

Russell Squire  
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  
Transportation Committee**  
Wednesday January 5, 2022, 6:30 PM  
*Conducted Remotely on Zoom*

*Please note: The resolutions contained in the committee minutes are recommendations submitted by the committee chair to the Community Board. At the monthly full board meeting, the resolutions are discussed and voted upon by all members of Community Board 8 Manhattan.*

**Minutes**

*Present:* Rit Aggarwala, Lori Bores, Michele Birnbaum, Lorraine Brown, Alida Camp, Rebecca Dangoor, Billy Freeland, Paul Krikler, Craig Lader, Rita Popper, Barbara Rudder Charles Warren, Peter Borock (public member)

*Absent (Excused):* Lowell Barton, Rebecca Lamorte, Valerie Mason, John Phillips, Barry Schneider,

**Resolutions for Approval:**

**Item 1 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Commercial Parking Regulations**

**Item 2 – Neighborhood Loading Zones**

**Item 3 - “No Parking” signage in front of 205 East 92<sup>nd</sup> Street (The Easton) (Unanimous)**

**Item 4 - Disapproval of Revocable Consent Request: 160 East 70<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Item 5 – Commercial Parking Regulation Request: 115 to 119 East 60<sup>th</sup> St. (Unanimous)**

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 PM.

**Item 1: NYCDOT Proposed Expansion of Commercial Parking Regulations on 3rd Avenue between 61st and 96th Street**

Matthew Garcia, NYCDOT Parking Planning Deputy Director and Katarina Carey, NYCDOT Assistant Transportation Specialist, presented a proposal to expand the amount of commercial loading zone parking regulations along 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue between 61<sup>st</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> Streets that was transmitted to CB8 on December 1, 2021. The scarce existing commercial parking signage along this corridor doesn’t meet the current commercial parking demand, resulting in double parking, blocked traffic and congestion. The proposal would improve the functioning of 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue by providing more curb space for deliveries to take place, match times of commercial parking activity with hours in which commercial parking is prioritized, and provide more aggressive commercial meter regulations on high-demand blocks.

Ms. Carey displayed maps depicting current parking regulations along 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, highlighting that there is a dearth of commercial parking on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue; commercial parking is available on certain cross streets near their intersections with 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, both free and metered; it is more sparsely available north of 70<sup>th</sup> Street. She described the NYCDOT toolbox for addressing commercial parking issues, including allocating curbside spaces for commercial uses, matching regulations to the days and times when commercial activity is highest, and establishing time limits to encourage turnover of parking spaces. The recommended actions and levels of interventions were based on a commercial activity and land use data analysis, which assessed commercial land use density, commercial vehicle parking violation frequency, the amount of commercial vehicle access on side streets, and data collected and observed in the field.

The proposed changes were developed to accommodate the specific needs of each individual block; not every block is proposed to have commercial parking regulations, but all blocks with commercial parking will have pay parking by meters. Some blocks will only have commercial parking in place on weekdays and revert to general metered parking on weekends; blocks with the heaviest commercial parking needs will also have commercial parking signage in effect on Saturdays. Blocks will either have 1, 2, or 3 hour limits depending on the time of day. The regulations would generally begin at either 7AM or 8AM, and would allow for street cleaning to be performed. The block-by-block proposal is available on the CB8 website. Implementation is targeted for the first half of 2022. Following implementation, NYCDOT will evaluate the impact of the changes, and determine whether any changes to scale up or reduce commercial parking are needed.

Committee members were strongly supportive of NYCDOT's intent to provide more commercial parking opportunities to address pervasive double parking and congestion, though there were differing views as to whether the extent of the proposed interventions was sufficient enough to address the issues at hand. There was concern expressed as to whether there was enough outreach to businesses along the corridor performed by NYCDOT and whether there was sufficient notice that the proposal was available and to be discussed by CB8. Ultimately, it was agreed that delaying implementation would only prolong the ongoing issues, and that once installation of new signage is completed NYCDOT should provide a one-year post-implementation status update to determine whether further changes are necessary.

The following resolution was then put forward by CB8:

**WHEREAS;** New York City Department of Transportation has developed a plan to expand commercial parking on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue between 61<sup>st</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> Streets; and

**WHEREAS;** 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue is a major commercial corridor within Community District 8; and

**WHEREAS;** double parking of commercial vehicles is pervasive along 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue; and

**WHEREAS;** current parking regulations along 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue do not provide ample commercial parking opportunities; and

**WHEREAS;** most existing commercial parking inventory along 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue is situated on cross streets near their intersections with 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue; and

**WHEREAS;** the proposal presented by New York City Department of Transportation attempts to balance commercial parking needs with general parking needs; and

**WHEREAS;** the proposal attempts to address the needs of each individual block based on specific land use and parking inventory characteristics; and

**WHEREAS;** NYCDOT will measure key performance metrics to determine whether any implemented changes are working; and;

**WHEREAS;** Community Board 8 seeks further discussion to determine whether additional changes to parking regulations are needed beyond those currently proposed to address other causes of double parking, such as between 86<sup>th</sup> and 87<sup>th</sup> streets; and

**WHEREAS;** Community Board 8 and NYCDOT shall work with the NYPD 19<sup>th</sup> Precinct to enforce newly implemented parking regulations;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** that Community Board 8 Manhattan supports the New York City Department of Transportation proposal to change parking regulations on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue between 61<sup>st</sup> Street and 95<sup>th</sup> Street, as presented to provide new commercial parking opportunities on Weekdays and Saturdays;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that New York City Department of Transportation shall return to Community Board 8 after one year of the new regulations being in place to review the regulation's performance and determine whether further expansion or reduction of commercial parking regulations is necessary.

*Yes (11):* Aggarwala, Bores, Brown, Camp, Dangoor, Freeland, Krikler, Lader, Popper, Rudder, Warren

*No (1):* Birnbaum

*Abstain (0):* None

## **Item 2: NYCDOT Proposed Neighborhood Loading Zones - 37 Locations**

Following a presentation in June 2021 to the Transportation Committee in which NYCDOT described the Neighborhood Loading Zone (NLZ) program and requested public input for potential placement of such zones as they prepared to expand across New York City, the Committee reviewed a proposal transmitted in a letter to CB8 on December 1, 2021 to install 37 NLZs within Community District 8.

The letter indicated that the program is intended to allow for short-term loading activities such as package deliveries by commercial vehicles, active loading and unloading of personal vehicles, and taxi and car service pick-up and drop-off". It will "use signage to repurpose parking spaces into loading zones during the daytime and evening periods, from 8am - 6pm Monday through Friday. Neighborhood residents may park in these spaces overnight and on weekends. In addition to the regulatory signage, DOT will install informational signage describing the use of the zone at the pedestrian level". The program focuses more on residential loading/unloading activity rather than the e-commerce "warehousing" practices that often result in double parking and disruption on the Avenues.

The 37 locations identified were mapped by one of the Committee Co-Chairs, and is available on the CB8 Transportation Committee webpage. 31 of the 37 locations are situated along cross streets; the majority of these zones are on streets that also have unprotected crosstown bike lanes. There are no locations currently proposed for any location within Community District 8 below 70<sup>th</sup> Street. The zones will be between 25 and 40 feet in length.

Colleen Chattergoon, NYCDOT Senior Planner and Liaison to CB8, noted that the program has been successful in neighborhoods such as Chelsea and the Upper West Side, and said that her office would return after a year to provide an update on their performance in Community District 8. She also noted that the NYCDOT accepts NLZ feedback on their website and requests for additional locations, and that it is very likely the program will further expand in the future to more locations. In response to a question regarding whether people with parking placards will abuse such zones, she indicated that the signage should discourage placard holders from parking in NLZs.

Most of the feedback received was supportive of the program, with most comments reinforcing the need to provide additional opportunities for short-term curbside access to allow for passenger pick-up and drop-offs, and to help address double parking that is common across the district. There were some comments lamenting that the proposal of 37 locations was too modest, and that the NLZ program won't address unloading from tractor trailers and trucks performing "warehousing" activities on the avenues. There were also questions regarding how users will know how long they may legally remain in a NLZ, as NYCDOT's explanation of "expeditious" loading and unloading is understood to be less than 30 minutes but without a prescribed limit. One member noted that some of the NLZ locations were adjacent to buildings that had driveways, and questioned whether these locations should be prioritized for NLZs. One member thought it was too early to vote on the proposal.

The following resolution was then put forward by CB8:

**WHEREAS;** New York City Department of Transportation has developed a Neighborhood Loading Zone program that dedicates curbside space for expeditious loading and loading of passengers and deliveries; and

**WHEREAS;** NYCDOT reports that the NLZ program has been successful as a pilot in other Manhattan neighborhoods; and

**WHEREAS;** the growth of e-commerce and for-hire vehicle activity has increased the amount of loading and unloading activities along curbsides in Community District 8; and

**WHEREAS;** double parking caused by loading and unloading creates congestion and is a safety hazard for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers; and

**WHEREAS;** NYCDOT has proposed 37 locations for NLZs within Community District 8 that would be in effect on Weekdays between 8AM and 6PM; and

**WHEREAS;** NLZ locations will revert to general parking on weeknights and weekends; and

**WHEREAS;** NYCDOT acknowledges that the initial set of 37 locations doesn't address all blocks that may benefit from a NLZ, and has committed to returning to Community Board 8 to consider additional NLZ locations and to review the first year of the program;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that Community Board 8 Manhattan supports the proposal from New York City Department of Transportation to create and install signage indicating 37 Neighborhood Loading Zones;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** that New York City Department of Transportation shall return to Community Board 8 after one year of Neighborhood Loading Zones being in place to review performance and determine whether further expansion or reduction the program is necessary.

*Yes (10+1):* Aggarwala, Bores, Brown, Camp, Dangoor, Freeland, Krikler, Lader, Rudder, Warren, Borock (public member)

*No (0):* None

*Abstain (2):* Birnbaum, Popper

**Item 3: Continuing discussion of a request for "No Parking" signage of about 2 car lengths in front of 205 East 92nd St. (the Easton), and general discussion of the criteria that CB8 should consider for future request for "No Parking" or "No Standing" signage in front of building entrances**

In December 2021, the Transportation Committee heard a request from residents of 205 East 92<sup>nd</sup> Street (the Easton) to install 2 car lengths of "no parking" signage in front of their building entrance to facilitate loading and unloading of passengers. The Transportation Committee voted to disapprove this request by a vote of 6 yes, 3 no and 2 abstentions, as committee members were reluctant to accommodate a request that would possibly set a precedent for other residential buildings that would like similar accommodations. When the resolution came to the Full Board, there was a lengthy discussion whether this and other future similar requests should in fact be considered by CB8 under its historical policy of disapproval, as there was a recognition that curbside access for passenger loading and unloading is a serious safety matter for many constituents, especially those who have limited mobility or physical disabilities, and necessitated a more nuanced approach. The vote was tabled and sent back to the Transportation Committee for reconsideration, and whether the policy of CB8 to not grant requests to restrict parking in front of residential building entrances should be updated going forward.

There was significant discussion regarding whether a formal CB8M process should be considered for determining how to approach future requests to keep the curbside clear in front of residential buildings. There was a general sentiment that the prior policy of rejecting such requests as a rule is too restrictive, but some were also concerned that a process that was too rigid would not be ideal. Much of the discussion centered on optimal allocation of curbside uses, and whether parking or sidewalk access should be prioritized and in which cases safety concerns should be the most important consideration. Some members expressed their belief that many more people would

benefit from having curbside access in front of buildings compared to the relatively few people that would inhabit a parking space for up to days at a time. It was determined that the Committee would revisit this issue at an upcoming future meeting, where criteria for evaluating proposals such as population/building densities, land uses, proximity to nearby curbside access due to fire hydrants or signage, and other safety considerations and unique traffic patterns can be further discussed.

In regard to the Easton, one board member who is a resident of the building explained that the steep slope of 92<sup>nd</sup> Street results in speeding vehicles that accelerate while going downhill, and how that endangers anyone who exists a vehicle on the passenger side of a vehicle. She noted that there are residents who are Access-a-Ride users that also have difficulties when the vehicle can't pull along the curbside. Other members agreed that in the case of the Easton, installing signage to provide curbside access to the entrance was appropriate, and that a "No Standing" regulation would be better equipped to prevent a vehicle with a parking placard from blocking the space. One member suggested that an existing no standing zone just over 100 feet east of the Easton's front entrance that is used for sanitation purposes could be used for curbside access, but others thought that it was important that the curbside access be provided directly in front of the building entrance. It was also agreed upon that the signage would extend for 2 car lengths, which would better accommodate Access-a-Ride vans and other vehicles that would otherwise need to parallel park on a street with a steep slope. It was also suggested that a speed hump be installed to help slow down traffic on 92<sup>nd</sup> Street.

The following resolution was then put forward by CB8:

**WHEREAS;** residents of the Easton, a residential building located at 205 East 92<sup>nd</sup> Street, have requested signage to prevent vehicles from blocking curbside access to their front entrance; and

**WHEREAS;** the Easton is a large residential building with over 200 units and a significant number of residents for whom getting into and out of vehicles can be physically challenging; and

**WHEREAS;** East 92<sup>nd</sup> Street has a steep grade that contributes to frequent vehicular speeding that threatens the safety of people entering and exiting vehicles that must stop in the moving lane because they can't access the curbside in front of 205 East 92<sup>nd</sup> Street and is a through street that provides access to the FDR; and

**WHEREAS;** Community Board 8 has reconsidered the Easton's request, and recognizes the unique safety issues that would be addressed with a change of parking regulations; and

**WHEREAS;** Community Board 8 seeks actions that can improve safety along 92<sup>nd</sup> Street by preventing speeding; and

**WHEREAS;** Community Board 8 will continue to discuss how to approach the issue of improving curbside access for passenger pick-up and drop off in front of residential buildings and whether changes to parking regulations should be more regularly considered;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that Community Board 8 Manhattan supports the request from residents of 205 East 92<sup>nd</sup> Street (the Easton) to change parking regulations in front of the building front entrance, and requests that the New York City Department of Transportation install "No Standing" signage for 2 car lengths.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** that Community Board 8 Manhattan requests that the New York City Department of Transportation conduct a speed hump feasibility study on 92<sup>nd</sup> Street.

*Yes (13):* Aggarwala, Bores, Birnbaum, Brown, Camp, Dangoor, Freeland, Krikler, Lader, Popper, Rudder Warren, Borock (public member)

*No (0):* None

*Abstain (0):* None

**Item 4: PUBLIC HEARING: Revocable Consent Request to Construct, Maintain and use a Fenced-In Area in front of 160 East 70th Street**

Alan Berman, Principal, and Eve Claros, Associate, from the firm Archtype Architecture, presented on behalf of the owners of 160 East 70<sup>th</sup> Street a revocable consent request for a fenced in area.

Existing Conditions - The townhouse's existing entryway is at the same level as the sidewalk, with a sunken front area way that had previously provided access to a basement rental unit that was inhabited by a medical office. There is a tree pit in front of the property. The building entrance is aligned with the adjacent property to the west (#158); the property directly adjacent to the east (#162) extends four feet beyond the current front entrance.

Proposal – A fenced in area would be created to accommodate an expansion of the townhouse's front entryway by two feet into the sidewalk. A new front entrance would be built in the center of the front façade, which is situated within the sunken area; this would require steps to access the new entrance. The proposal also calls for an area under planters to hide the garbage. The proposal would result in the fenced in area extending two feet past the property directly to the east, and be two feet shorter than the adjacent property directly to the west. The new sidewalk clearance in front of the tree pit would be 7' 8", which would continue to far exceed the clearance in front of 162 East 70<sup>th</sup> St.

The building renovation project was reviewed by CB8's Landmarks Committee, which resulted in a disapproval due to design objections regarding the building facade. The design was modified and subsequently approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, but it has yet to receive a certificate of appropriateness.

There was strong opposition to the proposal, mostly due to objections that this project would use public space for private interests, and that this project doesn't have any public benefit that would be generated aside from trash being able to be concealed.

The following resolution was then put forward by CB8:

**WHEREAS;** a revocable consent is requested to allow a fenced in area in front of a townhouse located at 160 East 70<sup>th</sup> Street; and

**WHEREAS;** the revocable consent is needed to accommodate stairs that would lead to a new front entrance that would be located in a sunken front area way; and

**WHEREAS;** the proposed extension of the front entranceway of 160 East 70<sup>th</sup> Street would result in the use of two feet of public sidewalk right-of-way; and

**WHEREAS;** the building's proposed renovation was previously disapproved by CB8's Landmarks Committee; and

**WHEREAS;** there is no apparent significant public benefit that would result from the private use of the public right-of-way;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that Community Board 8 Manhattan disapproves the request for a revocable consent for a fenced in area in front of 160 East 70<sup>th</sup> Street.

*Yes (10+1):* Aggarwala, Bores, Birnbaum, Brown, Camp, Dangoor, Freeland, Krikler, Lader, Popper, Rudder

*No (1):* Warren

*Abstain (0+1):* Borock (public member)

**Item 5: PUBLIC HEARING: Request for a parking regulations change in front of 115 to 119 East 60th Street (60 feet between Park and Lexington Avenues) from a No Standing Zone to Commercial Parking**

James Mallios, owner and managing partner of Amali Restaurant located at 115 East 60<sup>th</sup> Street, requested a change in parking regulations Monday to Saturday from 7AM to 7PM from No Standing to Commercial Parking, covering the area in front of 115, 117 and 119 East 60<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Mallios explained that commercial parking regulations had been in place at some point in the past between 7AM and 7PM, and that restoring those regulations would allow him to be able to continue to use the curb space for outdoor dining as the NYCDOT Open Restaurants program evolves into a permanent program in 2023 with new and more stringent guidelines. Under the temporary Open Restaurants program, Amali received a variance allowing them to use the curb space for outdoor dining while the No Standing regulation between 7AM and 7PM was in effect, but the variance would no longer be permitted when the permanent program is in place if No Standing regulations are posted; the loss of outdoor dining would threaten the ability for Amali to survive. He also suggested that commercial parking is necessary on this block to facilitate deliveries that regularly occur.

Matthew Garcia from NYCDOT Parking indicated that it was likely that the no standing regulations were designed to facilitate traffic flow on 60<sup>th</sup> Street that were impacted by it generating traffic from vehicles exiting the Queensboro Bridge Lower Level.

The Committee was very sympathetic towards Amali's situation, and there was strong support among members to provide the relief requested by Mr. Mallios and restaurants that may be unable to participate in the permanent NYCDOT Open Restaurants program due to their location on streets with other curbside uses. One member expressed concern that removing the no standing regulation would have detrimental impacts on congestion and air quality given the high traffic volumes on 60<sup>th</sup> Street that may necessitate a second moving lane during certain dayparts, and wanted to find an alternative approach where NYCDOT could find a workable traffic solution that would also achieve Mr. Mallios' goals of continuing to participate in Open Restaurants.

The following resolution was then put forward by CB8:

**WHEREAS;** Amali Restaurant located at 115 East 60<sup>th</sup> Street, is requesting that parking regulations be changed in front of 115, 117 and 119 East 60<sup>th</sup> Street from No Standing 7AM to 7PM except Sunday to Commercial Parking 7AM to 7PM except Sunday; and

**WHEREAS;** Amali Restaurant currently participates in the NYCDOT Open Restaurants Program; and

**WHEREAS;** due to the presence of a No Standing parking regulation weekdays between 7AM and 7PM, Amali Restaurant had to obtain a variance from NYCDOT to accommodate their participation in the Open Restaurant Program; and

**WHEREAS;** new Open Restaurants program guidelines are under development as a new permanent program is scheduled to become effective in 2023; and

**WHEREAS;** the permanent Open Restaurants program is unlikely to allow restaurants to participate if there are no standing regulations in place; and

**WHEREAS;** Amali Restaurant seeks to continue to participate in the permanent Open Restaurants program starting in 2023; and

**WHEREAS;** commercial parking would benefit the entire East 60<sup>th</sup> Street block between Lexington and Park Avenues given the prevalence of commercial vehicle loading and unloading;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that Community Board 8 Manhattan requests New York City Department of Transportation change parking regulations in front of 115, 117 and 119 East 60<sup>th</sup> Street from No Standing 7AM to 7PM except Sundays to Commercial Parking 7AM to 7PM except Sundays.

*Yes (13):* Aggarwala, Bores, Birnbaum, Brown, Camp, Dangoor, Freeland, Krikler, Lader, Popper, Rudder Warren, Borock (public member)

*No (0):* None

*Abstain (0):* None

#### **Item 6: NYCDOT Updates**

There were no updates provided by NYCDOT.

#### **Item 6: Old Business**

A member was interested in further analysis of Crashmapper Data similar to what was presented at the December 2021 Transportation Committee meeting, and requested the Committee revisit the topic and try to devise solutions to the safety issues that the data spotlighted.

#### **Item 7: New Business**

A member noted the lack of light on the west side of 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue between 86<sup>th</sup> and 87<sup>th</sup> Street, and expressed concerns about safety on this block.

A member expressed concern about the plantings and tree pits located at the M15 SBS bus stop at the corner of 87<sup>th</sup> Street and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, noting that the plants are in poor condition and that the pits are filled with trash and attracting vermin. It was requested that they be removed, as it also interferes with passengers exiting buses. One of the co-chairs clarified that these non-traditional tree pits are actually “rain gardens” that are part of a Department of Environmental Protection’s Green Infrastructure program that is in place for water collection purposes. It was suggested that this issue be addressed in the Environment Committee jointly with the Transportation Committee. It is not clear who is responsible for cleaning and maintaining the rain gardens.

A member raised the issue that the MTA’s new fare payment system’s rollout is not equitable, as the recently announced fare capping program will only be available to general OMNY users even though OMNY has not been made available for persons who are eligible for reduced fares. It was pointed out that this was a pilot program and there will be a permanent program put in place in 2023 which should deal with these issues.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00PM.

Respectfully submitted, Charles Warren & Craig Lader, Co-Chairs