

**Alida Camp**  
**Chair**

**Will Brightbill**  
**District Manager**



**505 Park Avenue, Suite 620**  
**New York, N.Y. 10022-1106**  
**(212) 758-4340**  
**(212) 758-4616 (Fax)**  
**www.cb8m.com - Website**  
**info@cb8m.com - E-Mail**

**The City of New York**  
**Community Board 8 Manhattan**  
**Full Board and Land Use Meeting**  
**Wednesday, September 16, 2020 - 6:30 PM**  
**Via Zoom**

**Community Board Members Present:** Vanessa Aronson, Elizabeth Ashby, P. Gayle Baron, Lowell Barton, Michele Birnbaum, Lori Ann Bores, Taina Borrero, Loraine Brown, Alida Camp, Barbara Chocky, Sarah Chu, Anthony Cohn, Saundra Coleman, Brian Correia, Rebecca Dangoor, Felice Farber, Billy Freeland, Edward Hartzog, David Helpert, Paul Higgins, Wilma Johnson, Takako Kono, Craig Lader, Rebecca Lamorte, May Malik, Valerie Mason, Gregory Morris, Dorothea Newman, Jane Parshall, Peter Patch, Harrison Pierson-Panes, Sharon Pope-Marshall, Rita Popper, Margaret Price, Elizabeth Rose, Barbara Rudder, Abraham Salcedo, William Sanchez, M. Barry Schneider, Tricia Shimamura, Cos Spagnoletti, Russell Squire, Marco Tamayo, Carolina Tejo, Adam Wald, Elaine Walsh, Charles Warren, Sharon Weiner, and Jack Zimmerman.

**Community Board Members Absent (Excused):** Lynne Strong-Shinozaki.

**Community Board Members Absent (Unexcused):**

**Total Attendance: 49**

**Chairwoman Alida Camp called the meeting to order at 6:30PM.**

**1. Public Session** – Those who wish to speak during the Public Session must register to do so by 6:45 pm

- Steven A. Williams spoke about the Accessible Dispatch Program.
- Maggie Barbour from the NYPL gave library service updates.
- Wendy Machaver spoke in support of the 210-foot building height cap.
- Lara Secchin spoke in opposition to the 210 East 62nd Street landmarks application.
- Lo Van Der Valk spoke in support of the 16 East 94th Street Revocable Consent application.
- Marvin Mitzner spoke in support of the 16 East 94th Street Revocable Consent application.
- Julianne Bertagna spoke in opposition to the 210 East 62nd Street landmarks application.
- Andrew Ravashiere spoke in favor of air quality monitoring.
- Vanita Solomon & James Solomon spoke in opposition to the 210 East 62nd Street landmarks application.
- Betty Cooper Wallerstein spoke about community issues.
- Joseph Sellman spoke in favor of an elected civilian review board.
- Carter Pottash spoke in opposition to the 210 East 62nd Street landmarks application.

**2. Adoption of the Agenda** – Agenda adopted

**3. Adoption of the Minutes** – Minutes adopted

**4. Manhattan Borough President's Report**

Manhattan Borough President Gale Brewer reported on her latest initiatives.

**5. Elected Officials' Reports**

Elected officials or their representatives reported on their latest initiatives.

1. Assembly Member Rebecca Seawright
2. Council Member Ben Kallos
3. Council Member Keith Powers
4. Assembly Member Dan Quart
5. Comptroller Scott Stringer
6. State Senator Liz Krueger

**6. Chair's Report – Alida Camp**

Chair Alida Camp gave her report.

**7. District Manager's Report -- Will Brightbill**

District Manager Will Brightbill gave his report.

**8. Selection of Nominating Committee**

Members voted on the following slate of board members to serve on the 2020 Nominating Committee.

Votes received are in (parenthesis).

- Patch, Peter (33)
- Tamayo, Marco (22)
- Borrero, Taina (32)
- Warren, Charles (24)
- Price, Margaret (33)
- Schneider, Barry (29)
- Walsh, Elaine (22)
- Bores, Lori (14)
- Parshall, Jane (29)
- Kono, Takako (26)
- Baron, Gayle (26)

The members of the 2020 Nominating Committee include: Patch, Borrero, Price, Schneider, Parshall, Kono, and Baron. At the meeting, they elected Gayle Baron to serve as the chair of the 2020 Nominating Committee.

## 9. Committee Reports and Action Items:

### A. Landmarks Committee - David Helpern and Jane Parshall, Co-Chairs

**LM-1: Item 1 (Sep) - Approval**

**LM-2: Item 2 (Sep) - Approval**

**LM-3: Item 4 (Sep) - Approval**

**LM-4: Item 5 (Sep) - Approval**

**LM-5: Item 1 (Aug) - Approval**

**Item 1 (Sep): 1022 Lexington Avenue – Upper East Side Extension Historic District – *Theodore Bodnar, Architect*** – A neo-Grec brownstone rowhouse constructed by Thom & Wilson between 1880-1881. Application is for the enlargement of the first and second floor window openings and the relocation of the residential building entry from Lexington Avenue to East 73rd Street.

**WHEREAS** 1022 Lexington Avenue is a neo-Grec brownstone rowhouse designed by Thomas & Wilson Between 1880-1881.

**WHEREAS** 1022 Lexington Avenue has two elevations: 80' along 73rd Street and 17' along Lexington Avenue

**WHEREAS** the first two floors of 1022 Lexington present as a restaurant; the upper two floors are residential.

**WHEREAS** the applicant proposes to increase the amount of light into commercial space by enlarging all the windows at the first and second floor both on the Lexington Avenue elevation and at the 73rd Street elevation.

**WHEREAS** by adding more glass at the first and second stories, the applicant will reduce the now-existing inconsistencies among the windows which are of different sizes and have differing characteristics.

**WHEREAS** at the 73rd Street elevation, the applicant proposes 5 large plate glass windows and at the ground floor, 3 new plate glass windows and two new doors (one for the commercial space and one for the residential space); the windows will range in area from 64 sq. ft. to 95 sq. ft.;

**WHEREAS** at the Lexington Avenue elevation, the applicant proposes one large glass window at the second floor with 143 sq. ft. of area and at the first floor one large glass window with 110 sq. ft. of area;

**WHEREAS** the applicant's objective is to align the new windows with the vertical glazing in the residential portion of the building, to separate the commercial use from the residential use and to present consistency and visual uniformity on both elevations.

**WHEREAS** the applicant also proposes to change the existing entry to the residential portion of the building — now located on Lexington Avenue at the south portion of the building — to 73rd Street;

**WHEREAS** the applicant will retain the decorative wrought iron panel at the internal residential entry at the new entry on 73rd Street;

**WHEREAS** at the 73rd Street elevation, the applicant proposes to remove the existing one wood cladding and replace with brick so that the historic look and fabric of the 73rd Street elevation for the first two floors is restored;

**WHEREAS** although disorganized, the existing windows add great charm and character to 1022 Lexington Avenue, especially the non-historic multi-paned window at the 2nd floor at Lexington Avenue;

**WHEREAS** the proposed design presents as not integrated — the artistry needed to combine something historic with something contemporary is lacking; the quirkiness of the 1022 Lexington Avenue is lost.

**WHEREAS** the applicant's proposal to replace the existing configuration of the windows with huge glass is out of context and inappropriate within the historic district.

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that this application is **DISAPPROVED** as presented.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 46 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**Item 2 (Sep): 793 Madison Avenue – Upper East Side Historic District – *Joseph Tarella, Architect* –** A neo-Grec building designed by Thom & Wilson, originally constructed in 1881. Application is for elevator and lobby additions to the rear yard and new storefronts for the front and rear portions of the building.

**WHEREAS** the applicant has responded to the comments of the Committee made during his initial presentation;

**WHEREAS** the applicant has redesigned the façade along East 67th Street;

**WHEREAS** the door into the retail remains in the same location as the current door;

**WHEREAS** the masonry opening for the door is centered between the windows on the second floor;

**WHEREAS** the door is set within the original framed, sculpted masonry opening;

**WHEREAS** 8'-6" wide windows with bronze frames are placed symmetrically either side of the door;

**WHEREAS** elements of the original masonry wall are visible directly behind the windows;

**WHEREAS** the easterly extension for the one-story lobby is set back eighteen inches from the property line;

**WHEREAS** the garden and the view through the site are replaced with the lobby structure and the elevator at the north end of the lobby;

**WHEREAS** the view through the adjoining site, through an alley approximately five feet wide, is maintained;

**WHEREAS** the lobby level is raised about 2'-0" above the former garden level to meet the sidewalk and ground floor level;

**WHEREAS** the lobby has a glass entry door and window set within a bronze frame;

**WHEREAS** the westerly side of the frame is a bronze panel the width of the fire escape stairs;

**WHEREAS** the fire escape terminates in a ladder that that will descend, if needed, in front of the bronze panel;

**WHEREAS** the bronze and glass storefront is recalled in the masonry openings and at the lobby;

**WHEREAS** the current design retains the masonry character of the building on 67th Street;

**WHEREAS** the single-story treatment of the 67th Street façade is more residential in character than the two-story storefront at the corner of Madison Avenue and East 67th Street;

**WHEREAS** the current design is contextual and appropriate within the historic district;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that this application is **APPROVED** as presented.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 40 in favor, 0 opposed, 7 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**Item 4 (Sep): 210 East 62nd Street –Treadwell Farm Historic District – *Arctangent Architecture* –A neo-Grec style building designed by F.S. Barnes and constructed in 1870. Application is for roof addition, rear yard extension and interior renovation.**

**WHEREAS** a rooftop addition and rear yard extension was approved by CB8 in 2016 and received a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Landmarks Preservation Commission;

**WHEREAS** the rooftop structure that has been built is larger than the rooftop addition that was approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission;

**WHEREAS** the applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for a larger rooftop addition that is similar to what has been built;

**WHEREAS** the rooftop addition angles up from the front and the rear to a peak that the applicant states has not been changed;

**WHEREAS** the setback in the rear is being reduced from 3'-0" to 2'-4";

**WHEREAS** the angle of the rear roof of the addition has been made shallower thereby increasing the height of the rear wall from 8'-0" to 9'-1";

**WHEREAS** the angled front of the roof of the addition met the building roof directly but the angle has been made shallower thereby terminating in a vertical return to the building roof;

**WHEREAS** the large single window on the rear of the rooftop addition has been changed to an asymmetrical condition with one large window and one small window;

**WHEREAS** these changes in the shape of the roof structure have added to the volume of the rooftop addition;

**WHEREAS** the increased volume makes the rooftop addition more visible;

**WHEREAS** the cornice at the top of the front façade has not been built in accordance with the approved plans;

**WHEREAS** the approved cornice had acted as the parapet;

**WHEREAS** the built cornice has reduced the height of the building by 1'-10";

**WHEREAS** the height from the bottom of the cornice to the top of the windows on the fourth floor has been reduced by 1'-10" thereby changing the proportional relationships of the original building design by F.S. Barnes and the previous façade design approved by the LPC;

**WHEREAS** a parapet has been constructed behind the cornice as built;

**WHEREAS** the originally approved cornice was proportioned appropriately to the design of the front façade in that the space between the bottom of the cornice and the tops of the windows did not feel compressed;

**WHEREAS** the proposed cornice is to be the incorrectly built cornice;

**WHEREAS** the proposed and as-built changes detract from the design that received the Certificate of Appropriateness;

**WHEREAS** the proposed and as-built changes are not contextual and appropriate within the historic district;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that this application is **DISAPPROVED** as presented.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 46 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**Item 5 (Sep): 147 East 69th Street—Upper East Side Historic District – Cass Stachelberg, Higgins Quasebarth & Partners –** A neo-Georgian style building designed by John Correja, with present façade by Barney & Colt, originally constructed in 1880. Application is for a rooftop addition and replacement of a rear extension fence.

**WHEREAS** 147 East 69th Street is a neo-Georgian style carriage house designed by John Correa and constructed in 1880; the existing elevation later designed by Barney & Colt;

**WHEREAS** the applicant proposes, at the rear elevation, to replace a non-historic wood fence with a slightly lower glass brick wall;

**WHEREAS** the applicant proposes, at the roof, a one-story addition set down into the roofline or body of the existing building to minimize its visibility;

**WHEREAS** the front edge of the one-story addition will be set back 13 1/2' from the front elevation; the proposed new chimney will be set back 30' and the stair bulkhead will be set back 27';

**WHEREAS** at the one-story addition will be set back 13 1/2' from the rear elevation;

**WHEREAS** 147 East 69th Street is 25' wide; thus, the one-story addition will go across the width of the building, measure 56'11" in depth and vary in height from 9'10" at the front elevation to 11'10" at the rear elevation, adding 1386 sq. ft. to 147 East 69th Street;

**WHEREAS** the one-story roof-top addition is minimally visible from the public way — looking northwest at the side elevation, approximately 2' - 3' of the stair bulkhead is visible;

**WHEREAS** the bulk of the one-story roof-top addition is unusual for a carriage house, it is very minimally visible from the public way, especially because of the setback at the front elevation;

**WHEREAS** the addition doesn't disturb the streetscape of the existing carriage houses adjacent to it along East 69th Street;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that this application is **APPROVED** as presented.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 46 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**Item 1 (Aug): 220 East 61st Street (between Second and Third Avenues) – Treadwell Farm Historic District – Page Ayres Cowley, Architect –** late Anglo-Italianate style house designed by F.S. Barnes in 1871. Application is to keep the existing condition of the built parapet wall in place without modification.

**WHEREAS** 220 East 61st Street received four Certificates of No Effect from the Landmarks Preservation Commission for renovations that included interior work, structural work, rooftop addition, and rear balcony;

**WHEREAS** the construction approved in the Certificates of No Effect is complete;

**WHEREAS** the rear façade, prior to the alteration, had corbeled brick under the exposed gutter;

**WHEREAS** the newly built condition extended the rear wall upwards just over three feet;

**WHEREAS** the newly built condition incorporates a balcony with a railing above the top of the wall;

**WHEREAS** the top of the rear wall of the newly built condition is about three feet higher than the tops of the rear walls of the buildings either side;

**WHEREAS** adding height to the rear wall interrupted the continuity of height among the adjoining buildings;

**WHEREAS** the variation in height is echoed in variations in the heights of rear facades throughout the block;

**WHEREAS** the newly built condition does not include corbelled brick under the gutter;

**WHEREAS** the newly built condition does have projected bricks under the gutter;

**WHEREAS** the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) has requested that the upper portion of the rear wall be rebuilt to include the appearance of corbeled brick under the new gutter;

**WHEREAS** the applicant stated that the LPC suggested the use of a polymer panel to simulate corbeled brick;

**WHEREAS** the polymer panel is an applique that does not maintain the integrity of the original brick material;

**WHEREAS** the use of brick corbeling would require, if achievable due to structural considerations, a far more invasive reconstruction than the reconstruction required to accommodate the polymer panel;

**WHEREAS** a polymer panel is not an appropriate substitution for masonry;

**WHEREAS** a polymer panel will not age or weather the same as brick;

**WHEREAS** the design of the rear façade is unchanged on the third and fourth floors;

**WHEREAS** the punched openings with one over one windows are unchanged;



**WHEREAS** there was no ornamentation on the upper floors except for the corbelled brick;

**WHEREAS** the simplicity of the original design of the rear wall is maintained in the added height and the rooftop balcony;

**WHEREAS** the new balcony has a metal railing, an appropriate termination to the rear façade;

**WHEREAS** the design for what was built was approved by the LPC;

**WHEREAS** the overall composition of the rear façade, inclusive of the new, higher termination has a visual cohesiveness;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the upper portion of the rear façade remain as built without modification.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 45 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**B. Transportation Committee - Charles Warren and Craig Lader, Co-Chairs**

**TR-1: Item 1 - Unanimous Approval**

**TR-2: Item 2 - Approval**

**Item 1: Revocable Consent Application Public Hearing (Revised Application):** Proposed fenced-in area including steps, planters, together with snowmelt system in front of 106 East 78th Street.

**WHEREAS**, the property owner of 106 East 78th Street is requesting a revocable consent for a fenced-in area; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed fenced-in area will not be extended into the sidewalk beyond its current footprint; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed snow-melt system was approved by Community Board 8 Manhattan in June 2020;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**; that Community Board 8 Manhattan supports the application, as presented, for a revocable consent for a proposed fenced-in area including steps, planters, together with a snowmelt system in front of 106 East 78th Street.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 47 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**Item 2: Revocable Consent Application Public Hearing:** Proposed front yard expansion at 16 East 94th Street

**WHEREAS**, the property owner of 16 East 94th Street is requesting a revocable consent on a front yard expansion that has previously been completed; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant's original proposed front yard expansion design, which called for a 6' expansion, was disapproved by Community Board 8 and its Landmarks Committee in 2016; and

**WHEREAS**, a revised front yard expansion design with a 3' expansion did not obtain approval from Community Board 8, but proceeded to obtain approvals from the NYC Landmarks Commission and Department of Buildings; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant has completed construction, including the 3' front yard expansion, without obtaining the necessary revocable consent from the Department of Transportation; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant has acknowledged the errors that resulted the proper procedures not being followed, and should have known that a revocable consent was a critical component of the process;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**; that Community Board 8 Manhattan **DISAPPROVES** the application for a revocable consent for a front yard expansion at 16 East 94th Street.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan disapproved this resolution by a vote of 27 in favor, 17 opposed, 3 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**C. Parks and Waterfront Committee – Tricia Shimamura and Barry Schneider, Co-Chairs**

**PW-1: Item 1 - Unanimous Approval**

**Item 1: Reconstruction of the East River Esplanade**

**WHEREAS** in light of the recent collapse of the East River Esplanade at 76-74th Street, and

**WHEREAS** the two most recent major collapses, including at 89th Street at Gracie Mansion, have taken place between seawall inspection periods; and

**WHEREAS** there are several other areas of the East River Esplanade showing potential structural concerns;

**BE IT RESOLVED** CB8 requests an immediate inspection of the entire East River Esplanade from 60th to 120th Street to ensure the safety of all Esplanade users and to avoid any further emergency collapses; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** all engineering reports with previous assessments of the Esplanade and seawall should be submitted to Community Board 8, to be compared with a current report.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan unanimously approved this resolution by a vote of 46 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**E. Street Life Committee – Abraham Salcedo, Chair**

**SL-1: Items 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a (Sep); 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 2a, 3a, 3b (Aug) - Unanimous Approval**

**1. (Sep) New Applications to the New York State Liquor Authority for Liquor Licenses:**

- a. Di Fara Group LLC, dba Di Fara, 1304 A Second Avenue (Between 68th and 69th Streets) - New Application for Wine, Beer, & Cider**

WHEREAS this is a new application for Wine, Beer, & Cider only

WHEREAS no one from the public objected

WHEREAS establishment has 80% Food - 20% Drinks

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED**, subject to the stipulations above.

- b. Botanicus Lexington Inc., dba Le Botaniste, 833 Lexington Avenue (Between 63rd and 64th Streets) - New Application for Liquor, Wine, Beer, & Cider**

WHEREAS this is a new application

WHEREAS no one from the public objected

WHEREAS the building has a violation, but NOT the establishment

WHEREAS no one from the public objected

WHEREAS establishment has 90% Food - 10% Drinks

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED**, subject to the stipulations above.

- c. Guadalupe Lucero, dba Tacos & Tequila, 1742 Second Avenue (Between 90th and 91st Streets) - New Application for Liquor, Wine, & Beer**

WHEREAS this is a new application

WHEREAS no one from the public objected

WHEREAS establishment has 70% Food - 30% Drinks

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED**, subject to the stipulations above.

**2. (Sep) 30-Day Waiver Renewal Applications to the New York State Liquor Authority for Liquor Licenses:**

- a. **Roma Salerno Corp, dba P Q R Pizza Quadrata Romano, 1631 Second Avenue, Store 2 (Between 84th and 85th Streets) - 30-Day Waiver – Renewal Application for Wine, Beer, & Cider**

**WHEREAS** this is a renewal WITH NO CHANGES

**WHEREAS** the applicant failed to notify CB8 in a timely manner

**WHEREAS** no one from the public objected

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED**, subject to the stipulations above.

1. **(Aug) New Applications to the New York State Liquor Authority for Liquor Licenses:**

- a. **APQ 1131 Madison Avenue NY LLC, dba Le Pain Quotidien, 1131 Madison Avenue (Between 84<sup>th</sup> and 85<sup>th</sup> Streets) - New Application for Wine, Beer, & Cider**

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for a Wine, Beer, and Cider License; and

**WHEREAS** no one from the public objected; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has agreed to Community Board 8's stipulations concerning delivery bikes and bar crawls; therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED**, subject to the stipulations above.

- b. **APQ 1592 First Avenue NY LLC, dba Le Pain Quotidien, 1592 First Avenue (Between 82<sup>nd</sup> and 83<sup>rd</sup> Streets) - New Application for Wine, Beer, & Cider**

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for a Wine, Beer, and Cider License; and

**WHEREAS** no one from the public objected; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has agreed to Community Board 8's stipulations concerning delivery bikes and bar crawls; therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED**, subject to the stipulations above.

- c. **APQ Carnegie Hill NY LLC, dba Le Pain Quotidien, 1309 Lexington Avenue (Between 87<sup>th</sup> and 88<sup>th</sup> Streets) - New Application for Wine, Beer, & Cider**

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for a Wine, Beer, and Cider License; and

**WHEREAS** no one from the public objected; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has agreed to Community Board 8's stipulations concerning delivery bikes and bar crawls; therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED, subject to the stipulations above.**

**e. APQ First Avenue NY LLC, dba Le Pain Quotidien, 1270-1272 First Avenue (Between 68<sup>th</sup> and 69<sup>th</sup> Streets) – New Application for Wine, Beer, & Cider**

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for a Wine, Beer, and Cider License; and

**WHEREAS** no one from the public objected; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has agreed to Community Board 8's stipulations concerning delivery bikes and bar crawls; therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED, subject to the stipulations above.**

**f. 85 Wine Corp, 1505 Third Avenue (Between 84<sup>th</sup> and 85<sup>th</sup> Streets) – New Application for Liquor, Wine, Beer, & Cider**

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for a Liquor, Wine, Beer, and Cider License; and

**WHEREAS** no one from the public objected; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has agreed to Community Board 8's stipulations concerning delivery bikes and bar crawls; therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED, subject to the stipulations above.**

**g. Bilao Inc, 1437 First Avenue, Store 1 (Between 74<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> Streets) – New Application for Wine, Beer, & Cider**

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for a Wine, Beer, and Cider License; and

**WHEREAS** no one from the public objected; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has agreed to Community Board 8's stipulations concerning delivery bikes and bar crawls; therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED, subject to the stipulations above.**

**2. (Aug) Renewal Applications to the Department of Consumer Affairs and/or Department of City Planning for a Sidewalk Cafe:**

a. Zep LLC, dba Zuccherio E. Pomodori, 1435 Second Avenue (Between 74<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> Street) – Renewal Application for Sidewalk Café - Unenclosed – 6 Tables and 12 Chairs

i. **Deadline for Submission:** March 22, 2020

**WHEREAS** this is a renewal application for a sidewalk cafe; and

**WHEREAS** no one from the public objected; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has agreed to Community Board 8’s stipulations concerning delivery bikes and bar crawls; therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED, subject to the stipulations above.**

**3. (Aug) Changes:**

a. OVG Cafe LLC, dba Candle Cafe, 1307 Third Avenue (Between 74<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> Streets) – Corporate Change

**WHEREAS** this is a corporate change application to change partners and

**WHEREAS** no one from the public objected; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has agreed to Community Board 8’s stipulations concerning delivery bikes and bar crawls; therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED, subject to the stipulations above.**

b. Spice Corner 236 Inc, dba Spice, 1479 First Avenue (Between 77<sup>th</sup> and 78<sup>th</sup> Streets) - Corporate Change

**WHEREAS** this is a corporate change application to change shareholders and

**WHEREAS** no one from the public objected; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has agreed to Community Board 8’s stipulations concerning delivery bikes and bar crawls; therefore

**BE IT RESOLVED** that the application is **APPROVED, subject to the stipulations above.**

**Community Board 8 Manhattan unanimously approved this resolution by a vote of 46 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**10. Old Business** – No items of old business were discussed.

**11. New Business** – One item of new business was discussed.

**NB-1: Item 1 - Unanimous Approval**

**Item 1: 210 East 62nd Street –Treadwell Farm Historic District – *Arctangent Architecture* – A** neo-Grec style building designed by F.S. Barnes and constructed in 1870. Application is for roof addition, rear yard extension and interior renovation.

**WHEREAS** a rooftop addition and rear yard extension was approved by CB8M in 2016 and subsequently received, in modified form, a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Landmarks Preservation Commission;

**WHEREAS** this partially completed rooftop addition is larger than the approved proposal;

**WHEREAS** the applicant seeks a Certificate of Appropriateness for this enlarged rooftop addition;

**WHEREAS** changes in the shape and height of the roof structure have added to the volume of the rooftop addition, adding to its visibility;

**WHEREAS** the proposed and as-built changes substantively alter the design that received its Certificate of Appropriateness in 2017;

**WHEREAS** the applicant has incurred numerous stop work orders and violations at the Department of Buildings;

**WHEREAS** the built rooftop addition encroaches on the neighboring property;

**WHEREAS** the stop work orders and violations clearly indicate a pattern of behavior demonstrating disregard for both Department of Buildings and Landmarks Preservation Commission rules and regulations;

**WHEREAS** the violations demonstrate a lack of supervision and management on the part of the Architect and Owner;

**WHEREAS** the Landmarks Committee and full Board of CB8M disapproved this application to remedy construction not approved by either the Department of Buildings or the Landmarks Preservation Commission;

**WHEREAS** the Treadwell Farms Historic District Association and neighbors raised objections to the increased volume requested by the applicant as well as the numerous technical violations triggered by the applicant's actions;

**WHEREAS** the built deviations from the approved application warrant a full investigation of the project under the enforcement provisions of the Landmarks Preservation Commission;

**WHEREAS** under Chapter 7, Section 7-06 of Title 63 of the Rules of the City of New York, the Landmarks Preservation Commission has the authority to revoke a Certificate of Appropriateness;

**THEREFORE** be it resolved that the Landmarks Preservation Commission fully investigate this project and revoke its Certificate of Appropriateness.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan unanimously approved this resolution by a vote of 42 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 PM.**

**Alida Camp, Chair**

DRAFT



Name	LM-1	LM-2	LM-3	LM-4	LM-5	TR-1	TR-2	PW-1	SL-1	NB-1
ARONSON, VANESSA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
ASHBY, ELIZABETH	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
BARON, P. GAYLE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
BARTON, LOWELL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
BIRNBAUM, MICHELE	Y	Abst	Y	Abst	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
BORES, LORI ANN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
BORRERO, TAINA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
BROWN, LORAINÉ	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
CAMP, ALIDA	Y	Abst	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
CHOCKY, BARBARA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
CHU, SARAH	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Abst			
COHN, ANTHONY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
COLEMAN, SAUNDREA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
CORREIA, BRIAN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DANGOOR, REBECCA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
FARBER, FELICE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
FREELAND, BILL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
HARTZOG, EDWARD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
HELPERN, DAVID P.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
HIGGINS, PAUL										
JOHNSON, WILMA	Y	Abst	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
KONO, TAKAKO	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
LADER, CRAIG	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
LAMORTE, REBECCA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Abst	Y	Y	Y
MALIK, MAY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	
MASON, VALERIE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
MORRIS, GREGORY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
NEWMAN, DOROTHEA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
PARSHALL, JANE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
PATCH, PETER	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
PIERSON-PANES, HARRISON	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
POPE-MARSHALL, SHARON	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
POPPER, RITA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
PRICE, MARGARET	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ROSE, ELIZABETH	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	
RUDDER, BARBARA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SALCEDO, ABRAHAM	Y	Abst	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SANCHEZ, WILLIAM										
SCHNEIDER, M. BARRY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SHIMAMURA, TRICIA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
SPAGNOLETTI, COS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
SQUIRE, RUSSELL	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
STRONG SHINOZAKI, LYNNE										
TAMAYO, MARCO	Y	Abst	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
TEJO, CAROLINA	Y	Abst	Abst	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WALD, ADAM	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WALSH, ELAINE	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
WARREN, CHARLES	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WEINER, SHARON	Y	Abst	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ZIMMERMAN, JACK	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Abst	Y	Y	Y