delivery person got off their bikes and walked on the sidewalks. A little continuing police presence would be helpful.

Steve Brown urged Joy Phelan to attend the Transportation Committee meeting to further discuss the issue.

Hannah Weinerman from Congressman Jerry Nadler's Office: When both the Infrastructure and Build Back Better bills pass, I will come back to provide the details. Congressman Nadler reintroduced the Empower Act, to provide workplace protections to those who speak out about harassment in the workplace. Medicare open enrollment is now through December 7.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:48 PM

FULL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

November 3, 2021 at 6:30pm via ZOOM

Steven Brown, Chairperson

Present: Barbara Adler, Jay Adolf, Andrew Albert, Linda Alexander, Richard Asche, Kristen Berger, Steven Brown, Elizabeth Caputo, Courtney Clark Metakis, Joshua Cohen, Christian Cordova, Ken Coughlin, Page Cowley, Louisa Craddock, Mark Diller, Beverly Donohue, Robert Espier, Sheldon Fine, Paul Fischer, Miranda Goodwin-Raab, Amy Hyman, Madelyn Innocent, K Karpen, Natasha Kazmi, Doug Kleiman, Blanche Lawton, Ira Mitchneck, Klari Neuwelt, William Ortiz, Michele Parker, Seema Reddy, Andrew Rigie, Richard Robbins, Madge Rosenberg, Peter Samton, Susan Schwartz, Roberta Semer, Ethel Sheffer, Polly Spain, Benjamin Wu and Howard Yaruss. **Absent:** Daniela Alvarado, Rosa Arenas, Catherine DeLazzerio, Audrey Isaacs, Sara Lind, Jeannette Rausch, Melissa Rosenberg, Meg Schmitt and Erana Stennett.

The full Board of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Wednesday, November 3, 2021, on the Zoom online platform. Steven Brown called the meeting to order at 6:33pm after the Secretary confirmed the existence of a quorum. He noted that the chat has a sign-in form for members of the public who wish to speak. He announced that there are 13 items to be voted on and that he will pause before each vote to allow the public to speak.

Public Safety Session

Report from Captain Zuber, NYPD 20th Precinct:

- He recently attended a Zoom meeting with the BIDs representing businesses in the precinct. They are concerned about the homeless on the streets. The NYPD is not the primary agency charged with addressing this issue. They offer services and the homeless are free to decline. He urged restaurants with outdoor seating to secure the area with a door where possible.
- Concerning the shooting at 71st and Broadway, the two individuals involved knew each other and happened to run into each other at this location. An innocent bystander was wounded and has recovered. The investigation is moving along well.
- Property crime is a problem, particularly larceny, shoplifting from stores. They are making significant numbers of arrests of the same people over and over. Within a few hours they are back out on the street. The issue is that the prosecutors treat multiple thefts by the same individual as separate misdemeanors, not charging grand larceny, a felony which requires theft of a value greater than \$1,000 and is treated more seriously by the courts. The officers are doing their job.

Report from Deputy Inspector Yoguchi, NYPD 24th precinct:

- Robberies are increasing in Riverside Park, particularly between 8:50 PM and midnight.
- There has been an increase in stealing from residential mailboxes, especially checks. He recommends on-line banking to avoid being victimized.
- Monday night, there was a shooting at Douglass Houses. Detectives have made a lot of progress in their investigation.
- There were two arrests in the August shooting incident.
- Last week shots were fired at 91st and Amsterdam and they arrested an individual with a gun.
- There has been an uptick in package thefts. Based on data about when these thefts occurred, officers changed their work hours to catch an individual around midnight.
- One individual on Broadway who exposed himself was arrested.

Captain Gallager of the Central Park Precinct was not available to attend.

Steve Brown then recognized members of the public and the Board to ask questions.

- Erica Gerson: How can the Community Board bring elected officials to the table to address the catch-and-release of criminals? Can more cameras help?

Captain Zuber: Cameras are worth their weight in gold. They provide the ability to go back in time. There is a method to get NYPD cameras, but they rely heavily on private cameras. Since there are legal issues for companies, they require subpoenas to provide videos to the PD.

D.I. Yaguchi: The funding for cameras in the parks comes from the City Council. Punishment that can be handed down to criminals is not up to the PD. Bail reform is a State issue. He was providing anecdotes to give the Board an understanding of what the PD faces.

- Courtney Clark Metakis: Crimes need to be prosecuted. It is crazy to hear the public safety report. She has encountered people on public transportation who make her uncomfortable to travel with her children.
- Peter Samton: Amsterdam and Columbus Avenues have delivery vehicles parked on both sides, leaving only a single lane for traffic. Bicycles speed on the bike lanes at 30 mph. Accidents are waiting to happen. Cars are parked repeatedly at hydrants and they don't get tickets.
D.I. Yoguchi: The PD will try to step up enforcement on double parking on Amsterdam Avenue.
Captain Zuber: The PD is trying to get bikes on the one-way bike lanes and cars at least moving in the same direction.
- Susan Schwartz: The intersection of Broadway and 72nd Street is known as the "bowtie of death". E-bikes are creating dangerous conditions.
Captain Zuber: The PD is scrambling to catch up with the explosion of E-bikes on the streets. Deliveries increased with on-line food services during the pandemic. The cramped space on the streets has led to sideswiped cars.
- Madelyn Innocent: As a NYCHA resident, she is embarrassed at the shootings in public housing. As a Community Board member, she asks why and where these events are going on. NYCHA residents have experienced these problems for decades, and now they are spilling out to the neighborhood. The PD report is hurtful to Douglass Houses.
- Kristen Berger: Please explain what a desk appearance ticket is?
Captain Zuber: It is like a summons. It used to be for a more limited list of offences. If an arrested individual does not appear before a judge on the assigned date, a warrant is issued for arrest.
- Jay Adolf: For restaurants to place doors on outdoor eating areas to prevent use by the homeless, the areas would have to be fully enclosed which is against regulations. Past practice of the community board has been to disapprove fully enclosed sidewalk cafes. Would the PD support banning e-bikes from bike lanes?
Captain Zuber: That is not a PD issue.
- Klari Neuwelt: A couple of years ago we were told that the 72nd Street and Broadway corner was a crime site for kids coming from out of the community, robbing people and escaping via the subway. Is that still the case?
Captain Zuber: Incidents have occurred around the dismissal time from schools on the Martin Luther King campus. With the full reopening of schools, the PD is returning to pre-pandemic stationing, increasing police presence. The recent shooting incident doesn't have anything to do with the site. It is just where these two individuals happened to run into each other.
- Rich Robbins: There have been more traffic fatalities in the district than in any recent year.
D.I. Yaguchi: We have a dedicated traffic team, but it is short-staffed at this moment. The statistics are troubling. There is an effort underway to focus on these safety issues.
Steve Brown noted that this topic is on next week's Transportation Committee meeting and suggested that representatives of the PD might wish to attend.
- Robert Espier: There are cable TV channels dedicated to showing video from street cameras. Would this be a useful tool?
Captain Zuber: Traffic cameras are useful. Any and all cameras are very helpful.
- Doug Kleiman: I attended the BID conversation mentioned earlier. Alarming crime statistics were cited.
Captain Zuber: Many arrests are of the same people repeatedly. Grand Larceny incidents are up (thefts of property valued at \$1,000 or more) and petty larceny incidents are down. If a threat is involved, that turns it into a robbery.

Steve Brown thanked Captain Zuber and D.I. Yoguchi for attending.

Business Session

Transportation Committee: Howard Yaruss and Andrew Albert, Co-Chairpersons

Resolution Re:

1. **2642 Broadway 3rd Floor** (West 100th – 101st Streets.) Renewal application #B01743 to NYC Taxi and Limousine Commission by Two-Way Black Cars & Radio Group Transportation, Inc. for a renewal of their For Hire Base Station License. Andrew Albert announced that the renewal application involved no changes. The committee vote in favor was 10-0-0-0.

The vote to approve was taken by a show of hands. The motion passed, 39-0-0-0.

2. DOT to develop street safety for current outdoor dining.

Howard Yaruss: In many cases, with open restaurants, we have a bike lane going between the sidewalk and restaurant seating in the street, in effect, a bike lane through the middle of a restaurant. This resolution asks the DOT to come up with a safer plan for this configuration. We are only requesting the thoughts of the DOT experts on how this configuration can be made safer.

Jay Adolf: I agree 100 percent with Howard's statement. However, the resolution reads, "Community Board 7 calls on DOT to develop solutions to address the issue without sacrificing either the physically protected bike lanes or outdoor dining." I offer a friendly amendment to remove the phrase starting with "without". We pay a lot of taxes for a lot of experts, and we should not tell them what their study should reveal. If Howard accepts the friendly amendment, I will support the resolution.

Howard Yaruss: The goal is not to cut out uses but to see if it is possible to increase safety and have the same uses. If it is impossible, they will tell us. Then we can think about what to cut. Anything that diminishes that message goes against the intent of the committee.

Rich Robbins: I love the protected bike lanes and I love the open dining. I am very concerned that we effectively have a vehicle lane going through restaurants and that we will have fatalities soon. I had proposed that DOT initiate short term actions as soon as possible and study the issue longer term. That language was removed in committee. I urge everyone to support the resolution.

Ken Coughlin: This board voted overwhelmingly in favor of protected bike lanes and overwhelmingly in favor of Open Restaurants, so I support the resolution as written.

Barbara Adler: I took the minutes at the committee meeting. We had quite an argument, but the language we all agreed to did not include this final phrase.

Susan Schwartz: Howard frequently says we should listen to the experts. I think it is inappropriate to tie their hands. I would like to hear from the experts without constraints. I will vote against the resolution as currently written.

William Ortiz: I was at the committee meeting. I second Jay's friendly amendment.

Richard Asche: As a procedural matter, Howard rejected the friendly amendment, so someone would have to make a motion to amend the resolution he presented. On the merits, I agree with Susan and Jay. Having restaurant seating in the street was intended to be temporary. With DOT developing longer term regulations, the proper resolution is to ask DOT to study the problem, period, without any preconceived notions.

Louisa Craddock: We are asking for a study with two major factors off the table. Regardless of what happened at committee, we should not give the DOT parameters.

Maria Danzillo: I would like to ask a process issue about how long members are allowed to stay on a committee. Meeting after meeting, the same people are arguing the same points--cars are bad, bikes are good. Are we driving toward eliminating cars from the streets? The question is when we can have an open discussion about sharing the streets without preconceived ideology? Steve Brown responded that the process question would be proper for the Community Session later.

Richard Asche proposed an amendment to the resolution eliminating the phrase, "without sacrificing either the physically protected bike lanes or outdoor dining" So that the resolution reads "Community Board 7 calls on DOT to develop solutions to address the issue." Jay Adolf seconded the amendment.

Rich Robbins strongly urged a "no" vote on the amendment. The board overwhelmingly voted in support of the protected bike lanes and also in support of outdoor dining. This should not be a way to get rid of either.

Andrew Rigie: At multiple meetings we have had these conversations about outdoor dining and bike lanes. As it concerns outdoor dining, the City is developing an outdoor dining program that should consider all these varying uses and how outdoor dining and other uses will interact. It will be helpful when the City does release its plan, if we can comment on the specifics, rather than making a statement prior. It is doubtful that we will get a response from DOT before they release their entire program, at which time we can comment on what they are thinking.

Roberta Semer: I am concerned that, with 2 exceptions, everyone who has spoken on this issue was at the Transportation meeting and took part in the extensive discussion there. I urge committee members to work it out ahead of time rather than at the Full Board meeting.

Ken Coughlin: I just want to be clear that if you vote for this amendment, you are contemplating pitting restaurants against bike lanes, and we don't want to do that.

Howard Yaruss: It is risky to be implying that we might be pulling a lifeline from many restaurants. To open the idea that increasing safety requires reducing seating is a really bad idea. Let's see if there is a safer configuration without reducing restaurants or bike lanes or putting a dagger in the heart of restaurants trying to survive in this environment.

Jay Adolf: With respect, asking DOT to study the issue without constraints is not putting a dagger in anyone. It doesn't change anything the Board has voted on previously. It is calling for a study and not supporting any elimination. It calls for them to come up with solutions that they deem to be appropriate. We are concerned here with safety. It acknowledges that bike lanes adjacent to open restaurants create a dangerous situation that needs to be addressed. If DOT feels it is necessary for safety, reductions to restaurant seating on some part of some street or relocation of some bike lanes would be called for and we shouldn't be saying they can't do that.

The vote on the amendment was 23-12-0-0. The amendment passed and the vote on the amended version was taken: 30-4-1-0. The resolution passed as amended.

3. Feasibility of restaurant street seating on the westside of Columbus Avenue.

Andrew Albert: Currently, restaurants on Columbus are asked to take down structures every day for rush hour cleaning. This resolution asks that DOT suspend rush hour regulations as long as the City allows the current temporary restaurant rules to stay in place. The resolution passed 7-0-2-0 in the committee meeting.

Jay Adolf: I will vote against the resolution. These structures are supposed to be temporary. While moving them could be inconveniencing, not one of these restaurants have shown up at the committee or full board meeting. DOT is where the expertise resides and they have determined that using the lane for cars during the rush hour is the best solution to the problem, based, I suspect, on health and safety reasons. The busiest times of day are determined by DOT and we should not advise them otherwise.

Ken Coughlin: The resolution is not open-ended, rather only until the current emergency outdoor dining regulations end. It is three hours in the morning only. With current rush hour rules, we have a de facto situation that is dangerous where cars could run into structures. This puts restaurants at a disadvantage. During the pandemic, we have to make sacrifices and drivers can make this very small sacrifice.

Doug Kleiman: Helen Rosenthal has written a letter, which I have requested, on this topic. While the structures are technically temporary, it is not feasible to remove them daily. The seating is not on rollers. Restaurants have reached out to us and to other elected officials and I think we should support them.

Steve Brown: What did DOT give as a reason for the rush hour requirement? Andrew Albert: They did not say. They just said they would look at the issue.

Andrew Rigie: This is an attempt to get DOT to come and see if an exception can be made. Daily removal of dining structures is not feasible. It is a big issue for many restaurants in that area.

The vote on the resolution was 32-3-2-0. The resolution passed.

Housing Committee: Louisa Craddock and Melissa Rosenberg, Co-Chairpersons

Resolution Re:

4. Resolution in Support of the Mitchell-Lama Omnibus Bill (A.7272/S.6412) enacted by the New York State Assembly and the New York State Senate.

Louisa Craddock: The resolution is in support of a bill sponsored by Linda Rosenthal to protect Mitchell-Lama residents who wish to remain in the Mitchell-Lama Program. The bill outlaws proxy voting and requires 6 open meetings per year. The vote threshold for dissolution of a Mitchell-Lama project is increased from $\frac{2}{3}$ to an 80% vote and it prevents a new dissolution vote for 5 years after a failed vote. In committee, we agreed to support the bill 7-0-0-0. Two non-committee

members voted yes. The bill passed the legislature but was not signed by Governor Cuomo. We want to endorse it as offering protections to residents.

Steve Brown noted that Linda Rosenthal spoke in favor of the bill at committee.

Jay Adolf: I looked at the bill. Privatization of Mitchell-Lama is a contentious issue in the City. The law provided low-rate mortgages. When the mortgage expired, the building could go private. The law includes a prohibition of using funds to advocate for privatization. When one is privatized, there are restrictions on sale price, but it can be a financial advantage to tenants who can sell their homes for a lot more than they paid. When a building is converted, tenants stay under rent stabilization. I have serious reservations about the bill because it is changing the rules in the middle of the game.

Robert Espier: Mitchell-Lama needed up-dating. The option to refinance was built into the program.

The vote on the resolution was 30-0-6-1. The resolution passed.

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

Resolution Re:

5. 2701 Broadway (West 103rd Street.) New applications to the SLA for two-year liquor licenses by Shree Sethiya, Inc. d/b/a Aangan Restaurant.

Linda Alexander: This is an application from a restaurant that has been around for 12 years. It is only a change in ownership.

6. 300 Amsterdam Avenue (West 74th – 75th Streets.) New applications to the SLA for two-year liquor licenses by HBM UWS, LLC d/b/a Miriam.

Linda Alexander: This is an application for a new restaurant from a seasoned restaurateur. It will be an affordable Mediterranean/Israeli restaurant.

The vote on the resolution for both liquor licenses was 36-0-0-0. The resolution passed.

Elected Officials

Steve Brown congratulated Gale Brewer on her election to the City Council.

Borough President Gale Brewer: Gale recognized April Adams for her success in getting 35 elected officials from New Jersey and New York to sign a letter stating that we are sick and tired of tourist helicopter flights from New Jersey creating noise and pollution, sometimes every 15 to 20 minutes. Elected officials held an event at the West Side heliport to call attention to the issue. A helicopter came along and they could hardly breathe because of the fumes from the fuel. To the credit of Congressman Nadler, it is her understanding that if the infrastructure bill passes, then no non-essential helicopter flights will be permitted over a city with a population greater than 8 million -- i.e., New York. 311 complaints have tripled on this issue since last year.

I would like to thank the Columbus Avenue BID for having the open streets. However, the traffic backs up at the Green Market when the street closes. A small suggestion is for the NYPD or DOT to ensure that there is an agent there to redirect traffic away from Columbus when the green market is in process.

I am working on the garbage situation at the new grocery store in the 60's on West End Avenue.

It is my understanding that the Attorney General will make available \$256 million City-wide in January from the Sackler family settlement for drug treatment and prevention. There will be a board of some kind to direct spending. I want to be sure that these funds go to needs that are real.

There are a lot of challenges related to public safety. Captain Zuber explained how shoplifters are released and are back at it the same day. I am working to get midtown court open again.

Because of increased enforcement, there is less activity now from the "door openers" who ask for money and hang out at establishments at 95-96th Streets on the west side of Broadway. These individuals are not homeless and they make at least \$100 a day.

The next redistricting hearing is scheduled for November 10. District lines are likely to change drastically and may end up being drawn in the Assembly and Senate.

It is not clear what will happen regarding the Open Meetings Law after the current law making virtual meetings legal expires on January 15. We have purchased an OWL for each community board to facilitate blended meetings. Every other Tuesday at 2:00 we hold a forum on either the vaccines or on where the money is going in terms of our future. April Adams has put in the chat details on the next Community Leadership training series. Dec 12 we will have our last town hall meeting on Manhattan futures at John Jay.

Assemblymember Linda Rosenthal: Thank you for voting for the Mitchell-Lama bill; I am positive it will be helpful. It hasn't been delivered to Governor Hochul yet. We are talking to the Lieutenant Governor, who is doing a lot of the housing work, and are hoping for a good outcome.

We celebrated the Governor's signing of my bill with Senator Hoylman on untraceable ghost guns. The law bans sale and possession. Sales of ghost guns have proliferated during the pandemic; the law closes loopholes, providing a new tool for law enforcement. I have another bill about micro-stamping guns for next year that I am working on with all the local and national gun groups. I talked to Captain Zuber right after the shooting on 71st Street. The new mayor has promised a focus on public safety and hopefully we will have better news starting in January.

Sanitation left the Upper West Side out of their plans to resume composting, despite the interest of many buildings, then reinstated it. Now, they have delayed the restart in this and a number of other neighborhoods because of staff shortages due to vaccine resistance. When their staff shortages end, we will commence composting pick-ups. I have written to Duane Reade on 72nd Street -- they have a lot of garbage on the sidewalk. I have requested that Sanitation do an audit and speak to businesses that are not doing their part to keep sidewalks clean. We now have a garbage can at 79th and Amsterdam after I requested one.

Brooklyn Fair opened and promised to be affordable. Let me know if there are any concerns.

I have another bill with Senator Brian Kavanaugh that has not been delivered to the Governor yet but that is very important. Mayor DeBlasio finally raised the value of the CityFHEPS housing vouchers up to 100% of the fair market rent. The State bill will raise the value of the state voucher from 85% to 100% fair market rental. We had an event with housing advocates and advocates against domestic violence. Domestic violence has increased in the last year and a half. Without these vouchers, we can say to victims of abuse "leave your abuser" but they will have nowhere to go. We need the Governor to sign it to keep those on the brink of homelessness in their homes and to give the homeless a chance to find a home.

Other announcements: Shred Day is November 14, Sunday 10-2 in front of my office. We are holding a Rat academy on December 4. If you know anyone who needs a mammogram, call the office; we have slots left for the December 8 mammo-van.

Assemblymember Richard Gottfried: The Governor signed my bill on permitting tenants to sue in small claims court. Having property in the City will give jurisdiction to the City in cases of absentee landlords. Previously, if the landlord did not have an office in the City, the court did not have jurisdiction.

Now that children 5 years old and up are eligible for Covid vaccine, I am cosponsoring a bill introduced by Jeff Dinowitz from Riverdale adding Covid vaccine to the list of vaccine mandates for going to public school. Public school vaccine mandates have been a powerful public health tool.

Gale Brewer briefed you on helicopter issues. I attended the press conference at the heliport a week ago. With Brad Hoylman, I am introducing a bill to get the heliport out of Hudson River Park. All of Manhattan will benefit.

Business Session Continued

Preservation Committee K Karpen and Michele Parker, Co-Chairpersons

Resolution Re:

7. 143 West 72nd Street (Amsterdam – Columbus Avenues.) Application #LPC-20-00052 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a full-width rear yard addition on the third and fourth floors with the addition of a Juliette balcony on the new proposed rear facade, new fenestration, and the removal of common brick and recladding the rear facade in stucco; and the addition of a fifth floor with rooftop stair and elevator bulkheads.

Michele Parker: We are asking the Board to disapprove the application because it is inappropriate to the character of the historic district. The building was built in 1883 and later drastically modified in muted art deco style. They are asking for retroactive approval for an added fifth floor, a rear extension and covering the brick with stucco -- work that was already completed -- plus new work to add a green roof and remove the fire ladder. The Committee voted to disapprove the application.

The board vote to disapprove the application passed: 32-0-2-0.

8. 6-16 West 77th Street (Central Park West.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to enlarge and alter an existing penthouse on the eastern portion of the roof.

K Karpen: This application was approved by a vote of 5-0-3-0 at the Preservation Committee. We received a number of written community comments, which were circulated to Board members. The building is on West 77th Street immediately to the west of the New York Historical Society. K. Karpen then walked the Board through a series of slides of the proposed work, which evokes the Glass House. The proposed penthouse is in contrast to the rest of the district but a majority of the committee felt that the design had merit.

Steve Brown called on a number of community members who had signed up to speak first. Board members would be able to speak afterwards.

Eric Krebs: I cared for the previous owner of the penthouse during the end of her life with Alzheimer's and am intimately familiar with the four apartments that were woven into one during her lifetime. The current apartment was not well thought out because it is an add-on. I have looked at the plan and I think it is extraordinary. We should be looking at the future of architecture, not the past. Right outside my window is the Hearst Tower, a modern tower sitting on an historic masonry base, an emblem of what NY can be in the future. I am strongly in favor of this. It is exciting and beautiful.

Jonathan Weiner: I've been a resident of the building for over 2 decades. It is a cooperative built in 1927-8. Many of you who have gone past the building recognize it as an understated but gracious structure, on a beautiful block. The current board has not taken a formal survey of shareholders, but I'm of the belief that a majority of shareholders oppose the project, including about 10 former members of the co-op board. The current board has not voted on this project yet. Quoting from our building's alteration agreement, we all share a concern for the architectural integrity of our building. We have followed these norms for many decades. The current project crashes through these norms and is of great concern to us. Using the 3 criteria for evaluating changes to landmarks: 1. Is it visible? Yes, it is quite visible from the neighborhood. 2. Does it preserve? When you demolish a penthouse, you are not preserving anything. 3. Is it contextually appropriate? The answer is clearly no.

Cristiana Pena: I'm speaking on behalf of the project team. The Landmarks Committee vote speaks to the responsiveness of that body to the many members of the community who attended last month and testified enthusiastically in support of this project. Some of those committee members cited that testimony as influential in their decision. For the record, supporters include:

- Paul Goldberger, resident of the Beresford at 211 Central Park West and architectural critic
- David Klafter and Nancy Kestenbaum, residents of West 90th Street at West End Avenue for 23 years

- John Phufas, on behalf of the Board of the Beresford at 7 West 81st Street / 211 Central Park West
- Ryan Israel, resident of the Astor Apartments at 235 West 75th Street
- Tim Barefield, resident of the Park Belvedere at 101 West 79th Street
- Beverly Dolinsky, resident of West 77th Street
- Evan Bakst, resident of 225 Central Park West
- Irwin Cohen, resident of 146 West 57th Street
- Louise Mirrer, N-YHS
- Frances Halsband, architect and resident of 6 West 77th Street
- Paul Hilal, resident of the Majestic at 115 Central Park West
- Susan Solomon, resident of the Beresford
- And many others, including beyond the UWS community.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak to you prior to your vote.

Frank Bloch: I am also a resident of the building which was built almost 100 years ago. The question before you is the architectural appropriateness of this project. It is a two-story hard-edged glass structure that would be plainly visible from many vantage points in Central Park and along Central Park West. For many of my fellow tenants, it is not appropriate and I ask that you not approve it.

Paul Goldberger: I am here both as a resident of 211 Central Park West and a former architectural critic of both the New York Times and the New Yorker. I am in strong support of the design by Foster and Partners of the penthouse. Contrary to what others have said, one of the great strengths of sensitive modern architecture is its integration of modern additions with historic buildings. It is a specialty of this firm. In 2015 I wrote a book called *Building With History*. It documented many of the successful works around the world by this firm that juxtaposed striking yet sensitive modern additions to historic buildings including Hertz. If the design for 6-16 West 77th Street had been complete at the time I wrote that book, I would absolutely have included it. Though it is small in scale, it holds the promise of being among this firm's finest pieces of work. It is a misconception that the only way to add to an historic building is to imitate the original structure. Foster has been showing us for some time that a light, modern, elegant structure can be respectful and deferential to historic context as much as anything that mimics older architecture. The existing penthouse is not distinguished, nor is it wholly original. Unlike the facade of the building, which is quite beautiful, the penthouse contributes nothing to the fabric of the historic district. The penthouse will enhance the rooftop view from elsewhere on the Upper West Side and it will be close to invisible from the street, so it will not diminish the historic image of this building from the ground level. On balance, it will enhance the neighborhood. I'm also speaking as a trustee emeritus of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and an ardent preservationist who welcomes this design as an example of enlightened preservation. I hope you will support the Landmarks Committee's recommendation to approve this application.

John Richards: I believe, along with quite a few of my neighbors on West 77th Street, that the project is both risky and inappropriate and should not be approved. The building is 92 years old. The vibrations and impact of completely removing the old penthouse and constructing a new one presents a serious risk to the infrastructure of the building. One possible result of the proposed work would be to cause many new leaks -- we have had quite a few in the past -- and damage to the building's common plumbing structure, both immediately during the construction and possibly later as well. It may also cause damage to the building's actual support structure, despite assurances of the construction firm and the architect. We have a sensitive building. It required extensive replacement of the building's vertical steel support columns only recently. As to inappropriateness, the building is part of a collection of historic buildings forming the fabric of the Upper West Side Historic District. Approving the destruction of the current penthouse and the imposition of a new structure with a very different aesthetic on top of the main building will compromise the look of the 1927 structure. More importantly, approving this structure provides a precedent of plopping down inappropriate structures on other historic buildings in the district whenever there is enough money on hand.

Paul Hilal: I'm a 25-year resident of the neighborhood. I lived in a roof apartment on top of a fifth-floor walk-up with a clear view of the pink penthouse and I still live in the neighborhood. I am a huge supporter of this design. I understand the concern that it doesn't match the building below but consider this: the facade of the building below is attractive on 77th Street, but most of the view people will see is from the park, and that view is not attractive. The Central Park West facade was not designed to be seen; it is not aesthetic. And it makes no sense to ask someone to build a penthouse that matches both the 77th Street facade and the side of the building. You can't; they are too different. So, what they did, which is so clever, they basically expanded the steel superstructures of the Upper West Side onto this building, preserving the proportions of the steel superstructures -- that hold up water towers, HVAC facilities, etc. Instead of having air between the steel struts, they have clear glass. That way they create living spaces where there is just air in a superstructure. The proposal is clever and the alternative would be cumbersome and unattractive, having one side match the facade and one side match the side of the building. I think this is brilliant, it's an enhancement, consistent with the superstructure and for that reason it doesn't shatter norms and is consistent with an aesthetic to which we have all become accustomed. The fact that it is somewhat visible is a big plus.

Mary Breasted Smyth: I am a resident of 16 West 77th Street. I feel that this proposal would create a dangerous precedent, especially for the historic preservation district. You know that the developers are dying to get into the West Side and build high rises. A few years ago, developers tried to raise the height of all the landmarked buildings all over the City. That was defeated. This structure is so glaringly contrasting with the style of our building that I feel that it is really inappropriate for us and disagree that it echoes the charming struts under the water towers. It looks like a house designed for Malibu or a restaurant pavilion by the waterfront. It can be seen from the park, from the street, from everywhere. We worry that this is going to become a precedent for changes all over our district. You know what the developers want. You hear about this pressure all the time. This is the most beautiful block in the City of New York perhaps. People walk through it every day on their way to Central Park. It is not just for the people who live here. This is a treasure of the whole City. It is right across from the Natural History Museum and it is right by the entrance to Central Park. It would be a crime to build this structure. We have no objection to Mr. Ackman renovating his apartment and the penthouse, but we do not want a Malibu House on top of our building.

David Schnadig: I have lived in the building at 16 West 77th Street for almost a decade with my family. It is crystal clear to me that this would be a massive improvement to the building and to the neighborhood. You started this discussion with a depiction of this pink stucco eyesore that sits on top of our building. This would clearly be a significant improvement. I would like to correct the misstatements by several other residents of the building so you hear a broader perspective. The Landmarks Committee approved this 5-0-3, a clear mandate to approve this. What you heard in response was a very small group of very vocal people who don't like change. You are hearing from a minority of the building, not a majority. There are many supporters of this project in the building, for all the reasons you have heard from extremely knowledgeable esteemed architects and designers, not just people who are against change. It is important to understand that this cannot be seen from everywhere, only several vantage points.

Steve Brown: About how many apartments are in the building? David Schnadig: About 90.

Roberta Gratz: I served on the Landmarks Preservation Commission for 7 years. We were scrupulous in ensuring that rooftop additions did not exceed a height that could be seen from the street. I have no fundamental objection to the idea of emulating Philip Johnson's Glass House and putting it on the top of a West-Side building but it should not be seen and it should not be so tall. There are levels to it and I assure you that you will now see a flood of roof-top additions that can be seen from the street and you will have a hard time ignoring this precedent. When I was on the Commission, this architect, Mr. Foster, came to us with a very arrogant proposal to expand the Breuer into the Whitney Museum, asking us to break all kinds of landmark rules and we said 'no.' The result was we got the downtown Whitney, which is 100% better. It is not reasonable to let this structure be as big and visible as it is. You will be opening yourselves up to a couple of years of heavy proposals.

Kenneth Marians: I have lived in the building for 27 years and have been on the board multiple times and president of the board 3 times. I am opposed to this project. If anyone walked around the neighborhood while the mock-up was there, they would see that it is visible from the park and many different views along Central Park West. In terms of appropriateness, I ask you to think about the 2 major structures that surround us -- the Museum and the New York Historical Society. I draw a contrast with the expansion of the NY Historical Society, which was approved by CB7 and is quite consistent with the architecture of the Historical Society itself and does not look like a flying saucer landed on top of the building. It also creates enormous problems for the people who live in the building. It is a long construction project. You have heard about loads and stresses. Prudence dictates that, in a nearly 100-year-old building, you don't mess around with it.

Bill Ackman (owner of the project): I have lived on the Upper West Side since June of 1992 and am now living at the Beresford. For years, I looked from our apartment at this pink penthouse. It would be really helpful for this Community Board meeting to go back to the slide of the structure that is there now. There are a lot of things that have been said about the existing structure that are not actually true. The structure that is there now is not original. It wasn't originally pink; it did not originally have stucco, and the existing windows were not there. They were staff quarters that were not of the same quality as the rest of the building, it is a crumbling penthouse and the roof is not in good condition. But we love the site and we love the Upper West Side. My wife and I want to raise our new family here. Our approach was to build something additive to the neighborhood, but there was nothing we could do with what is there. The building over the years approved many changes to the penthouse. Almost all the people who have objected live in the building. I completely understand that people would prefer there not be construction on the roof. The alternative is to sell three separate apartments to three different owners each of whom would do something different. We wanted to do something special. That's why we hired Foster and partners and Frank Sciamie Construction, the best contractor in New York who does sensitive, careful projects. The structure that we are building weighs less than the structure that is there. We are building a steel superstructure that will increase the strength of the building. It will be a material enhancement to the structure of the building and from an architectural and height standpoint, we are keeping the same height of the pink box and the piece above just envelopes the elevator overruns. It doesn't make sense to have this glass box and then have a brick elevator overrun on top. It is much less visible than the pink stucco box that is there now. We have matched the steel to the struts of the water tower. It is as minimal as can be. The reason why people are objecting, in my view, is not because of architectural integrity; it is because they would rather that there be no construction on the roof. No one will take as much care as we will. We want to live peacefully with our neighbors; we don't want them to be upset with us. That is why we hired the team that we hired. We have offered the building to modernize the elevators and the fire safety system. We have also committed that if and when the blue penthouse becomes available, we would replicate a smaller version of the one we are building to match the two sides. In terms of visibility, there was a study which was done and presented to the Preservation Committee. The structure is not visible from the front of the building, not when you are looking at the Historical Society, not from inside the park when the trees have leaves, but if you walk up Central Park West on the east side of the street and you stop about 45 feet north of 77th Street and you look up to the right, you will be able to see this. But it is much less visible than the pink stucco penthouse. We have stepped back the structure from the 77th St side and the Central Park West side

Peter Hoffman: The design of the glass and steel superstructure is an imposition on the prewar building profile and style. It is a gesture to the 77th Street block, the New York Historical Society edifice, the American Museum of Natural History Central Park West facade, the span of cooperatives south of the block -- the San Remo, the Dakota -- and north to the Beresford in a neighborhood where I have lived since 1975. Along the avenue and from a remove, the gesture would be noticeable, jarring, to the neighborhood residents and arriving out-of-town out-of-state and foreign visitors to museums and on the tranquil paths and glades of the park. The 6 West penthouse project and the Historical Society expansion project are creating upheaval among the 6-16 West 77th Street residents. At the October 14 hearing, the project team put forth by way of comparison the immodest Philip Johnson Glass House. As a Stanford boy, I passed by the Glass House on the bus to and from the New Canaan Country School. We children glimpsed the marvel. The Glass House and its outbuildings had rhythm. The immodesty of the penthouse proposal is disturbing. Its design used the 16 West building as

a support and strap for a platform temple to a titan. It is out of balance with the contours of Central Park and Central Park West. It has lost its rhythm. Visitors from all over the world visiting the park and the museums would find in their field of vision the Ackman aerie and wonder who let this happen and what possessed them.

Mark Diller: This was a very hard choice for me as a member of the committee. What I am wrestling with is the conflict between the beauty of the architecture and the standard of appropriateness that asks does this beautiful structure belong where it is proposed to be put. And I am adding to that the concern that we have fidelity to our precedents. With respect to precedent, there is a very similar structure that this Board approved four or five years ago on West 70th Street. It wasn't visible. And the question here is how you want to assess the visibility of this proposal because it is visible principally over secondary or non-fronting facades. It is better in my view to have a clean break from a design than to try to emulate it and fail. It comes down to whether this unduly calls attention to itself. In the late spring, we considered a shade structure on a Central Park West building that was brightly internally lit and constructed of white, reflective material; it was raised on a platform and even though it was only minimally visible from below it went out of its way to call attention to itself. I do find this penthouse design to be appropriate because it is not as intrusive as what we disapproved earlier on Central Park West and it is consistent with what we approved on West 70th Street. I believe it will not unduly call attention to itself, though I acknowledge it is a very hard question.

Madge Rosenberg: I am very much in support of it. There is something no one has mentioned: the Planetarium. The museum is gorgeous but the planetarium has enhanced it. Though the planetarium was controversial, it is an asset and people are very proud of it. We have also been encouraged by Landmarks to approve things that contrast and this does contrast in a very positive way. I'm thrilled that it is coming to the neighborhood.

Page Cowley: This is a difficult project to assess because the intentions seem honorable but in fact it would be a huge mistake to tamper with the structure and the purpose of this penthouse, the beauty of these two penthouses. They may be mismatched colors, but the reality is that this is the way this building type exists. You have the formal facade below, terra cotta, then a more modest architecture above. The terrace maintains terra cotta and there are planters and all sorts of wonderful details that happen at the top of the building that you can't have in other places. I also think this building was designated as a whole. Saying we will only save the bottom is not an approach to preservation. Masonry can be brought back and look just as beautiful as the day it was initially designed. I grew up in a penthouse on Central Park West. The view from inside an original cozy structure makes all the difference in the world. Landmarks made a good decision when they designated this building. It doesn't need to scream at you with modern details to look attractive; it has its own character. If you start adding things inappropriately then you have lost the purpose of our Landmarks rules and regulations. If approved, it will be open season on the upper parts, and everyone will be trying to create a different architecture that won't match and that will lose the character of what these buildings in the 20's and 30's was about.

Roberta Semer: I don't think it is appropriate. I am concerned about the dangers of construction. It is a dangerous precedent. The block is a brilliant block, very historic. I have heard from members of the building that they have had leaks, plumbing issues and elevator issues, and support structure problems. I'm concerned that move-ins and move-outs will be disrupted for a year while construction is happening, upper floors may not have access to the elevator for periods, It sets a bad precedent and disturbs other shareholders. There is a danger to the structure.

Jay Adolf: I voted in favor of this project at committee and I plan to tonight. I think it is forward looking, innovative and should be approved. I have been on the Preservation Committee since I joined this Board and spent 7 years as co-chair of Preservation. I learned a tremendous amount from the architects we have had (particularly Peter Samton) about how to treat modern additions to historic structures. The Landmarks Commission has approved many modern additions to historic buildings throughout the City. Every building in the landmarks district was approved as a whole but many have been added to. In addition to the one Mark Diller mentioned, we also approved a modern addition on West End Avenue and 85th Street several years ago. Landmarks policy for approving a modern addition to an historic building is that it be very distinguishable from the original building. I was also going to mention the Rose Science Building, a complete glass addition

to the Natural History Museum and the Gilder Center which this Board recently approved. I think the project is a perfectly appropriate, brilliant design.

Peter Samton: Nobody has spoken about the fact that this is a 2-story penthouse, which is quite visible. During my 8-9 years on the committee, we have not approved anything of this magnitude. I knew Philip Johnson quite well when I was President of the New York chapter of the AIA when we gave him a gold medal. He was both sensitive to historic architecture and a modernist. I also know Paul Goldberger and those who spoke in favor of this. I think they are missing the point. There is nothing wrong with putting a modern penthouse on a building, provided it is not so visible. This stands out and it will completely change the historic districts of the Upper West Side, not to speak of the whole City.

Richard Roberts.: I think you know that I am not in favor of additions, especially when they are for hedge fund billionaires, and I don't mean any offense to anyone. I respect what a lot of people have said both in favor and in opposition. I think the design is beautiful and an improvement on the pink box. I will be voting in favor.

Ken: I agree with Mark that it is not an easy call. I am inclined to vote for it. Beauty is beauty, no matter where it is. There are a lot of things on the tops of our buildings that are just utilitarian and look awful. I do question how sustainable this design is, given the solar gain; it will need a massive amount of air conditioning during the summer, though maybe that will be offset by less need for heat in the winter.

Bill Ackman: I'm married to a woman whose career is focused on sustainability; sustainability is important to us. The Foster team spent a lot of time on developing a roof cantilever that meaningfully reduces the amount of solar gain on the windows, using very special glass. We also have a large amount of space to put in solar -- something we have not yet gotten approved by the building. We would love to make this the first net zero apartment in New York City. Also, to manage bird issues, we are working with Christine Sheppard, bird collisions campaign director for ABC Birds. They are advising us on everything from what kind of plantings we should plant to things we can do from a sonic perspective to the design of the structure and the kind of shades you can use during migration season. These are important issues to us. On the point made before, the new structure is less visible than the current one. The original structure was never intended to be visible. It was built prior to the New York Historical Society's addition. The facade that faces the park was never intended to be seen. If it were covered by a lot line building like the Majestic or the Beresford, it wouldn't be seen. This is why the quality of construction is different and the use was for staff apartments.

Michele Parker: I want to clear up a possible misunderstanding. This application did not go before the Landmarks Preservation Commission yet. It will go before them on November 16. It was approved by the Preservation Committee at CB7. This is a very difficult application to hear. While I agree with Mark Diller and Jay Adolf, we have to consider what happens at the building board meeting. If they disapprove of this renovation, we are on uneven ground at best. How can we resolve that?

Bill Ackman: The application that went before CB7 was an application of the building approved by the board. The project itself is not going to be finally approved unless Landmarks and all the various approvals are obtained and the final version of the construction drawings are completed to the satisfaction of the building's engineers, but this has the full support of the board. We couldn't be in front of CB7 without that. For those worried about the building falling down, we cannot start construction until the building's engineers sign off on every element of the design and construction.

Steve Brown: Our purview is to vote on whether the project is appropriate to the character of the landmark district.

K, Karpen: I would like to advance this resolution on behalf of the Committee as we approved it by a vote of 5-0-3-0. It has been wonderful to hear all the input and to take it all into consideration. On balance, I am personally still in favor of this and I urge the Community Board members to vote in favor.

Steve Brown: It has been a spirited conversation. I, as Chair, would like to put into the record that it is not relevant or appropriate to reference someone's financial status as an applicant.

The vote on the application was 25-7-2-0. The resolution was approved.

9. 500 West End Avenue (West 84th – 85th Streets.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Window Master Plan.

Michele Parker: The building was built circa 1914. They are applying for a window master plan. They are looking to replace existing windows with single wide double-hung windows in conformity with the original design. It also includes an emulation of the original brick molds and frames that are a lighter-colored brown than the current aluminum frames and are believed to be closer to the original. The single stained-glass window in the lobby will remain in place and have a single pane of glass over it to preserve it. We approved this application as appropriate to the historic district and know that the LPC likes window master plans. We are asking for Board approval.

The vote on the resolution was 23-0-0-0. The resolution was approved.

10. 61 West 86th Street (Columbus Avenue.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to replace the store front.

K Karpen: This is a 5-story building built originally in the 1880's. This is a redo of mostly the first floor. The facades are currently a bit of a jumble. The idea is to unify the storefronts and expose an original limestone band above and use that to bring unity to the Columbus Avenue elevation. The Committee felt that it was a sensitive and thoughtful change to the building and would put the building more in the context of the historic district.

The vote on the resolution was 23-0-0-1. The resolution passed.

11. 1 West 88th Street, Trevor Day School (Central Park West.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for modifications of entryway to provide improved ADA access, including the creation of a sidewalk ramp and new landing, installation of an ADA lift over existing stairs and modifications to existing stair enclosures.

Michele Parker: The Trevor Day School filed an application to improve ADA access, They are installing a sidewalk ramp and a new landing and an ADA lift over the existing stairs and a modification to the crumbling basement stair enclosures. The building was built about 1967 of brick and concrete and the changes will light up the area better.

The vote on the resolution was 25-0-0-0. The resolution was approved.

12. 33 West 89th Street (Columbus Avenue – Central Park West.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for:

1. restoration of the front stoop and façade.
2. a full-width, full-height rear yard addition; and
3. rooftop additions including elevator and expanded stair bulkheads, a shade structure, and mechanical enclosures.

K. Karpen: The application is for a brownstone from the 1890's. They want to restore a missing box stair and basement plus add a full width extension aligned with the extension next door and a modest roof extension.

The Committee vote was 8-0-0-0.

The vote was 24-0-0-0. The resolution passed.

13. 311 West 102nd Street (Riverside Drive – West End Avenue.) Application #LPC-22-01899 to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to enlarge an existing beveled-edge rear facade with a two-story, full width squared extension.

Michele Parker: We are asking you to approve this application. The committee voted 5-3-0-0. The main objection by some was that the rear extension was too boxy. The proposed windows are not too different from what you see in similar backyards.

Stacy Loren: I have been the co-owner of the home for 20 years. We love the block. We want to expand because we have 3 daughters in their 20's, soon to have sons-in-law. We just want to expand in keeping with what others have done in the

area. We think it will add value to the neighborhood and add privacy. We think that the windows we are instilling are more in keeping with the tradition of the house. We have kept the facade the same as the other facades on the block. We hope you will support us.

Eric Andreasen: I am the architect. This project is not visible from any public thoroughfare.

Mark Diller: The reason I voted against this in committee and intend to tonight is that the facade in the rear has a quite lovely, beveled effect. The proposal obscures the shape of the rear facade and the unusual character of this rear yard.

The vote was 14-7-3-0. The resolution was approved.

14. 360 Riverside Drive (West 108th Street.) Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for use of GFRC (glass-fibre reinforced concrete) in lieu of the original terra cotta in connection with certain ornamental detail restorations on the 6th floor facade.

K. Karpen: The application asks for approval to use GFRC to replace terra cotta on the facade. If the replacement is on the 6th floor or above, we are required to vote. The Committee approved the application 8-0-0-0.

The vote was 24-0-0-0. The resolution was approved.

Approval of minutes from previous full board meeting

The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

Community Session

Zach Campbell: A quick report on the Gilder Center project. We have established a site fence to perform renovations on the park. We are working with the Parks Department to salvage the materials in the area. We are also putting in protection for trees. We are almost at the top of the building with shotcrete. The facade material has not started to go on yet. We will continue to average 10-15 truckloads a day and 100 workers on site.

Kevin Williams from Senator Brad Hoylman's Office: As Assemblymember Rosenthal said, the Governor signed the Jose Webber Act on Ghost guns. There has been a 479% increase in ghost gun seizures. The act ensures that the parts will be serialized and traceable. We attended the press conference on helicopters with Gale Brewer and Linda Rosenthal. . The proposed legislation creates a cause of action -- a new tort -- for creating unreasonable noise, it bans helicopters from non-essential use in Hudson River Park, and it amends the City Charter to prohibit concession agreements with the tourism helicopter companies. Thanks to Steve Brown for raising the PSAL sports issue. We have sent a letter to the DOE on travel issues with the State Championships and the problems with spectators.

Joy Phelan: I would like to raise the issue of the Broadway and 72nd Street corner. I was on the corner with my daughter when the recent shooting occurred. Almost every afternoon, there are brawls there. It is a hub for delivery bicycles and some on the sidewalks have nearly knocked people down. I would like to put the issue on your agenda for future consideration. After the shooting, when there were two policemen on the corner, every delivery person got off their bikes and walked on the sidewalks. A little continuing police presence would be helpful.

Steve Brown urged Joy Phelan to attend the Transportation Committee meeting to further discuss the issue.

Hannah Weinerman from Congressman Jerry Nadler's Office: When both the Infrastructure and Build Back Better bills pass, I will come back to provide the details. Congressman Nadler reintroduced the Empower Act, to provide workplace protections to those who speak out about harassment in the workplace. Medicare open enrollment is now through December 7.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:48 PM

PRESERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

K Karpen and Michele Parker, Co-Chairpersons

November 4, 2021 6:30 PM via ZOOM

The Preservation Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Thursday, November 4, 2021, via the Zoom online platform. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm by Preservation Co-Chairs Michele Parker and K Karpen.

Present: Co-Chairs Michele Parker and K Karpen; Jay Adolf, Joshua Cohen, Page Cowley, William Ortiz, Madge Rosenberg, Peter Samton and Mark Diller. **Non-Committee Board member:** Ira Mitchneck and Doug Kleiman.

The following discussions were had and actions taken.

Re: 393 West End Avenue (West 79th Street). Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to replace the canopy at the main entrance; widen window openings and install paired new windows on a column of windows on the west (secondary) façade of the building and increase the size of and renovate the existing penthouse.

The subject building is a fifteen-story apartment building in the Colonial Revival style designed by Goldner and Goldner and completed ca. 1927. It is included in the West End – Collegiate Historic District Extension.

The existing front façade is composed of light-colored brick with spare ornamentation in stone, cast stone and terra cotta.

Presentation by Cas Stachelberg of Higgins Quasebarth, Preservation Consultants; and John Cetra and Sara Azizian of Cetra Ruddy, architects.

CANOPY

- The existing condition (prior to façade renovations that required its removal) is a generic fabric canopy (in green) with ribs underneath and stanchion poles at the far end embedded in the sidewalk.
- The existing canopy did not reach the curb.
- The canopy was not original to the building.
- The proposal is to replace the canopy with bronze and glass marquis-like shelter structure that would proceed from the façade a shorter distance.
- The design calls for a square frame of medium-colored bronze, with glass panels above with a slight bend to allow for drainage. The drains would tie back to conduits within the façade walls.
- The proposed marquis canopy would be secured to steel within the existing façade, and include rods tying back to a point above the structure for additional support.
- The reason for the change is that the existing canopy obscures the detail of the stone and terra cotta ornamentation surrounding the main entrance.
- The primary facades are “almost modern” in the sparsity of detail and ornamentation, so the decoration surrounding the main entrance should not be obscured.
- There are numerous precedents for marquis-like canopies in this and neighboring Historic Districts along West End Avenue.

WINDOW OPENINGS ON WEST FAÇADE

- The application concerns the column of windows at the northern (left) most edge of the west façade at the top 6 floors. The west façade is a secondary façade with no ornamentation and is clad in light-colored common brick.
- Beneath the column of windows, the façade shows the scars from the removal of a fire escape system.
- The existing condition consists of a column of 1:1 double-hung windows with a much smaller window to the south (right).
- The proposal is to widen the existing large window opening to the north (left) and install a pair of 1:1 double-hung windows. The configuration, color and materials would match the other windows on that façade.
- Even with the expanded window opening, that pier that forms the north corner on the west façade will still read as solid and the proposal will not interfere with the visual impression of the building from the west.

PENTHOUSE RENOVATION

- The existing condition consists of a 1-story penthouse that wraps around the two primary facades on the north (West 79th Street) and east (West End Avenue), with elevator and stair bulkheads and a water tower at the southwest and west portions of the roof. There are currently 3 apartments within the penthouse structure, which is set back from the facades.

- The proposal is to (a) increase the footprint of the existing penthouse by approximately 300 square feet; (b) increase the ceiling height throughout the penthouse from between 8'2" (to the beams) & 8'11" (to the plane of the ceiling) to approximately 12'; (c) construct a covered walkway connecting the two stair bulkheads; and (d) reclad the entire penthouse with porcelain panels.
- As to (a) – the increase in the footprint of the penthouse would be achieved in the open space to the southwest of the existing roof, between the current walls and the water tower.
- As to (b) – the ceiling heights would increase throughout, with slightly higher ceilings at the northeast and northwest corners.
- As to (c) – the covered walkway would be built of dark colored steel with glass surfaces between the framing members.
- As to (d) – the proposed cladding would consist of porcelain tiles with a textured surface and arranged in large tiles to emulate the appearance of stone. The color would be slightly lighter than the existing stucco cladding. Visibility: The existing penthouse is visible from various locations in all directions, although the extent of visibility is minimal from many such vantage points. The proposed increase in height of the penthouse will be additionally visible from all such locations.

Committee Questions and Comments:

Klari:

- Q: Will the canopy employ fritted glass?
- A: There will be a pattern to the glass, which among other things helps obscure minor accumulations of grit and precipitation.
Q: Has the brick façade been cleaned, and what relation will the color of the penthouse proposed porcelain cladding bear to the primary facades?
- A: While the brick has been cleaned, it was not recent. The porcelain tile will not be intended to relate to the brick below. It will be of a lighter hue, not as yellow, as the brick below.
- Q: Did the applicant consider using brick to match the facades below?
- A: Existing brick is common brick, which would not agree with the design intentions.
- Concern that the porcelain will be too shiny in appearance and call attention to itself.
- Concern that the 12' ceilings will be environmentally and visually incompatible with the building. Environmentally because it will create a larger energy drain, and visually because it will increase the visibility of what should be a secondary structure.
- Q: Is there sufficient FAR [floor area ration] to permit the addition of 300 square feet of additional occupiable space?
- A: Yes – DoB has confirmed.

Peter:

- The lighter color of the porcelain tile will not be compatible with the design of the penthouse – it will make it stand out too prominently.
- A: Will work toward a slightly greyer appearance.

Page:

- Q: Concern for the rating of the glass used in the new fenestration on the penthouse – energy efficiency rating?
- A: Will employ glass that has energy coatings but will not look “too purple.”
- Concern for roof structure – are planters and plantings planned for terraces?
- A: potential for planters, but no gazebo or trellis structures planned.

K:

- Q: Drawings include a green roof above the penthouse?
- A: Yes, proposing a small planted green roof.

Ira:

- Q: Will there be lighting under the canopy?
- A: The existing sconces flanking the main entrance should provide sufficient lighting. Aim is for the canopy not to call attention to itself and away from the highly decorated main entrance surround or the bright bronze ornate doors.

Doug:

- Aesthetically the changes appear appropriate. Concern for the water tank height viz the increased height of the penthouse.

Mark:

- Q: if the goal is to have the canopy not compete with the ornate door and surround, did the applicant consider a black or darker metal frame for the canopy?
- A: trying to balance the goal of being a minimal intrusion with agreeing with/complementing the bronze entry doors.

Community Comments and Questions:

Paula White:

- Neighbor – concerned with the dust, noise and interruption from the construction.

K: CB7 can help keep the parties in contact – advising applicant to provide contact information for neighbors through the CB7 office.

Resolutions – Separate resolutions for the Canopy, west Window Openings, and Penthouse.

A. Resolution to approve the Canopy as presented:

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted.

VOTE: *Committee: 8-0-1-0. Non-Committee Board Members: 2-0-0-0.*

B. Resolution to approve the enlarging of the west windows as presented:

After deliberation, the resolution to approve was adopted.

VOTE: *Committee: 9-0-0-0. Non-Committee Board Members: 2-0-0-0.*

C. Resolution to approve the penthouse renovations, with a recommendation to lower the overall height of the proposed penthouse:

After deliberation, the resolution to approve with a recommendation was adopted.

VOTE: *Committee: 7-1-1-0. Non-Committee Board Members: 2-0-0-0.*

Application is calendared for a public hearing at LPC on December 14, 2021.

Re: 114 West 86th Street (Columbus – Amsterdam Avenues). Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission to legalize the installation of non-historic windows on the primary façade.

The subject building is a 16-story apartment building constructed ca. 1927-28 by architect J.M. Felson in the Neo-Renaissance style. The primary façade is composed primarily of brick with stone cladding at the lower floors and stone and terra cotta detail above. It is included in the Upper West Side / Central Park West Historic District.

Presentation by Andrew Pisani of Metropolis Group.

- The application concerns a violation issued by LPC in 1999 relating to the installation of 1:1 double hung windows on the primary façade without an LPC permit.
- The original window configuration called for divided light, which the applicant believes were either 6:6 or 9:9 panels.
- The window replacement was completed by a prior owner who is not available to assist with this application.
- Replacement windows should be approved because 6 other apartment buildings on the same block also have 1:1 double hung windows on their primary facades, and because the cost to conform to divided light would be unnecessarily high.

Committee Question and Comments:

Page:

- The application needs to include historical photographs and details of the original condition and the rationale for changing to the current condition.
- Applicant should make an argument to retain the current windows that is specific to the condition and merits of this building rather than the general circumstances of the block.
- It should not be difficult to find the tax photos and other plans to indicate the original condition.
- Troubling to attempt to decide the legalization application in the absence of these materials and information.

Jay and Mark:

- Q: Confusion as to the status of the violation.
- A: Violation discovered while preparing other work – not disclosed to new owner.
- Need more information before the Board can evaluate the proposal. The criteria for such a legalization application is to treat it as if no work were done and determine whether the Board would have approved the replacement windows if approval had been requested ab initio.
- LPC Staff is limited in its authority to approve at Staff level only windows that conform to the original configuration. Hence the public hearing before the full Commission.
- Applicant should follow Page's good advice.

Community Comment:

Peggy and Peter Salwen (residents of the subject building):

- Residents in the building for over 40 years.
- Windows were replaced long ago but cannot currently determine whether the replacement was done pre- or post-designation of the Historic District [in 1990].
- Some apartments replaced their windows based on approvals from the Super. The old windows were not energy-efficient.
- After some individual apartment residents replaced their windows, the building replaced the rest.
- Will check for records, but a long time ago.

Committee Discussion:

Jay:

- Applicant should withdraw this application and prepare the information and arguments recommended by Page.

Mark:

- Applicant could simply postpone the public hearing before the LPC and return to the Committee and Board with a revised application including the information Page outlined.

Applicant:

- Agreed to postpone the hearing and return to a future Committee meeting with additional information and arguments.

Resolution: Protective resolution to disapprove the application without prejudice to return with additional information – such protective resolution to be withheld upon confirmation of the postponement of the LPC public hearing.

After deliberation, the protective resolution to disapprove was adopted.

VOTE: *Committee: 8-0-0-0. Non-Committee Board Members: 2-0-0-0.*

New Business:

The Co-Chairs and Committee discussed certain changes made to the versions of resolutions as prepared by the Committee and as presented to the full Board on November 3rd.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Mark Diller

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Andrew Albert and Howard Yaruss, Co-Chairpersons

November 9, 2021 at 6:30 PM via ZOOM

#3: Presentation by DOT/Con Ed regarding an electric charging station pilot at West 76th /Columbus Ave and West 84th /Amsterdam Ave and potential resolution regarding same.

Susan McSherry and Mark Simon from DOT give presentation on EV charging stations – changing the locations (CB7 already heard from DOT on these stations).

Maximum 4-year demonstration program to encourage EV ownership. The cost is \$2.50/peak and \$1 off peak. Testing to see whether infrastructure on the street helps to build confidence among consumer and whether we can increase the number of EV registration. Study done with consultants to look at locations that make sense. Six parking spaces on the UWS, six on the UES and two in Washington Heights. 100 parking spaces total around the city. When DOT first presented this the locations were: 93/CPW, 86/WEA, 70/WEA. After COVID there turned out to be sidewalk sheds at the 86th and 70th locations. Owners did not want to modify the structures to accommodate charges. So found two new locations: West 76th/Columbus Ave. and West 84th /Amsterdam Ave. North side of the street – left side parallel parking because most of the ports are on that side of the vehicle.

Andrew: How long will it take to get these installed?

Answer: Sidewalk work takes about 3-4 days. Then ConEd connects, takes a day or two. So, construction happens pretty quickly.

Andrew: What will the signage say?

Answer: Signage says: “Electric Vehicle Charging Only”. Still need to pay the meter, move car for alternate side parking, etc. Also, an informational sign that informs the reader about the charger.

Andrew: Is the city publishing a map to let people know where the charging stations are?

Answer: www.nyc.gov/PlugNYC. Also listed on www.plugshare.com

Sara: Is this for vehicles only? How is this enforced?

Answer: Vehicles only – purpose built for cars; too much power for a moped or any bike. The rule is EV charging only. If you are a vehicle (even an EV) and you’re not charging, you could be subject to a ticket. That’s NYPD giving out tickets. They have been enforcing on 93rd street.

Doug: Did you mean construction sheds or restaurants? On West 76th Street, there’s a Citibike station right there – how close is that going to be?

Answer: Sidewalk sheds for safety reasons related to construction. Re: Citibike, we can send a schematic of the design; don’t think that they’re side by side.

Erana: I live on 93rd St and I’ve seen this on 93rd. Every time I go by, someone is charging their car. This is being used!

Ken: 84th St, is that in front of the playground? These are level 2 stations? App for payment?

Answer: Yes. Yes. The station is owned and operated by Flow (Canadian company). It is app-based. Don’t necessarily have to have an account with them but makes the experience easier and more efficient.

Colleen: It would be great to get a resolution in support of these two new locations.

Barbara: Proposes resolution supporting both locations. Andrew seconds.

Ken: In the hierarchy of uses of the curb space, replacing car storage with a charging station is a step in the right direction. A couple thousands New Yorkers die premature deaths every year due to exhaust and because of our carbon footprint. But EVs are still cars and we need to be moving away from cars.

Answer: DOT’s position is that we want you to take mass transit or other modes, but if you do have to drive then EVs are better.

Howard: Is this revenue neutral to the city>?

Answer: The cost to do this was funded by moneys that came from the public service commission. Private money is paying for this. While people are paying for the service, it will in no way recover the cost. It's ConEd's loss, not the City of New York.

WHEREAS, electric vehicles promote cleaner air, and whereas, in order for them to have increased popularity, charging stations are essential. As two of the locations that were chosen in the past are now not available.

THEREFORE, Community Board 7/Manhattan Approves the application to install two pilot electric charging stations, one to be on West 76th Street between Columbus and Amsterdam Avenues on the north side of the street, and the other between West 84th Street between Columbus and Amsterdam Avenues on the north side of the street.

VOTE: Committee: 8-0-1-0. Non-Committee: 4-0-0-0.

#4 Secondary Street Naming for 89th Street between Columbus and Amsterdam Avenue – Ballet Hispanico.

Emily Corona: Reads brief statement advocating for renaming in honor of enduring legacy and contribution to UWS community on milestone 50th anniversary. Assistant Director of Institutional Relations. Headquarters on 89th Street. Largest Latinx cultural org in the US. Serve nearly 200,000 annually. Co-naming the block will formalize our permanence in this community.

Ken: I usually vote against Secondary Street Names. They're intended to honor important members of our community who are no longer with us, not to provide free advertising for institutions. Don't believe that we should be using public space to promote an ongoing institution. So I will vote against.

Mark Diller: Ballet Hispanico is an incredible contribution to our community. This would fit well into rubric honoring pillars of the arts. We shouldn't only be honoring white men who are prominent in the arts. The second reason to vote for this: BH use of the former Claremont stables is a wonderful example of adaptive reuse of an historic building that otherwise would have fallen into disrepair.

Erana: I echo Mark. Lived in this community for decades. BH has endured through the best of times and the worst of times in this community. Provide cultural education to hundreds of low-income young people.

Doug: Only ever heard good things about BH. How is BH incorporated? Is it a non-profit?

Answer: 501(c)(3)

Rich Robbins: I always vote against street namings. I completely support the idea of paying tribute, I just think that street signs are a bad way to do it. It doesn't help people who don't know enough about the organization. Also worry that we just create more clutter on street signs, which are meant for safety and quick directions.

Howard: Assume you complied with all of the prerequisites?

Answer: Yes. Collected 120 signatures, posted 38 signs, collected letters of support

Andrew Albert: Move to honor BH with a secondary street naming. Erana seconds.

WHEREAS Ballet Hispanico is seeking approval from Community Board #7 for a secondary street signage on West 89th Street between Columbus and Amsterdam Avenues to recognize the legacy of Ballet Hispanico on the Upper West; and

WHEREAS Ballet Hispanico has met the requirements for such street naming.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Community Board 7/ Manhattan **approves** the secondary naming of West 89th Street as Ballet Hispanico Way.

VOTE: Committee: 7-1-0-0. Non-Committee Members: 3-1-0-0.

#1: Discussion and addressing Spike in Traffic Fatalities in CB7 and potential resolution

- **Speakers: Julia Kite-Laidlaw, DOT, Representative from the 20th Precinct, 24th Precinct and the NYPD Transportation Bureau (20th and 24th Precinct unable to join but they did answer some written questions.)**

Howard: There were two fatalities last year and there have been 9 this year.

Rich presents short slideshow on this matter: Huge spike in fatalities this year. Four deaths in 2017 and 2019, only two in 2018 and 2020. This year year-to-date there have been 9. Five on Amsterdam Avenue, Two on Henry Hudson, Two on CPW. 7 people hit by cars or trucks, 1 by an illegal moped, and 1 by an ebike. Most 65 or over. If we had nine people killed by guns, the community would be up in arms. 389 injuries in our district in addition to 9 fatalities.

Julia Kite-Laidlaw from DOT: Very much appreciate CB7's interest in road safety and Vision Zero. DOT is very disturbed by the increase in fatalities citywide this year. This is actually a statewide and nationwide problem. We're in a time where we are experiencing disorder throughout all of society and one way that plays out is through reckless driving and bad driving decisions. Driver behavior has worsened. A lot of speeding, failure to yield, shocking number of hit and runs (which often conceal other wrongdoings). The trends that we're seeing are largely down to driver behavior. The number of fatalities on Amsterdam is very disturbing because we have designed the street for safety over the past several years.

Legislation pending in the state which would allow the city to run speed cameras 24/7. We have over 1700 in 750 school zones. But we can only run the cameras 6am-10pm on weekdays. About 1/3 of non-highway fatalities happened where there are cameras but at times when cameras are not allowed to operate by law. These cameras have been phenomenally useful. Also working with NYPD to increase in-person enforcement for things that cameras can't get. Also dusk and darkness campaign.

Andrew: What about automatic safety features on cars?

DOT: Private sector has some promising innovations, but not sure we can legislate this. One thing that Federal DOT does is the star rating system on new vehicles. Would be good to rework the standards to include automatic emergency braking, etc. to include impacts to people outside the car.

William Ortiz: Vision Zero website for DOT – there are a lot of dead links. Important to have that up and running and working. City hasn't done anything to educate bikers to follow the rules. City needs to make more of an effort on how to ride. I feel safer riding on the street than on a bike path.

Howard: There is a lot of education for drivers – have to pass both a written test and a driving test and they are still accounting for about 99% of the deaths. So we can't rely completely on education.

Ken: We start talking about deaths and injuries and the conversation immediately goes to taking about "bad cyclists". Looking at the city as a whole, what's killing and injuring people? Of the two on the UWS, one was an illegal moped and shouldn't have been on the streets at all and the other was an ebike in a bike lane not doing anything illegal.

Julia: It's a mix of things. The landscape of what people are using on the streets is quite different than what we had when we started Vision Zero in 2014. Overwhelmingly still the crashes are involving cars, including more SUVs. We've had three pedestrians killed by bikes or mopeds, we think this reflects the changing ecosystem on the road. Speed is so often the determinant of living and dying.

Ken: With regard to the death of Williamson at 86/CPW I had asked DOT whether they knew or were contemplating any infrastructure changes and we were told that it was a failure to yield and therefore there would be no infrastructure changes.

DOT: When we designed CPW bike lane we had turning conflicts in mind.

Sara: Nearly 300 people have been killed on the streets this year alone, most of them pedestrians, the vast majority of them by vehicles, many of them children. Dangerous Vehicle Abatement Program – when will this be in effect and can we amend the law so that drivers who continue to disobey the law get their vehicles impounded.

Colleen: Looking at DVAP – working with stakeholders about this can share more info with CB7 in terms of gathering information.

Susan: In nursery school I learned how to share and it seems like bikers in New York don't know how to share. Pedestrians have every right to be in the city and we are in danger all the time. Asking for a study of the bowtie of death and bikers are all over and don't follow any rules. Please do something about that. We need enforcement for everything.

Rich Robbins: Note how low priority fatalities are that we put this item #3 on the agenda even though Julia had to leave early. Enforcement in our district is dramatically down this year. Chief Royster mentioned that when gunshots increased officers were shifted from her group to addressing guns. Of course, we're all concerned about guns, but because these are traffic incidents instead of gun violence people don't seem to care. It's a 99:1 ratio between cars and bikes in terms of what is more dangerous. Street safety is the only life or death issue where the city is required to go to a community board to get approval. The fire department would never be required to go to the CB to make critical safety improvements. CB should get out of the business of blocking DOT from making necessary safety improvements.

Erana: Wondering whether DOT is considering licensing these two-wheeled vehicles. What's the plan for these motorcycles and other devices?

Ken: They are required to be licensed.

Steve: What's the rationale for why it's not 24/7?

Sara: To get it passed they put them only in school zones and during school hours. Then they expanded it to 6am-10pm.

Rich Robbins: Need to call on the police to increase enforcement as well. Automatic enforcement is good, but we also need NYPD.

jkite@dot.nyc.gov for any additional questions.

Howard: I think that is a more complicated issue. Proposed resolution. Andrew seconds.

In order to improve street safety, CB7 supports amending the necessary law(s) to remove the limit on the number of street speed and red-light cameras and to allow all such cameras to be kept in operation at all times.

VOTE: Committee: 11-0-0-0. Non-Committee: 2-0-0-0.

#2: Discussion and potential resolution regarding the request by DOE Staff from the Joan of Arc Educational Campus to extend the "NYCDOE Employee-Only Parking" zone and associated street signage.

Jay: We've already lost many parking spaces this year and residents of the neighborhood need parking.

Erana: Educators already using the play yard to park, which should be for children. Don't think we should single out Joan of Arc to have special parking spaces. If faculty feel that strongly about driving, they can park their cars in the parking garages.

Ken: I agree with Jay, but for a different reason. We shouldn't be encouraging people to drive to work, should be wherever possible encouraging mass transit. Westchester has Metro North.

Howard: I would say that we just move on if no one supports this.

Steve: If we don't take up a resolution than we just move on.

Andrew: We're sympathetic, but we can't accommodate everyone's request. If we give everyone parking, we just don't have enough space. Don't believe that we can move forward with this particular proposal.

Jay: We should vote on a resolution to deny the request.

Tomkin: Understand everyone's position and will take back this decision to my colleagues.

RTomkin@schools.nyc.gov

Resolution to deny the request by DOE Staff from the Joan of Arc School to extend the "NYCDOE Employee-Only Parking" zone and street signage.

VOTE: Committee: 10-0-0-0. Non-Committee: 2-0-0-0.
Resolution Passes

#5 Discussion and potential resolution on eBike safety.

Jay: This resolution is not a proposal to restrict the use of ebikes in any way. Two deaths by electrically-assisted vehicles and took extensive investigation to find the operators of the vehicles. Anyone who is involved in an accident with an electrically-assisted bike should be able to identify the owner of that bicycle. The way you do that is you require it to be registered. Right now under state law, all other vehicles are required to be registered. The second part is financial responsibility, which we think of as insurance, but doesn't have to be insurance per se. Would be the sellers of ebikes that would create a process to coordinate the registration and financial responsibility. The third part simply says that operators should be required to wear protective headgear, which is for their protection. Finally, considering the financial situation of delivery workers, resolution provides that the delivery companies should bear the responsibility of providing for insurance. Before the meeting I contacted a leading insurance provider for these devices and had a discussion: they provide three levels of insurance: \$25k, \$50k, \$100k. Minimum required is \$25,000. In 10024 the cost would be about \$100/year. Most expensive cost is theft insurance, not liability insurance.

Ken: Are you lumping together all ebikes including pedal-assist, including citibike ebikes and cargo bikes and parents take their kids to school on?

Jay: I recognize the distinction between pedal-assist and the others. However, I think that registering it and insuring it really is protection for the owner. I think it should all be included.

Ken: And you're aware that mopeds of the kind that killed Lisa Banes are already required to be registered/licensed.

Jay: Yes. We're not talking about licensing operators. We're talking about registering the vehicles. Re: citibikes: registration and financial responsibility are the obligation of the owners. So none of that burden would fall on the users. Citibike could register their bikes in masse and would have to provide an insurance program, like rental car companies provide self-insurance.

Ken: You're aware that operators of class three ebikes are already required to wear helmets?

Jay: Wasn't sure. But let everybody wear them. Class 2 and Class 1 should also be required to.

Ken: This will make the streets less safe because it will erect needless barriers to the use of vehicles that are proven to be safer than the cars on our streets. If this were put into place, it would give the police another reason to pull over and arrest bike riders. This resolution is attacking the very forms of transportation that are safer and more sustainable and that we should be trying to get more of. There's a reason why the state classed ebikes as bicycles – wanted to make it easier for people to use them and to get more of them on the street. Part of what is needed to save the planet from the worst effects of climate change. Intended or not, this resolution's real effect will be to perpetuate our city's auto dependence. Fewer than 9% of hit and run crashes involving injuries result in arrest, and that's with license plates and registration.

Erana: Your resolution is specifically registering electric bicycles?

Jay: Yes, because everything else already requires registration

Erana; Are there any identifying numbers already on citibikes? So that if you encounter one? Issue for me with the ebikes, especially with the delivery people, is that if you get into an altercation with them and they almost hit you, there's just never any identification on them so that you can call the restaurant and say, "I almost just got hit by your delivery person can you please have a conversation with them".

Howard: Every citibike has a clearly identified number painted on it.

Andrew: But escooters and ebikes don't have any identification on them.

Jay: Citibike number is for the benefit of the company, so they know who's using which bike.

Doug: DOT rep talked today about how many of the crashes were as a result of hit and runs, failure to yield, etc. Hit and run often due to concealing criminal behavior. There's a lack of accountability and with transparency there's a greater likelihood of accountability and maybe compliance. Been hearing cries from our community about why aren't these things registered.

Barbara: Excellent resolution, completely in favor. I was in Riverside Park today and watched as 1 out of every 2 or 3 bikes was an ebike where they're not supposed to be.

Howard: When I get a rental car, I'm not required to get liability insurance. I turned it down, it was optional. I was general counsel at one of the largest insurance companies in America.

Jay: We're talking about New York State, it could not be registered without the company providing proof of insurance. Company is self-insured. The responsibility to ensure any vehicle is on the owner. In the case of citibike, this would be the company, not any individual rider.

Rich: Clearly there are concerns about ebikes. Of the crashes with injuries in our district this year, 232 had cars while 9 had ebikes as the vehicle listed. The vehicle that killed Lisa Banes was already illegal. The issue here is enforcement of existing laws that are already there. NYC Administrative Code § 10-157: Bicycles used for commercial purposes that already contains most of what is in Jay's proposed resolution. We need to get these companies to be responsible for their workers.

Steve: Strongly disagree that this is anything against delivery workers. Disagree with the data given. Don't believe the data doesn't drive the problem. Supportive of the resolutions. Cars are dangerous but that doesn't believe that we can't talk about anything else. Suggestion: Believe that we should delineate between throttle and pedal-assist bikes. Reconsider carving those out.

Jay: I did think about carving out pedal-assist, but I just think that registering and having insurance is actually of a great benefit to the owners of those bikes. Require citibike to register and insure them – it does not fall on the users.

Patrick Weir: Lived on the UWS for several years, owned several businesses. A lot of blame being cast upon ebikes. Would like to put a voice for ebikes. I have a special needs daughter and have been using an electric cargo bike to get her around the cities since 2017. When I take my daughter to school, it brings so much joy to see other families with their ecargo bikes. Enable parents to take parents to school or wherever in a way they couldn't do on a pedal bike. Ebikes open up the whole city to parents and kids.

David Vassar: Veteran cyclist since I came here in 1993. Discovered I didn't need a car to get around NYC and it's been amazing. The sheer joy of getting around by bike, especially at my age is really indescribable. I'm with Ken. Let's not do anything that discourages using an extremely healthy and environmentally friendly form of transportation. Our streets and avenues are utterly dominated, spatially and acoustically, by fast-moving, multi-ton four wheelers and everybody's attention is hijacked by the oppressive need to pay attention to the four-wheelers.

Carl Mahaney: I'm also a cargo bike parent and I whole-heartedly echo Patrick's comments. This resolution is classic moral-panic reasoning. It's labeling ebikes as a societal menace based on anecdotal evidence, while it overlooks the true threat: cars. There are challenges ahead, but the solution isn't knee-jerk reactions creation barriers.

William Milne: We shouldn't make it harder to ride ebikes here/ I personally think that ebikes are the future for personal transportation in cities. Super-efficient and so light. My fiancé and I, as we're trying to decide where to go, I want to stay here and enabling this way to get around is such a good thing to do. There are always growing pains, but let's not let that stop us from growing at all. I understand that some ebikers don't follow the rules and that's frustrating, but just because of that we shouldn't make it harder for a whole new mode of transportation to emerge.

Peter Arndtsen: Been a biker since 1980. Support biking, but we made bike lanes so that people would follow the regulations and that has not happened. Speaking on behalf of our community, we have a lot of elderly and a lot of families with kids and I hear from them that they are concerned about bikes that are going too fast and the wrong direction.

Jay: Irrelevant and a diversion. Comments by cargo bike users: great that they use it; none of them would give up the bike if they have to register it. Totally irrelevant.

VOTE: *Committee: 6-2-0-0. Non-Committee: 0-1-1-0*

The Resolution passes

#6: New business.

Ken: Intersection on the Hudson bike path at 83rd Street where cyclists going northbound are coming down a hill and they're rejoining a pedestrian path and often unaware and pedestrians are walking towards the esplanade who are not aware that they're crossing the most popular bike path in North America. It's really dangerous. Needs to be professional redesigned and put proper signage. Need to begin a conversation with Riverside Park immediately before anyone gets hurt.

Andrew: Could write a letter/email from both committees.

Colleen: West 103rd St Open Street is expanding one block to include block between Amsterdam and Broadway, active 8am-8pm 7 days/week

Doug: Bill in City Council which would require delivery apps to cover the cost of some drivers' accidents. We should take a look at this bill and might be something we should have on an agenda.

SENIOR TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

November 10, 2021 at 10:00AM

Roberta Semer, Chair

Meeting was called to order at 10 am

Present: Louisa Craddock, Madge Rosenberg, Roberta Semer, Lisa Miller and Janet Weinstein (lighthouse Guild), Aaron Rooney (Goddard Riverside), Conor Callahan (DOROT), Robin Strashun (Share and Care), Mark Jennings (Project Find), Paula Seefeldt (LILY). Daniel Leinweber (Mt Sinai Urgent Care), Shari Lerner (JCC). **Elected Representatives:** Cindy Cardinal and Rita Genn (Council Member Rosenthal), Hannah Weinerman (Congressman Nadler) and Erik Cuelo (Council Member Levine). **Absent:** Beverly Donohue and K Karpen.

1. Update by member organizations and elected officials

- Aaron Rooney is the new Associate Deputy director of the Goddard Network and Isaac Center,
- Conor Callahan is an intern with DOROT
- Paula Seefeldt explained that LILY stands for Life Force In Later Years. They just received a grant for home cleaning for seniors, she said the seniors are thrilled. They are also working with Riverside Church to provide cooked Thanksgiving Meals delivered to seniors.
- Janet Weinstein and Lisa Miller spoke about the new Technology Center to help people access technology to enhance their lives. Lisa Miller wants anyone with low vision to be able to access services and programs that will be of help. Her direct number is 646-847-4615
- Sharon Strashun said that Share and Care works with Holy Trinity Church to provide cooked Thanksgiving Meals to seniors.
- Roberta Semer added that Goddard Riverside will be both delivering Thanksgiving Meals to senior and others in the area but will also have grab and go meals out of the Senior Center at 595 Columbus. Before the pandemic in-person dining was a major component.
- Shari Lerner said that the JCC through the Wexler Center has connected with over 2,800 seniors throughout the pandemic.
- Mark Jennings said that Project Find has opened the waiting list for two buildings, but it is still a lengthy process. Additionally, they find the RFP process for funding to be quite slow.
- Cindy Cardinal and Rita Genn reported on several projects. They are providing mammograms along with Project Find in Clinton. The fresh food bag program is still in progress. There will be a webinar on "Aging in Place" on December 2 at 6 pm. They are working on this with OATs (Older Adults Technology Services) and LiveOnNY. Rita added that in conjunction with WSCAH and DOROT they have a program that brings groceries to older adults who can prepare their own food.
- Erik Cuelo said that they are working on housing and food insecurity, getting food pantry services to constituents.
- Hannah Weinerman said their office is working with constituents who have questions and problems with Medicare. People have until December 7 to enroll or change enrollment. Contact: nadler@house.gov

2. Discussion of future forums and programs

- "Everything You Want to Know about Aging in NYC", suggested by Lisa
- listing of available health and exercise programs and accessibility
- Medicare and Medicare advantage - Roberta and Robin advised people to attend State Senator Liz Krueger's program on the 18th of November, a flyer was sent to the Task Force members following the meeting.
 - Advance planning for pets - in case of hospitalization or end of life
 - Advance planning
 - Environment - and composting

Next Meeting December 9th, Thursday at 10am

BUSINESS & CONSUMER ISSUES COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Linda Alexander and Christian Cordova, Co-Chairpersons

November 10, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via ZOOM

Business & Consumer Issues Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan met via the Videoconferencing application Zoom. The meeting was called to order at 6:32 pm by Co-Chairperson Linda Alexander.

Present: Linda Alexander, Joshua Cohen, Madelyn Innocent, Doug Kleiman, Andrew Rigie and Benjamin Wu.

Absent: Christian Cordova, Paul Fischer, Miranda Goodwin-Raab and Erana Stennett.

Non-Committee Board Member: Seema Reddy.

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

1. 710 Amsterdam Avenue (West 94th – 95th Streets.) Seafood 710, Inc. d/b/a To Be Determined.

Presenting for the Applicant: James Wang, Jing Wang Consulting, Inc., j.y.wang.ny@gmail.com;

- Mr. James Wang, consultant representing both parties (buyer and seller) indicated that the application is for a change in ownership, and that the d/b/a (The Boilery) will remain the same.
- Hours will be 11am to midnight 7 days a week.

*After due deliberation, the resolution to **approve** was adopted*

Committee VOTE: 5-0-0-1. Non-Committee VOTE: N/A

Alteration Application to the SLA:

2. 2751 Broadway (West 105th – 106th Streets.) Alteration Licensee #1027462 to the State Liquor Authority for two-year liquor license by SMK Entertainment Group, Inc. d/b/a Smoke Jazz Club. Alteration is to relocate the bar and add more space to their location.

Presenting for the Applicant: Alexa Santory, Helbraun & Levey LLP, alexa@helbraunlevey.com; Paul Stache, President - SMK Entertainment Group, Inc., PaulStache@mac.com;

- They are expanding the space while keeping the same hours of operation.
- Looking forward to open in the next month and a half.

Comments:

- Peter Arndsten of the Columbus/Amsterdam BID spoke in favor of the applicant.

*After due deliberation the resolution to **approve** was adopted*

Committee VOTE: 6-0-0-0. Non-Committee VOTE: 1-0-0-0.

Expansion onto Municipal Property Application to the SLA and DOT:

3. 240 Columbus Avenue (West 71st – 72nd Streets.) Expansion onto Municipal Property Licensee #1334573 to the State Liquor Authority and Department of Transportation by Felice 240, LLC d/b/a Felice to allow use of the municipal space.

Presenting for the Applicant: Seth Weinberg, Attorney, SWeinberg@WZMPLaw.com;

- They missed the dateline from the existing emergency program so they had to apply to be able to serve liquor on the roadside seating.

*After due deliberation the resolution to **approve** was adopted*

Committee VOTE: 6-0-0-0. Non-Committee VOTE: N/A

4. New Business:

- Josiph Suero and Sabas, managers of Jacob's Pickles at 509 Amsterdam Avenue.
 - The business has received letters from the NYC Department of Transportation (DOT) on 11/3 and 11/8 (Notice of termination and cease and desist letters), due to their roadside seating, which is currently built to 8 feet 6 inches wide (8 feet is allowable).
 - Jacob's Pickles is currently working to adjust the structure back to 8 feet wide.
 - The business also received notice regarding excavation work that was done on the sidewalk.
- There was further discussion regarding some of the general confusion around existing regulations/guidelines under the emergency order, and the new regulations which are forthcoming from DOT.

The meeting ended at 7:24 p.m.

PARKS & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Barbara Adler & Natasha Kazmi, co-chairs

November 15, 2021 at 6:30PM via ZOOM

Meeting is available on YouTube at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Q33dJoAflg>

Present: Barbara Adler, Elizabeth Caputo, Ken Coughlin, Natasha Kazmi, William Ortiz and Polly Spain. **Absent:** Daniela Alvarado and Susan Schwartz.

Natasha Kazmi began the meeting, welcoming everyone.

Barbara made a brief public service announcement that dogs are allowed off-leash only in Bull Moose Dog Run, and not on the lawns of Theodore Roosevelt Park. Enforcement is in effect and fines are \$100.

1. Sanitation Issues in the Community Board 7 Area: A Comprehensive Look at Problems and a Collaborative Approach to Solutions.

Natasha displayed graphic representation of the urgent problems now existing in the neighborhood, with a major increase in rats and garbage. Many of the issues are due to the pandemic, as alternate side parking requirements decreased, collecting trash under vehicles, fewer trash pick-ups, outdoor restaurant structures providing feeding grounds for rats, and all contributing to a diminished quality of life on the Upper West Side. She showed the results of two surveys that were circulated and responded to by 314 neighborhood residents and 28 community organizations, indicating that the number one issue on everyone's list is rats. Other items included residential garbage put out on the street too early, loose trash, overflowing trash cans, missing trash baskets, curtailment of curbside composting, and missed pick-ups by DSNY. The most requested item from the Block Associations were more 'Rat Academies,' and Caroline Bragdon from DoHMH was present to discuss this in detail, along with many other organizations:

UWS Coalition of Neighborhood Block Associations: Chris Giordano, President of this not-for-profit, strives to bring together community groups and to address the UWS's diverse community concerns. They help existing block associations to create new associations, and he said it is all about communication, collaboration and coordinating efforts. Hopes that CB7 and District managers will be a central point in helping to coordinate.

OneBlock: Ann Cutbill Lenane, co-founder of this 501(C)(3) not for profit which incorporates many blocks on the Upper West Side, bags over 1,000 bags of trash weekly. Self-funded through donations and sponsorships, they have been able to employ three full-time workers who clean the streets and avenues 7 days a week. Their membership is 1800 strong, they would love collaboration, need to community to help raise funds, and baggers are needed. [Oneblockuws.org].

W. 111 St. Block Association: Michele Riggio, founding member of this not-for-profit which organized mid-pandemic. One of their unique problems is that being near Columbia University there is lots of late-night snacking, pizza boxes, etc. they started Operation Clean Biz, from 110th-116th Streets, talking to every merchant on the avenues to try to get them to properly bag and put out their garbage in a timely way, sweep the sidewalks, etc. and to try to incentivize them to be good neighbors. Communication is paramount, and they would love to get some sponsorships to pay for purchasing some BigBelly trash compactors. They would also love to see Rat Academy mandated since many don't want to take the time to attend and they think the program is essential.

Columbus Amsterdam BID, Peter Arnstdsen Executive Director: The BID has a team of seven local people sweeping, and they do one sweep a day between 96th-110th Streets. They clean only the avenues, not the side streets, which creates an issue, and rats are starting to repopulate tree pits formerly free of them. They are seeing residue from restaurant structures as one of the issues with rats, as well as illegal dumping in the area, creating issues. They're working with DSNY, thinks the city should have a smaller area to develop protocol regarding composting, and would love it to be in their area.

Environmental Justice Working Group: Seema Reddy, who was a member of CB7's working group that explored issues in the northern portion of our area, said the group concentrated on the NYCHA buildings and non-NYCHA buildings between

STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Steven Brown, Chair

November 16, 2021 at 6:30pm

Present: Barbara Adler, Andrew Albert, Linda Alexander, Richard Asche, Steven Brown, Elizabeth Caputo, Courtney Clark Metakis, Christian Cordova, Ken Coughlin, Page Cowley, Louisa Craddock, Mark Diller, Beverly Donohue, Sheldon Fine, K Karpen, Natasha Kazmi, Doug Kleiman, Michele Parker, Jeannette Rausch, Seema Reddy, Melissa Rosenberg, Susan Schwartz, Roberta Semer and Ethel Sheffer. **Absent:** Catherine DeLazzero, Blanche Lawton, Andrew Rigie and Howard Yaruss.

The Steering Committee of Community Board 7/Manhattan met on Tuesday, November 16, 2021, on the Zoom online platform. Chair Steven Brown called the meeting to order at 6:32 pm after the Secretary confirmed a quorum was present. The following discussions were had, and actions taken.

Chair Update

Steven Brown, Chair:

I will give a report. Then each committee chair will report, with special attention to any resolutions that will come before the board. Then old and new business for the committee.

1. We now have a new staff member! Maxwell (Max) Vandervliet will start on Monday. We are excited about that. We are working on defining his exact role. But he will definitely be all things digital – website, zooms, etc. He will hit the ground running. Christian and Mark will hopefully help to train him on these aspects. The digital aspects will be his focus for his first few weeks. We will figure out a way for everyone to meet him soon.
2. Elizabeth Caputo will head up the task force regarding future meetings. In January, the temporary modifications to the NYS Open Meetings Law will either end and we will go back to meetings in person; or it could be extended for another specific period; or the Open Meetings Law may be permanently amended in some way. So, Elizabeth's task force will explore what CB7 would like to see in this respect. The task force will make a recommendation to the board. She will share her ideas with us later in the meeting.
3. The holidays are coming up. All of them will affect our meeting schedule next month, in December. We will need to adjust the calendar a bit as a result. So, please be aware of this.

Committee Chair Reports

K Karpen, Preservation Committee

We have two resolutions coming up. One is very simple, and one is complicated but not controversial. Regarding the application from last month at 6-16 West 77th Street, at LPC today, they decided not to decide on the proposed glass house renovation. No decision yet. They would like to see the applicant make the penthouse structure less visible and less tall. The height is one thing to which they objected. We received a good deal of positive feedback on the Board's handling of the application.

- Page Cowley: It was a very long meeting at LPC. The issues were very interesting. I represented Preservation, no other entity. The conversation went all over the place. One thing that would help our committee is that when we have a resolution, rather than just talk about what we talked about, it would be better to hand in the resolution and read it. Everybody has a very important

point of view, and things got skewed. The public was not unanimous in terms of the residents, neighbors, activists, etc. To make it easy for everyone, my advice would be to write it down, read it and get it to the LPC as fast as we can. The applicant is coming back – they need to deal with height, set back further, etc. It is important that the community understands that we are on their side. There was a lot of talk about how much money the applicant has – very inappropriate. If the resolution is read, LPC can engage with you directly on that. Then you get more feedback directly.

Andrew Alpert, Transportation Committee

There will be four resolutions coming to full board: 1) one of which will be about installing two car charging stations; 2) a resolution about a secondary street naming of W89th Street between Columbus and Amsterdam Avenues for Ballet Hispánico; 3) a resolution disapproving additional parking for Joan of Arc High School; and (4) a resolution on ebike safety. There was lots of discussion which is likely to continue at board.

- Richard Asche: What is the ebike resolution?
- Andrew Alpert: The resolution would have ebikes observe traditional traffic safety rules/laws including getting licensed and insured. Registration of the ebikes is the biggest point.

Roberta Semer, Seniors Task Force

We had a good meeting this month. We discussed that the RFPs are taking a very long time to reach the agencies and to get the moneys back. We are going to put on forums for seniors which will take place after the first of the year.

Linda Alexander, Business & Consumer Issues Committee

We have two applications that are pretty pro forma: restaurants at 710 Amsterdam Ave and 2751 Broadway. We also have Felice at 240 Columbus Ave seeking approval to expand into municipal property.

Natasha Kazmi, Parks & Environment Committee

The main item on the agenda was about sanitation issues. There was a great showing from the public and from speakers. I am working on the resolutions now. The second item on agenda was EDC coming to us with an updated plan for the Dock House at the Boat Basin. There were a few design-related questions there. No resolution on that – a letter of support instead. The third item was regarding a renovation of the Chess & Checkers House in Central Park which will undergo a major renovation that will add restrooms. It was a very well thought out plan, and was unanimously approved. Barbara has completed that resolution already.

- Steven Brown: I want to compliment the chairs. It was a well-run meeting with a great survey sent out!
- Natasha Kazmi: There were 28 responses from local organizations, and 314 individual responses received! It was an impressive response.
- Roberta Semer: I thought it was a great meeting. I thought you did a great job.
- Courtney Clark Metakis: First, I loved the survey! I thought it was a great idea. I would love to talk more about how you got that number of respondents. I think it is a great tool to engage the community – to have their voice in the room. I want to applaud you and pick your brain on this.

- Natasha Kazmi: The survey was Chris Giordano's idea. Then I created one for the block associations that he distributed. Then we did one for individuals. I found out that it got posted in a facebook group. It just got forwarded along. The subject matter probably had a lot to do with it – they are issues that affect everyone right now. There was a real hunger to be heard by a lot of people! And it was on the CB7 website.
- Louisa Craddock: I want to thank you, Natasha! It went to the W80th St Block Association. It was sent around our building. And everyone just got into it and kept passing it along! It was the subject matter that everyone was interested in. There were 23 apartments out of 37 in my building that filled it in!

Richard Asche, Land Use Committee

We have nothing formal on the agenda, and decided to not hold the meeting this month. But coming up, we have an ongoing discussion about building scaffolding that never comes down. We want to explore how to address the issue. The other big thing is that we should be starting to talk about street restaurants. It may move fairly quickly, and we should get our act together – across committees. It should be a task force or jointly done with BCI and Transportation. We should start planning for that soon!

- Steven Brown: There was a resolution out of transportation about the process. It does go across likely three committees. We do have a little time after the CPC approval. But we should discuss it soon and figure out how we want to look at it.
- Richard Asche: DOT is holding a series of community meetings. The first is in the West Village. There was a tremendous amount of opposition from neighbors. The process is starting...
- Steven Brown: At Borough Board, I can ask if there is a timeline and a plan for this going forward.
- Jeannette Rausch: Regarding the Open Restaurants text amendment, I got contacted by a professor at Fordham who said she noticed that we voted against this, but on the ZAP portal it says we approved it. It would be good to have a clear procedure on what happens to a resolution when they are done, and that this resolution is corrected in ZAP.
- Steven Brown: Max, our future hire, has done all of this in his last role. We can engage him on this right away. If there was an error, he will fix it. Max will be your point person at Land Use. He has the experience and the passion for this. We will get on this right away.
- Richard Asche: When it is corrected in ZAP, we opposed the amendment to the zoning resolution because it put the cart before the horse.
- Linda Alexander: The zoning amendment did pass at CPC yesterday. It's there, and now we have some issues. DOT still refuses to meet with BCI. We sent our representative questions, and she is asking for more clarification. Apparently, she will only meet with Land Use and Transportation.
- Steven Brown: Let's talk offline. I think I know someone else with whom we can speak.
- Linda Alexander: I agree with Richard that we need to deal with this collectively. We must have BCI, the representative for the restaurants, at the table.
- Christian Cordova: We need to discuss what shape the new regulation will take. We will have restaurants on the streets. We need to help define that.

Doug Kleiman: There was a public meeting at DCP. DOT presented there. There is a recording available. They did speak about specific rules they intend to roll out. There are several things of interest to us! That process is afoot. Here is the link to the recorded meeting:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ACZjIYM5hYY>

Susan Schwartz, By-Laws Task Force

We are moving along well and expect to have work to present to the board in first quarter of next year – either at Steering or Full Board. The decision was to not torture the board with this more than once.

Courtney Clark Metakis, Youth, Education, & Libraries (YEL)

We have our meeting on Thursday. We will be joined by CEC District 3 President, Lucas Liu, to give us his perspective on future priorities and areas of potential collaboration. We will also be joined by Erica Overton from AM Linda Rosenthal's office. She has been very engaged about asking DOE for answers where they have been reluctant to engage. Erica will give us an update from her meeting with Chancellor Meisha Porter. I don't think we will have resolutions.

Shelley Fine, Health & Human Services Committee (HHS)

HHS will have two major pieces to our meeting:

1. Community conversations on Covid-19 vaccines with Dr. Simbo Ige, Assistant Commissioner of the DOHMH. She will discuss the surge in winter covid and other controversial things about what is included in mandates, etc. It's a hot issue and she is the one that knows the most.
2. We will have a report from the Racial Justice Commission about where the NYC Charter has structural racism embedded. I am looking forward to that.

I also just spoke with Help107 – an adult male employment shelter. There were good reports but the members of the 107th St. community had many complaints. The precinct commander was there and defined what they could do. Help107 defined what they could do. The main help line at Help107 was given out to the community – hopefully that will help bring the community closer to resolving their issues.

Melissa Rosenberg, Housing Committee

We're having Naoh Kazis, a legal fellow from the NYU Furman Center, talk to us about converting hotels to affordable housing and what are the barriers to doing so. I encourage you to join if you can! The meeting is on the 22nd. We may have a resolution in support.

Roberta Semer, Budget Committee

Thanks to Beverly. We did a major job getting everything onto the DCP Portal by the end of October. It's very different. We are going to have our first budget meeting for the new year in December. The portal wants things done in a certain way, which is not the way CB7 has typically done it. So, we will have new protocols with committees once we have that meeting.

Old Business

Elizabeth Caputo, Future Meetings Task Force

Thanks for the opportunity. I'm excited to think through these issues with board members. I've received a lot of feedback from people about how we can keep our meetings inclusive. Just like every company and organization is dealing with how to return to work, our board is dealing with it too now. I'm looking forward, over the next 2-3 months, to putting together a timeline and ideas. We will have a lot more to announce in the coming days.

I am excited and it is an important time as we think about public meetings and how to do them in this new era. How can we best solicit and involve the community as much as possible!

- Ken Coughlin: If the timeline is 2-3 months, January 15th is less than 2 months away. Don't we need to move faster?
- Elizabeth Caputo: You will be hearing in the next few days, a more detailed timeline. Our state and local elected officials also will weigh in on this issue. It is a short timeline, and we will get feedback soon. November and December will be quite busy. We will keep you apprised as we recruit people and talk about next steps.

New Business

- Michelle Parker: I want to talk about some of the conduct by some of the members at the last Full Board meeting. I thought it was extremely rude and unnecessary. I think it may have been directed personally at someone on the board. Even if it wasn't, it gave the appearance that it was directed at members of the board. I don't think it is right that board members act like that – it looks bad!
- Steven Brown: I will talk to Susan about some best practices as relates to the by-laws. I think the incident that you are talking about has been handled. But, the best practices should be re-sent out. We are on zoom; it is a new world. But there are best practices that should be followed. There are a series of things that should be tightened up!
- Michelle Parker: I believe the full board deserves an apology. We will soon learn the format of presenting resolutions from the board to various agencies – once written by the committee. In particular, I want to understand how Preservation resolutions get transmitted to LPC.
- Steven Brown: There is a process. Co-Chairs are responsible for reading the edits and catching any errors. I have addressed issues from this past month. There are checks and balances that need to be in place.
- Ethel Sheffer: A number of boards do have Ethics Committees that meet as needed to deal with questions that arise. There was a time that Board 7 had an Ethics Committee in the past. It was helpful and can be useful to detail inappropriate and appropriate practices, as relates to the by-laws. Most people on the Board know there is a procedure of how info is submitted to the board office. There have been some glitches I hear. But more clear communication can address this issue. Let's all work so that future glitches don't happen again.
- Jeannette Rausch: I want to point out that I was not trying to point fingers at anyone as regards the mistake. I recognize that there is a lot going on in the Board Office. But we were getting emails from DCP, and I had no idea we were supposed to submit this through the portal. I didn't realize this procedure. I just thought it would be appropriate to talk about this process.
- Page Cowley: I want to report that the MBPO did an amazing training session about implicit bias, Blind Spots. It was fascinating. There was a dynamic woman who presented and facilitated. You play games and it was quite an eye opener! It's good to get a tune-up and some positive reinforcement! She made us do silly things, but it made us look at how statements were read by others.
- Steven Brown: We all work really hard. Everyone makes mistakes. When in doubt, we should give people the benefit of the doubt and support each other. We are all in this together. When we are on zoom, it is easier to take things more personally. Let's have a little faith in our fellow people. No one is perfect.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:32pm.

100-110th. She shared her screen and showed photos of the trash pile-up at Douglass Houses and elsewhere in the area, the minimalistic trash bins, and the need for the area to be better serviced to decrease the rat and vermin population.

Council Member Linda Rosenthal's Office: Erica Overton announced that composting is scheduled to resume in our area on December 6th, but only to buildings that previously expressed an interest. These buildings will be contacted by DSNY.

Dept. of Health & Mental Hygiene: Caroline Bragdon, considered the rat expert in our city, stated that the pandemic shelved the work they were doing to eradicate rats. Instead, she and her staff were reassigned to Covid work. It is just as of today, she said, that her staff is back and will begin to address an enormous backlog of rat work. We learned that our area is #2 in 311 rat complaints in the city. Caroline advised everyone to have a look at their Rat Portal (<https://a816-dohbsp.nyc.gov/IndicatorPublic/Rats/>) to find when the city last treated, baited, or inspected the area. She runs a free Rat Academy for DoHMH, both in English and Spanish. Anyone can sign up for the two-hour class, and it is tailored to those from specific groups. Thanks to the outdoor restaurant structures, rats are finding a lot of food, and so their populations are thriving. Many questions followed. You can reach Caroline at cbragdon@health.nyc.gov.

Department of Sanitation (DSNY): Marissa Yanni, from DSNY's Community Affairs, told us that we can call DSNY directly with a question or complaint: The customer service number is 212-291-1220 or <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/donate/site/>. Asked about homeless encampments, she said that if someone says they own the stuff, they are not permitted to remove it. However, when people leave these encampments, leaving debris behind, a call to them will get the area cleaned up.

DSNY Curbside Recycling Reboot Program: Andrew Hoyles is the manager of the composting outreach program and education. He confirmed that Dec. 6th is the start date for composting in our area, but only for those who signed up by filling out the paperwork. For buildings with more than 10 units, a building manager must be the one to sign up. You can reach him for questions at ahoyles@dsny.nyc.gov.

Friends of Verdi Square: Natasha shared their talking points since they were not able to attend the meeting. Rat proliferation is the biggest issue, affecting both sides of the park; they would like a regular schedule for trash pickup. They clean up themselves on Saturdays, but as a not-for-profit, they are limited. Urine is its own issue, and must be addressed; the benches surrounding the rose bushes need regular cleaning from sticky substances, bird droppings, etc.

A resolution on the topic of Sanitation issues in CB7 will be drafted and circulated to the committee in the coming few days.

2. Presentation by the Economic Development Commission (EDC) on Proposed Refinements to the Boat Basin Dock House.

Julia Melzer, vice president for the capital program introduced the presentation, which was then made by Stephen Frech, Senior Project Manager at Moffatt & Nichol and Vadit Suwatcharapinun. This presentation concerned only the revisions to the Dock House, a presentation we had seen previously. Based on their first visit to the Public Design Commission (PDC), and from stakeholder comments, they made some changes, though they are slight. The project is now slightly set back from the esplanade, and they introduced a slope to the roof looking up from east to west. They modified the cladding to simplify the material palette, but it is still a building that is opaque on three sides and mostly glass on the water side. There were a number of questions and comments, noting that the building showed its best side where few would see it, and its worst side to what most will be looking at; that is too tall, too big, too clumsy. They did respond that they would have loved to have made the building airier, but that engineering obstacles did not allow. When asked if the PDC had approved their project the second time around, they said yes. In lieu of a resolution, CB7 will send a letter that had been previously written expressing many concerns about the project, but revising specifically the concerns about the Dock House.

3. Restoration of Kinderberg Chess & Checkers House, Central Park Conservancy

Chris Nolan, Chief Architect for the Conservancy, made the presentation for this restoration, which had previously been a children's shelter or nursery in the 1940's. Sitting on a large rock outcropping, it was razed, and in 1952 the Kinderberg Chess & Checkers House rose on the site. Since then, it has become somewhat dilapidated. The project includes recreating the rustic shelter that once surrounded the building, also serving as a trellis around the project; replacing heaving hexagonal pavers around the project; restoring the existing stairs and adding handrails; restoring the exterior, renovating the interior with a men's, women's, gender-neutral restroom, and utility room (currently non-existent in the Children's Area); replacing the roof, cupola, windows and doors, and upgrading existing mechanical and utility systems, etc.

A resolution to approve the project was unanimous.

Committee Member: 6-0-0-0. Non-committee Board Member: 3-0-0-0.

New Business: There was no new business.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Adler

BYLAWS TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

Susan Schwartz, Chair

November 18, 2021

Meeting on Zoom was called to order at 10A and adjourned at 11:10A.

Present: Barbara Adler (BA), Jay Adolf (JA), Josh Cohen (JC), Natasha Kazmi (NK) and Chair Susan Schwartz (SS)

We had a productive conversation about Open Meetings Law and also about our process moving forward. At the October meeting we had agreed that Susan would draft proposed revisions and circulate them before each meeting and then we would discuss additional revisions, as needed. We will try a different approach for the next meeting: Susan will send out the section to be reviewed at the next meeting and each member of the task force will review and send any suggested revisions to Susan for incorporation into the draft. This will be circulated before the next meeting. At the meeting we will discuss and revise, as needed.

With input from Chairperson Steven Brown, we agreed that it will be optimal to present the fully revised Bylaws in its entirety at a special meeting of the Full Board rather than going through that process twice with two halves of the Bylaws.

Next Steps

1. Our next meeting will be on Thursday, December 16, 2021 from 10-11A.
2. We will be discussing the following section of the Bylaws. Please review and send any suggested revisions by **Friday, December 3, 2021**. Please note that we partially finished Section III about Full Board Meetings, so it is midway through the revision process!!!!

START HERE!!!

III. G. ~~Agenda and/or Full Board Meeting Procedures~~

1. ~~Regular~~ Meetings
 - A. ~~Regular Full Board Monthly~~ Meetings. There shall be at least one ~~regular monthly~~ meeting of the Board each month, except for the months ~~of July and~~ August, at such time and place within the community district as shall be designated by the Chair ~~in the notice of the meeting sent~~ according to the notice provisions outlined within these Bylaws. ~~The Chair may, if necessary due to extenuating circumstances, cancel the monthly meeting after consulting with the Executive Committee.~~
2. Special and Emergency **Full Board** Meetings
 - A. A Special **Full Board** meeting shall be a meeting other than the ~~regular~~ monthly **Full Board** meeting and shall be called by the Chair or, if the Chair shall fail to do so, by a Vice Chair, if:
 1. The Chair deems it necessary,
 2. Upon a resolution adopted by the Board, by majority vote,
 3. At the request through written notice by the Borough President,
 4. Upon written request of no less than 1/3 of the Board's members.
 - B. Written notice of a special meeting shall be sent at least **72 hours** ~~five (5) days~~ in advance, **where practicable**, with a specification of the purpose of the meeting and delineation of the agenda of such meeting.
3. Attendance and Excused Absences
 - A. Board members shall be properly excused for the following reasons:
 1. Military service.
 2. Jury duty.
 3. Personal illness.
 4. Illness or death in the immediate family.
 5. Attending to Board business at the request of the Chair.
 6. **At the discretion of the Board Chairman.**
 - B. A Board member shall not be deemed present at a meeting for purposes of satisfying attendance unless such member is present for both roll calls taken at such meeting.

4. Agenda

A. The agenda for each ~~regular~~ monthly Full Board meeting shall consist of the following items:

- ~~1.~~ Call to Order by the Board Chairperson, at which point members are required to take their seats after a quorum has been confirmed by the Board Secretary.
2. Attendance (roll call)
3. Public Session
 - ~~1.~~ A member of the public may speak at the Public Session provided that he/she has registered his/her name and subject with the Secretary of the Board in advance. However, the number of speakers on the same subject may be limited at the discretion of the Board Chairperson. Each speaker shall be limited to a period of no more than three minutes unless otherwise permitted to do so by the Board Chairperson. ~~After the Public Session, persons who are not members of the Board may address the Board by selecting a Board Member to ask any questions during the Executive Session.~~
4. Adoption of minutes of previous meeting.
5. Public Officials' report which shall be limited to no more than three minutes per report and the sequence of the Public Officials' Reports in the agenda may be modified at the discretion of the Chairperson.
6. Board Chairperson's Report
7. District Manager's Report
8. Committee Business Reports:
 - ~~1.~~ Committee Resolutions Reports shall be distributed, if practicable, with the notice of the Board meeting, along with the agenda for that meeting. ~~Oral committee reports may be made at the board's discretion.~~
9. Old Business
10. New Business
11. Attendance (Final Roll Call)
12. Adjournment

B. At the discretion of the Chair the Agenda may reasonably vary from this list.

I. Officers

IV. A. Duties & Responsibilities

1. Officers

- a. The officers of the board shall consist of the Chairperson, ~~two~~ Vice-Chairpersons – First and Second Vice-Chairperson, and ~~two~~ Co-Secretaries, Treasurer ~~(This is list is not exhaustive or mandatory)~~
- ~~b.~~ Each officer shall serve for a one year term beginning immediately after the November elections. ~~(one or two) year period beginning on January 1st following the election of officers and terminating on December 31st of the [second] following year.~~

2. Rotation of Chairpersons

- a. To provide the greatest opportunity for service by each Member, no Board member shall serve for more than ~~three~~ ~~two (2)~~ consecutive terms.

3. Duties and Responsibilities of Officers

a. Duties of the Chairperson

- ~~i. List of duties may vary~~
- ii. Perform all duties prescribed in the Charter and any other duties prescribed by law.
- iii. Preside at meetings of the Community Board.
- iv. Serve as a member of the District Services Cabinet.
- v. Provide direction to and oversight of the District Manager.
- vi. Decide all questions of order and may appoint and remove a parliamentarian to assist in this regard.

b. Duties of the Vice-Chairperson

- i. List of duties may vary
- ii. In the absence of the Chairperson, preside at all Board meetings and, in the absence of both, the Second Vice-Chairperson shall preside.
- iii. Assist the Chairperson when necessary and as required.

- iv. In the event the Chairperson office becomes vacant, serve as the interim chair until the position is filled through a special election.
- c. Duties of the Secretary
 - i. Serve as the recording officer of the Board and with the assistance of Board staff, take the minutes of the regular monthly meetings, and special and emergency meetings.
 - ii. Distribute the minutes to the members at the following monthly meeting with the assistance of Board staff, which minutes shall be available for review at the Community Board office and posted on the Board's website within two weeks from the date of the meeting and within one week from the date of any executive session.
 - ~~iii. [CUNY Attendance]~~
 - iv. Assume the duties of Chair if both the Chair and Vice Chair are absent from a meeting.
 - v. Assist the Chair with related matters as requested or required.
- ~~d. Duties of the Treasurer~~
 - ~~i. List of duties may vary~~
 - ~~ii. Administer the financial affairs of the community board in consultation with the District Manager, under the supervision of the chair and as prescribed by the community board.~~
 - ~~iii. Provide an annual community board budget and such periodic modifications as requested by the elected board officers.~~
 - ~~iv. Report in writing to the elected board officers quarterly on the financial condition of the community board including expenditures, monies owed, cash on hand or available and projections of future commitments.~~

IV. B Election of Officers

- 1. Election Committee
 - ~~a. The Election Committee shall be appointed by the Board Chairperson elected at the September board meeting from among those nominated either prior to or at the September board meeting. All nominations from the floor must be confirmed at the meeting by the nominee, either orally or in writing.~~
 - ~~b. The three nominees who received the highest number of votes shall make up the election committee, provided each receives at least a majority.~~
 - ~~c. The election committee will be tasked with soliciting nominations for board officer positions and with conducting the election of the officers at the November meeting.~~
 - ~~d. The election committee may collect statements and biographies from the candidates at the discretion of the board.~~
 - e. No member of the election committee may run for a board officer position during their time on the election committee.
- 2. Nominations for Officers
 - a. Individuals interested in being a board officer shall announce their interest at the regular monthly board meeting one month prior to the scheduled election. Candidates' names will be recorded and ballots will be shared with all board members prior to scheduled elections.
 - b. At meeting with scheduled election, nominations may be heard from the floor.
- 3. Election Procedures
 - a. Elections of board officers may be conducted by signed ballot or through roll call vote.
 - i. Voting by Ballot – If the board chooses to elect board members by ballot, each voting member must receive an individual ballot with their name and must sign the ballot after they make their vote.
 - ii. Voting by Roll Call Vote – If the board chooses to elect board members by roll call, the list of candidates for each individual office shall be announced. Each voting board member present shall be called and their vote shall be announced and recorded.

- b. The candidate who receives the highest number of the votes shall be elected to that office, provided they receive a majority of the votes. If no candidate receives a majority, the top two candidates will have a run-off election and the candidate who receives a majority shall be elected.
 - c. If, after a run-off with the top two candidates, neither candidate receives a majority of the vote, the board may continue to hold rounds of voting until one candidate receives a majority of the vote; or by a majority vote call for a new election for the unfilled position.
 - d. Whether the vote is by ballot or through roll call, the Board must create a record listing each member's vote and make that record available to the public.
4. Special Elections
- a. If an officer position becomes vacant nominations to fill the remaining time of the term shall be taken by the last constituted election committee at the next regularly scheduled board meeting.
 - b. After nominations are taken, the election shall happen according to the election rules in section 3 above.

IV. C. Committees and/or Committee Meeting Procedure

<Committee meetings shall be conducted under the same procedures as Board meetings, however, committees may adopt additional procedures consistent with the Board procedures in these Bylaws.>

IV. D. Executive Committee

- 1. **Membership** - All board officers <and any other members that the board decides> shall be members of the executive committee.
- 2. **Actions**
 - a. In the months where the full Board does not meet, the executive committee shall transact any necessary business.
 - b. If necessary in an emergency situation, the executive Committee may take necessary action on behalf of the board, but any actions taken under this provision shall be subject to approval by the full board at the next regularly scheduled board meeting.
- 3. **Approval by the full board**
 - a. Any action by the executive committee is subject to review by the full board and must be approved by the full board at the next regularly scheduled meeting to be considered valid.
 - b. If an Executive Committee action is not approved by the full board, the Board will take steps to withdraw the action.

YOUTH, EDUCATION AND LIBRARIES COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Blanche Lawton and Courtney Clark Metakis, Co-Chairpersons

November 18, 2021 at 6:30PM via ZOOM

*The Youth, Education and Libraries Committee of Community Board 7/ Manhattan met Thursday October 21, 2021 by Zoom. The meeting was called to order at 6:35 by co-chairs Blanche Lawton and Courtney Clark Metakis. **Present:** Mark Diller, Seema Reddy, Beverly Donohue, Ira Mitchneck, Kristen Berger and Benjamin Wu participated. **District Manager:** Michelle Booker.*

Meeting started at: 6:35pm

Discussion regarding updates on district and citywide issues related to NYC Public Schools.

Guest speakers:

- Erica Overton, Deputy Chief of Staff for State Assembly Member Linda Rosenthal
- Lucas Liu, CEC3 President

Erica Overton:

- Have been working since the resolution and wrote a support letter to the DOE, and asked for a joint meeting with DOE. Transparency, transparency, transparency – so many time the DOE waits until the last meeting, doesn't share with the parents what is happening, feel like their voices were not lifted up or heard during the process. Finally got the meeting, in August. And even in the meeting, still didn't get the answers. Talking about ventilations, and devices, and testing of students and teachers. Seemed like things that should have happened already.
- One of the questions was related to G&T, and what is going to happen. There wasn't a whole lot of information – that's going to be more settled once there is a new admin. Next question was about applying for HS, and letting parents know. DOE – we don't have all the details yet, that's kind of a thing that's coming up. Pushing for answers
- PSAL: Arrange competitions for 45k public school students, and haven't been able to travel to compete, and the Assembly Member has reached out – found out the policy is under review.
- One of the main points to the chancellor – need to communicate differently, need to have actual conversations with parents and included them in the process. Hopefully, will be a difference

Lucas Liu:

- Goals we'd talked about on CEC3: one of our biggest goals is northern end of the district, exacerbated by COVID. But within the CB7 district, do have schools that are facing a number of challenge, some of our middle schools. PS9 – I think they're down about 125 students. 87 down about 200. These are bigger, in demand schools have lost the most students, what can we do about that. What can we do to help our schools keep students, stop the outflow to charter/parochial. DOE – is creating this – they are the source of the problem, and hopefully they're wise enough to be part of the solution as well.
- Booker T – one of the high demand middle schools. They just recently closed down a 6th grade class, now that school started, closed down a 6th grade class because of the way the DOE handles admission. When you have a school that's in high-demand and you close a class, makes you think what's going on. Looking to address admissions process. Affects everyone with a middle school kid, and in fact the lottery class has resulted in... (missed this) ... schools in less demand get fewer students because there's room at high demand schools.
- Hopefully the DOE will exercise common sense. HS admissions, everyone's waiting to hear what's going on. DOE has recommended to the mayor they continue with the lottery, cessations of screens. Right now, the assumption is it's going to be lottery unless new mayor decides to do something about it.
- Brilliant NYC curriculum: clearly our GT parents are frustrated. How does it affect Anderson, citywide. Other part of this new curriculum is Mosaic, social emotional learning and diversity. Schools received their first wave of books associated with Mosaic. My understanding is the schools didn't pick and choose. Don't know when the next set of books will be coming in – anyone is interested in seeing titles, go to Scholastic website – think it's called rising voices, about black and Hispanic boys – K-5.
- Early on, heard about parents holding kids. CEC passed a resolution encouraging DOE to. Asked to delay BrilliantNYC until they had the listening sessions. Back when they didn't renew the contract with Pearson, committed to having engagement with parents over GT, and never had them. Went straight into sessions. These Brilliant NYC sessions are controlled and not designed to get feedback from parents. 77% successful engagement,

which implies that 77% happy with Brilliant NYC. Frustration has caused more parents to get engaged. Kristen can back me up – if anything, parents have gotten more engaged and frustrated.

- Vaccines: pop-up vaccines have been at schools. Elementary schools – supposed to be a 2nd round coming. Only got 100-150 doses, so. Would encourage Natural History museum – at least you know when/where.
- Vacancy: looking to fill a vacancy on the Council – open to anyone. No same school rule.
- WXY: What her vision is for using WXY – was high level, will be talking more about it. Impressed upon Superintendent Christine Loughlin, whatever the plans are, should make sure she includes parents. District 26. WXY doesn't have a good track record. Parents from both parts of the district rallied together and pushed back. Parents got together – no parent wanted their child to put on a bus for 35-40 minutes. Why aren't we talking about improving the schools that aren't doing well? WXY is urban planners. Architects. They've since gotten some experience in education through some of this, but my understanding is that they're learning as they're doing. One person from WXY who disregarded parent concerns about buses because that person wasn't a parent. Also did District 15. I know parents who are happy, know some who aren't. Think it requires more discussion with parents about what they want.

Kristen Berger:

- In beginning I was concerned because WXY not much experience, but now they have 50 projects under the belt. There's just not that many companies who do this. Just want to be cautious because the scope of their work varies. Scope of District 26 is not what's likely here. More about marketing and engaging parents, market to families so that they're interested.

Lucas Liu:

- When we talk about marketing these schools – marketing to whom? Parents to convince them to come? If you're going to market to the parents, what are you going to market to them? Are you actually improving?

Kristen:

- PEP Agenda. This was the named contractor. They had to kind of do their work before they put it in the grant application, they got the next round – it's a state grant. PEP could knock it back, but money is coming from the state, so hard to knock it back.

Ira Mitchneck:

- How does this initiative differ from the magnet grant initiative which was supposed to be the new & improved? That might be a question we might want to bring – I know Bev/Mark were around. What's the difference between that tranche of schools, recent passed magnet schools? Anything new here or trying old process?

Beverly Donahue:

- What I'm familiar with – this is different because no one is saying you close down low-performing schools, this sounds different that you're trying to find ways to attract students for diversity purposes into schools that are not significantly being changed. Bloomberg way was to do small schools, many were successes, some were not. This is much more surface – doesn't get to parental engagement, partnership with non-profits

Kristen Berger:

- This is on a vastly smaller scale than that – this \$300k. This 3rd party, they do some consultations, it's nothing like a structural as a magnet grant.

Ira Mitchneck:

- Bloomberg grant was similar modestly funded project with far more immodest goals. What we're doing here might be somewhat more achievable.

Mark Diller:

- Ira and I may be thinking of different grants. I think we're talking about the same grants – Bev is correct, this is about generating enrollment. The thing that came out --- Lucas should be congratulated – it really smelled a lot like those serial attempts in the oughts. They wanted to close schools (76, etc.) for different reasons. Once it was

a blatant attempt to give building to charter school. Another was they killed the PreK program. Smelled more like that vs. trying to do something more positive.

Lucas Liu:

- My understanding of the work that is going to be done is more around how to – it's not about programming, or afterschool activities. Focusing on Title 1 schools. Obviously, our higher enrolled schools don't need marketing. Not all Title 1 schools are struggling but many of them are. Going to touch on admissions, don't recall exactly. What are you going to do with admissions? Screens, no screens, making schools. Since this was done pre-COVID thought this might change bc other challenges. Don't want to say Christine bc would be very upset. Don't see it's going to be her decision. She wanted to wait

Kristen Berger:

- The SIP team has existed since our first grant – it's three principals, which is reps by Christen and Matt Angel. And CEC members. There's a SIP team and they're the ones who wrote and then administered the grant.

Ira Mitchneck:

- On the charts, had a clear chart about the Title 1 schools and how the enrollments have dropped precipitously. Given the relatively short duration of this grant, is the DOE going to share in a specific way – any intent to release some granular data on impact on COVID enrollment decreases across the district.

Lucas Liu:

- My understanding is in Feb planning – postponed the closing deadline from October to November, not sure if extending the final register or just extending their internal deadline to release the data. They release it every Feb that tells you what enrollment is. Tells you the last 5 years across the school RESOLUTION

Blanche Lawton:

- Booker T – close a classroom. General sense that enrollment is down. Does DOE have a reasonably accurate since it becomes a financial issue, of the number of students in the system.

Lucas Liu:

- I think most people think DOE has a reasonable sense of enrollment, just don't want to release it yet.

Beverly Donahue:

- They traditionally release it, then data goes through a long cleaning process to remove the students who are basically not attending. The audit is what takes so much time. But absent that, have a pretty good idea. I did see a review of a study that was released this week by the city controller on pop loss in various community boards based on change of address and CB7 had steepest loss. Think it's real to say there is a COVID decline here. Signs of recovery in Tribeca, Battery Park City but didn't mention the UWS. Big change here we'll find out about in the coming months

Mark Diller:

- Postal service data doesn't seem to skew with census. Doesn't work the other way around because doesn't capture those in the Catskills saying change my address to NYC.

Ira Mitchneck:

- Also uses Street Easy, same problem noticed lots of people on Zoom in different areas.

Courtney Clark Metakis:

- Reads Kristin's comments about transparency / need for it from the DOE

Lucas Liu:

- Thing the DOE hates the most is parents engaged, writing letters, going to be another NY post article. Could partner on – idea is to get parents informed, parents writing emails, making our elected officials are aware. All about making sure the DOE hears our voices.

Mark Diller:

- I don't think we need a new resolution to do what Lucas just said – previous resolutions about transparency and our mission, also had a pretty robust resolution a year ago about how principals weren't involved. Maybe that letter can be a letter.

Courtney Clark Metakis:

- Can you tell us about the new IEP program that was announced?

Lucas Liu:

- PS 149 and 145 have the Saturday IEP programs starting shortly, part of the whole special ed recovery. They're looking at across the district what they can do for before/after school – have been staffing issues.

Kristen Berger:

- Is that for students who aren't enrolled in those schools?

Lucas Liu:

- Under impression for students in that schools. Hopefully will be able to identify more teachers who aren't exhausted.

Courtney Clark Metakis:

- Erica Overton asked we tell folks to let Linda Rosenthal know if need a Mobile Vax van

Ira Mitchneck:

- Miscommunication that shots were only for schools in that school. Hope the second round goes a little better. 2nd round of visits – not 2nd shots.

Lucas Liu:

- Been talking a bit with President of Citywide council – looking for ways to reach out to Sengalese communities. President is looking for ways to reach that community. That effort would be more about PS 191 neighborhood. Maybe up in Manhattan Valley. Looking for ways to reach those families – English classes set up for them. We're being offered up at the libraries; how do we bring those programs back. School hasn't had too many parents in the building, or local community centers.

Courtney Clark Metakis: resolution on PSAL + anything else?

Kristen Berger: Admissions is time-sensitive / need for transparency.

Ira Mitchneck: May be finding out who the new chancellor is in the next week or so.

Courtney Clark Metakis: calls for vote on resolution re: PSAL

Committee: 7-0-0-0.

Meeting ended at 7:55p

HOUSING COMMITTEE

Louisa Craddock and Melissa Rosenberg, Co-Chairpersons

November 22, 2021 at 7:00 PM via ZOOM

Present: Louisa Craddock, Co-Chair; Melissa Rosenberg, Co-Chair; Mark Diller, Robert Espier Ayala, Miranda Goodwin-Raab, Madelyn Innocent, Ira Mitchneck, Jeannette Rausch, Susan Schwartz and Ethel Sheffer. **Non-Committee Board Member:** Seema Reddy.

Presentation by Noah Kazis, Legal Fellow, Furman Center, NYU School of Law, author of the Furman Center Legal Brief: *Challenges and Opportunities for Hotel-To-Housing Opportunities*

Hotel conversion is a hot topic in NYC housing policy for good reason, but we may have missed the emergency moment. NK showed a map of hotels; mainly clustered in Midtown Manhattan.

- Discussed political and economic issues - not easy overall
 - A lot of opportunity, but a lot of challenges
 - It's a political moment - big campaign promise of Eric Adams
 - Most hotel rooms are in Manhattan
 - Outer-borough goal of 25,000 rooms probably not feasible
 - Most opportunity is in Midtown
 - CB7 hotels are older, not new
 - Most hotels that closed are also in midtown, some downtown
 - Value – opportunity to create housing cheaply
 - Potentially could save money, but depends on other factors
 - California pursued this policy aggressively – saw big savings, zoning regulations override. Differs from NY architecturally and in timing.
- Challenges
 - Regulations – zoning regulations and Multiple Dwelling Law, safety, density, use and accessibility issues
 - Housing reformers set distinctions between types of housing, especially inexpensive permanent housing and hotels – hotels and housing were separated
 - We have paid the price in losing low-price housing that was more flexible
 - City and state politics/authority – not clear who should be involved
 - Tourism somewhat rebounding but business tourism may not
 - If we gain housing, we lose jobs in hospitality sector
 - Timing – missed the point of COVID when hotels were cheapest
 - Politics and fair housing issues – local pushback
 - Early on, hotel conversions seemed like the natural solution, since hotels were empty - now there are tradeoffs
 - There are alternate options – office building conversions and the possibility of new construction.
- Q&A with Noah Kazis
 - Robert Espier – a lot of new boutique hotels in Midtown and therefore it seems like older hotel demand is even lower. Doesn't this affect ability to do conversions?
 - Noah Kazis – Many hotels built in last 20 years. Pre-pandemic, NYC was relatively low in number of hotels based on demand. Some older hotels easier to convert due to low desirability, but some new hotels are easier due to being up to standards
 - NK: The new hotel special permit requirement is going to make new hotel construction even harder. Makes existing hotels more valuable.
 - RE: The Park Savoy hotel seems like a model. Will that be standard?
 - NK: Have seen a lot of conversions to shelter or market-rate, but not affordable housing. Very hard to generalize. Old rent-stabilized hotels have a clearer pathway for conversion to supportive housing.
 - Melissa Rosenberg: What makes supportive housing more viable? Precedent?
 - NK: yes, precedent
 - Susan Schwartz - Building was formerly a hotel in 1920s, converted in 1970s to housing, but there was a big loss in rent-stabilized units

- NK: UWS is place where the lines between hotels and housing most fluid over time.
 - Ethel Sheffer – UWS has historically had conversions from conventional housing units to SROs (single-room occupancy). Was a lot of conversion after WWII. Then more recently, the conversion went the other way. UWS SROs used to house low-income people and those who were deinstitutionalized and ended up in low-quality housing. Now often single-family homes.
ES: CB7 was active in the advocacy around SROs. Now, seems like the bad reputation for SROs is being alleviated and many are advocating for a renewal of SROs for low-income people but with changes per zoning. A change in zoning and regulations to promote SROs with better conditions could be worthy policy to create cheaper housing.
 - NK: Agree modern SROs would be valuable. Served a need for some people. In 1980s, did a study showed that half of shelter entrants were from an SRO that closed. SRO closure directly led to homelessness crisis. Some of this housing is still on the UWS. SROs did serve a need by housing low-income people but also coincided with deinstitutionalization and dumping of people into SROs run by landlords who exploited the issue. UWS watched the homelessness crisis play out here. It was meant as good public policy but led to bad outcome and people suffered.
 - Jeanette Rausch – Agree that we have gone from good to worst in seeking perfect. People are living on the street because of quality concerns, but also a lot of hotels in low-income neighborhoods were turned into shelters. Services that were needed, especially in industrial areas, were not available. Adjacent uses were not compatible. Would be helpful to define basic criteria for what hotels should be used for housing.
- JR: Issues with SROs were from landlords trying to make money. Do you think hotels are a component of solving housing crisis? What should the criteria be?
- NK: That's the correct question. Can't keep all of the rules and still be able to use conversion to expand housing. But getting rid of all the rules would lead to bad conditions. It's hard to find what combination of regulation works. Some people value privacy more and so wouldn't live in SROs. Could sweep away a few building code rules. That is a small number. Need to identify key barriers and allow applications for waivers or something site-specific.
 - Ira Mitchneck – What you discussed is like what happened with the Loft Law. It could be created in one legislative session. Something like the Loft Board. Could set up a process to get around regulatory hurdles. With a mayor on-board, can be done. The loft bill still exists and still creates new catchment areas.
IM: Time element is a problem. In CB7, we have 2 buildings finishing. Construction of the building has been relatively fast; timeline to get there was infinitely long. Building on 96th Street about to start construction with micro-units. Those work economically because of public land. Time element is hideous. People could have used that housing over the 10-years of pre-development. City does not have much land anymore. Need to calculate value based on time element. Still might be worth it to convert, despite costs.
 - NK: Something like the Loft Law is the only way to do it fast. If not fast, you are not solving the problem and adding costs. There were many drafts of HONDA (Housing Our Neighbors with Dignity Act) - which helps finance the conversion of distressed properties as permanently affordable or supportive housing. Some of the proposals were just like the Loft Law. No change of certificate of occupancy. There was an option to do it legislatively but didn't pass. A lot of disagreement about what were suitable hotels. Money in HONDA wouldn't go far. AM Rosenthal said it would be revisited next session. Also, there is a new mayor coming in who may be more committed. Need to also consider cost of shelter. What is important is location, funding and who can accomplish it.
 - Louisa Craddock: Want to focus on UWS. We have so many old buildings. Some hotels and some old and empty. Always thought about permanent housing because eventually everyone needs permanent housing. Who is it that we want to house? Homeless folk? Seniors? Young people just starting out? We want nonprofits taking this on. Who is pursuing this?
 - NK: Great hotel conversions done in the past. Not a huge quantity. There are providers ready to seize opportunity.
 - LC: What can we do as a CB? Would like to advocate.
 - MR: What would you change policy wise?

- NK: Would agree with what Ira proposed. Line by line is not really feasible. Don't think that's realistic to make these deals happen. Need to find a category that approximates where you're trying to allow this. And say this is going to be a fast and fairly short process. Something between hammer and scalpel.
 - LC: Seems like hotels are appealing because they're ready-made.
 - NK: Not as ready-made as they seem. Breaking Ground conversion of Jehovah Witness hotel in DUMBO was more like housing already, so had only to do minor changes to building. Each room became an apartment. Few hotels need such minimal work or require no regulatory change. To do less renovation, need more wholesale legal change.
 - LC: For homeless single adults, it seems like hotels can work well as housing.
 - NK: Did see conflict about use of hotels for housing recently (Lucerne?). Accessibility issues. There is a way to make this work and we shouldn't lose sight of this.
 - LC: Can you share your presentation with the Housing Committee?
 - NK: Yes
 - ES: It might not be a bad thing for the members of this committee to look at the report on SROs written some years ago and report from NYS on needs and demographics of eight hotels on UWS with 1200 residents. Made policy and zoning recommendations. Some were passed.
- Noah Kazis left the discussion with our thanks.

- Committee discussion
 - MR: Do we want to write a resolution on this? Do we want to research one first?
 - IM: Do we want to make a statement citywide, or CB7-specific? Many hotels remaining in CB7 already owned by nonprofits. We have been effective in bringing changes Ethel is referencing. Problem with MDL is that NYS controls it and membership is statewide. Also, who is our audience.
 - LC: Is there a survey of hotel ownership in UWS? Need an intern.
 - ES: Could be obtained quickly. Would say let's not just pass a resolution. That's easy. Would be helpful to get some facts in neighborhood. How many hotels are there? Know that there are hundreds of homeless NYers on the street. Could first get some facts. Never presented to us in an accessible way. Would do that with a 3-month timeframe. Would be good to know what's going on in UWS.
 - RE: Would be great to go back to Furman. Should dig up from archives.
 - MR: Noah was from Furman to clarify.
 - MR: Disagree with what's been said. Digging in might just show more limited opportunity. Not sure that's helpful. Fine to opine citywide. Lack of housing affects homelessness in this district.
 - ES: Goal is not to write a resolution. Goal is to learn and understand more about what exists in our community. Who is in the community, who is being served. Could know more and get a real sense of housing and people we see in the street every day. Could take several months and would know more about what's happening. Then we should try to move.
 - Mark Diller: Would put in a plug for next part of this. Trying to figure out what structural impediments need to be changed from a legislative or regulatory standpoint. Presentation did not get too granular. I'm saying this aspect of legal infrastructure is an issue. That's a useful thing that we can do. Then can get electeds involved.
 - MR: Agree. We should educate ourselves and not write a generic resolution.
 - RE: Could update report from 2012 and add info on CBO acquisition and ownership. We could see who is missing from this conversation. Many already have plans for supportive housing.
 - MR: Feel like that is saying that the status quo is fine and not looking at what we can do.
 - RE: Part of our charge is to partner with CBOs to meet our objectives. I'm sure they would welcome this partnership. Need to add to our tool chest.
 - JR: Feeling pessimistic. Any property owner of a hotel in the UWS will always convert to market-rate residential to make money. CB cannot change the economics. Knowing the owner won't change his desire to make money. Wonder if we have good examples of conversions that can be done and win-win. Or could speak to nonprofit partners and hear what they are looking for in doing conversions. A little wary to do some resolution or statement that affects the whole city. Especially after press on 79th Street hotel. Press might use this narrative badly. Would like to do something proactive that is helpful. Might be better to focus on our own backyard to see what our players need to expand their work. Better than looking at specific hotels.

- MR: Could tie regulatory relief to affordability or other requirements to address economics.
 - IM: Most owners don't care about how they unlock value for property. Can unlock value with preservation option under inclusionary housing. Some kind of inclusionary bonus that allowed TDR for creating affordability, might be somewhere.
 - LC: I think if we're looking at doing some kind of zoning change, it would have a long lead time. Was wondering about a survey of hotels to learn what's out there. Pushing for Loft Board approach is interesting. Not interested in having many meetings and getting nothing done. Could put together a nonprofit and a building owner and see what is possible. But don't know what's out there.
 - MR: My proposal would be to allow carveouts from residential building code requirements and tying that to affordability.
 - RE: Can you ask Michelle to dig up 2012 report?
 - LC: Would be curious to talk to nonprofits in the UWS to hear what they are working on and their suggestions
 - MR: Next steps I recommend would be first to look at Furman materials. Then would want to meet with nonprofits with electeds or separately and discuss what they see as challenges. Providers would be Goddard, Project FIND, WSFSSH.
 - IM: Recommend Project Renewal.
 - MD: Recommend Samaritan Village. Have a facility for young mothers on 106th Street.
 - MR: Louisa and I should talk offline about whether to include electeds.
 - RE: Need to consider timing with students.
- New business
 - JR: Not sure if this is of interest to Housing Committee. My co-op board had a meeting and people who were older were asking about how to make a building age friendly. How can a building take steps to be more accommodating? Co-ops focused on improvements to increase value for resale. If focused on improvements for residents, would be things like better handrails. Might want to focus on age-friendly housing in coming year. Know a number of women who are getting old and live alone. Community would benefit from this.
 - LC: Agree completely. In my building, they are tearing down age-friendly gym for pelotons. Asked for equipment that could be used comfortably by many residents. A lot of buildings want to enhance resale value
 - RE: Board is everything. What is chatter on board about those ideas?
 - JR: It's a small board. All just happen to be young men. Board seems to be open to it. Got Board to put stickers on steps to mitigate potentially slippery conditions. Low cost and huge impact.
 - MR: Should probably be in partnership with Senior Taskforce. Could engage a group like LiveOn NY who does advocacy on these issues.
 - IM: Issue here is achievable improvements to people's lives in a measurable timeframe.
 - JR: No reason it should only be co-ops.
 - MR: Happy to take this on.

HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Catherine DeLazero and Sheldon Fine, Co-Chairpersons

November 23, 2021 at 7:00PM via ZOOM

Present: Sheldon Fine, co-Chair, Robert Espier, Audrey Isaacs, Sara Lind, Madge Rosenberg.

Non-Committee Board Members: Mark Diller, Seema Reddy and Rich Robbins. **District Manager:** Michelle Booker.

Sheldon Fine, Co-Chair introduced our presenters for *Conversations on Covid*:

Patria Alguila: Tailored Engagement Lead, Dr. Ole Simbo Ige: Assistant Commissioner, New York City DOHMH Center for Health Equity and Community Wellness DOHMH

I. **DR. SIMBO IGE**, *has supported vaccination programs in 42 countries and leads*

Q: the vaccination program in NYC.

Q: Is it better to get natural immunity or immunity from a vaccine?

A: Natural immunity needs you to be exposed and to recover. Even if you had covid, reinfection is possible. This is not the preferred way. Without vaccine reinfection is five times more frequent.

Q: Does an elderly person with 2 vaccinations need a mask?

A: A mask is another layer of prevention. Keep a mask on in case anyone is not vaccinated.

Q: A 50-year-old policeman with two vaccinations contracted and died from covid.

What more can you do to protect yourself?

A: Infection can happen after vaccination because some folks have weaker immune systems or take steroids for lupus or other diseases. Chemotherapy can also cause a lower level of antibody response.

Course of protection: If a storm is heavy, even if you have an umbrella, some water may force its way through, but the umbrella will mostly keep you dry. Wear a mask. Compare the recent death toll: 386 to 6000 deaths for people with and without vaccination.

Q: Are people who are vaccinated less likely to infect others? (Rich Robbins)

A: Vaccinated people who contracted Covid have it in their respiratory track, but carry it for less time. It does not stay as long in the body of the vaccinated as in the unvaccinated.

Q: What are arguments against the “infodemic” of misinformation from a small group on the internet?

A: The information is photoshopped. The vaccine issue is politicized. Trust is needed in communities of color where government has not provided housing and other promises. Therefore, citizens doubt government. Stories and testimony from local folks are best convancers. Encourage people to share their experience that vaccine is safe and will get them back to work, etc. It is hard to predict who will die. The majority of those who get Covid after vaccination get less severe cases.

Q: How long will immunity last after booster?

Antibody tests cannot tell the level of protection.

SEE ATTACHED “CONVERSATION TOOLBOX” FROM DOHMH.

II. **SHELLY** - 106TH street crosswalk at the center of the long block between Amsterdam and Columbus Avenues plan. Red Oak residents and Day Center at the New Jewish Home will have a much easier crossing. DOT is working on the plan and hopes to install the system in February.

III. **HAROLD MILLER** - Deputy Executive Director, External Affairs, Racial Justice Commission

The Racial Justice Commission was formed to empower and to seize this moment and support overcoming systemic racism. The City Charter outlines the organization, its decision-making process and accountability in rooting out racial injustice.

An interim report was created. - The feedback from the report will shape ballot measures and a roadmap for racial justice. Voters will adopt or reject measures in 2022.

The six patterns of inequity reported:

- Quality of services
- Work & advancement and wealth building
- Inequities across neighborhoods
- Marginalization and criminalization
- Inequity in representation and decision making and accountability
- Enforcement & accountability of government

Areas of exploration:

- Inclusion in decision making and accountability
- Quality education
- Scarcity of mental health services
- Insufficient prep for future
- Lack of access to capital
- Resources and decision making not equitable.
- Over criminalization
- Lack of civic participation
- Community needs not met
- Lack of accountability for police
- Land use process should not always come from a developer but from community
- Equity and race should be part of land use discussion

Which patterns resonate and have affected you? What is the vision for a city without inequity?

Respond at: nyc.gov/racialjustice or racialjustice@charter.gov

- Shelly: Encouraged Mr. Miller to make sure that ballot measures will not fail, as in 2021, because of lack of public information and education.
- Harold Miller: We will hold public sessions and have ads that educate.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Michelle Booker: Noise levels - many complaints. Maybe with Parks and Environment Committee we should discuss the problem. Is the noise worse in the St. Luke's Hospital Zone?

Park to Park 103 St. and the Youth Hostel are trying to open streets from Riverside Park to Central Park and include streets within Douglass Houses across 103rd Street. The group with the Parks Department Horticulture Division has already done four plantings between Broadway & WEA, including at the Marseille senior housing.

Shelly: We should explore a sanitation update after the exploration and report by CB7.

Send encouraged committee members to send in ideas and take on leadership.

Shelly on WSFSSH at 108th Street: Tenants are moving in on 108 Street. People are happy. There are now eyes on the street and trees planted. The bathroom adjacent to Aviles Park has installed along with community designed art fences. WSFSSH will begin rehab on their building on 85th bet WEA & RSD which will house low-income seniors.