

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  
Full Board and Land Use Committee Meeting  
PUBLIC HEARING  
Wednesday, April 13, 2022 - 6:30 PM  
Conducted Remotely via Zoom**

**MINUTES:**

**Community Board Members Present:** Vanessa Aronson, Elizabeth Ashby, P. Gayle Baron, Michele Birnbaum, Lori Ann Bores, Lorraine Brown, Alida Camp, Sarah Chu, Saundra I. Coleman, Rebecca Dangoor, Felice Farber, Billy Freeland, Edward Hartzog, David Helpern, Wilma Johnson, Paul Kriker, Craig Lader, Rebecca Lamorte, Valerie Mason, Evan Meyerson, Greg Morris, Jane Parshall, Peter Patch, John Philips, Sharon Pope-Marshall, Rita Popper, Margaret Price, Yma-Rodriguez Thoma, Elizabeth Rose, Barbara Rudder, William Sanchez, M. Barry Schneider, Rami Sigal, Cos Spagnoletti, Russell Squire, Marco Tamayo, Carolina Tejo, Adam Wald, Elaine Walsh, Charles Warren, and Sharon Weiner.

**Community Board Members Absent:** Lowell Barton, Taina Borrero (Excused), Anthony Cohn, Harrison Pierson-Panes, Abraham Salcedo and Lynne Strong-Shinozaki.

**Total Attendance: 41**

**Chairman Russell Squire called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.**

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

- Amy Baxter spoke about the Barbara Chocky Memorial Award application process.
- Julianne Bertagna spoke against the Landmarks application for 210 East 62<sup>nd</sup> Street.
- Duncan Sheik spoke against the Landmarks application for 210 East 62<sup>nd</sup> Street.
- James Solomon spoke against the Landmarks application for 210 East 62<sup>nd</sup> Street.
- Matthew Bauer provided updates on the Madison Ave BID.
- Evelyn David asked two questions about Congestion Pricing.
- Valerie Mason spoke in opposition to Congestion Pricing.
- Elizabeth Daly provided updates on the Frick Museum.
- Boaz Galil supported the Resolution in Support of the Reverse Location and Reverse Keyword Search Prohibition Act (NY State Assembly Bill A84A).
- Alida Camp spoke on the June 11<sup>th</sup> Art Show, safety concerns in the subway, and opposing propane tanks in open restaurants.
- Peter Patch spoke on CB8 issues.
- Andrew Ravaschiere spoke on climate change and development.
- Dylan Jeronimo Kennedy spoke on subway safety and in favor of Congestion Pricing

- David Menegon spoke in favor of keeping the Knickerbocker Greys in the Armory.
- Karin Lipson spoke on scaffolding on 86th between First and York Avenues.

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

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

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

Manhattan Borough President Mark Levine reported on his latest initiatives.

5. **Elected Officials' Reports**

- Council Member Keith Powers
- State Senator Liz Krueger
- Council Member Julie Menin
- Assembly Member Rebecca Seawright
- State Senator Jose Serrano
- Congresswoman Carolyn Maloney
- Manhattan DA Alvin Bragg

6. **Chair's Report – Russell Squire**

Chair Russell Squire gave his report.

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

District Manager Will Brightbill waived his report.

8. **Committee Reports and Action Items**

a) **Landmarks Committee – David Helpern and Jane Parshall, Co-Chairs**

**LM-1 Item 1 Disapproval**

**LM-2 Item 2 Unanimous Approval**

**Item 1: 201 East 65th Street (Individual Landmark: Manhattan House)** *Adam Kushner, Architect.* A modern style building designed by Mayer & Whittlesy, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill and constructed in 1947-1951. Application is to remove the existing awning installed without permits and replace with a new awning.

**WHEREAS** 201 East 65th Street a modern style building designed by Gordon Bunshaft of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill and constructed in 1947-1951, occupying the entire block between 65th and 66th Streets, 3rd Avenue to 2nd Avenue (The entrance to the apartment complex is at 200 East 66th Street.);

**WHEREAS** 201 East 65th Street/200 East 66th Street was designated as an **INDIVIDUAL LANDMARK** in 2007 by the Landmarks Preservation Commission for its influential mid-century modernist architecture;

**WHEREAS** this is the third time the applicant has appeared before the Landmarks Committee with a design for a commercial canopy to provide protection for the stairs leading down to the sub cellar;

**WHEREAS** the site for canopy is at the SW corner of 65th Street and Second Avenue;

**WHEREAS** the two previous proposals for canvas canopies with obtrusive large lettering advertising the medical practice occupying the sub cellar were turned down by the Committee; the color of the canvas

and the oversized white lettering were considered — *twice* — to be inappropriate for the site, given the individual landmark status;

**WHEREAS** the applicant now proposes a fixed canopy to be made of 1” thick frosted plexiglass, measuring 25’8” long x 8’ wide (equal to the width of the stairwell); the design for the canopy is based on an existing storefront design;

**WHEREAS** the canopy will be framed in an anodized aluminum material; signage in the same material will be at the front of the canopy — 4” in height x 6’ long — spelling out the name of the medical offices;

**WHEREAS** there will be downlighting along the canopy as well as at the stair railings;

**WHEREAS** ADA access to the medical offices exists through the residential lobby at the 66th Street entrance;

**WHEREAS** an office directory as well as an ADA access note will be placed on the existing concrete framed entryway;

**WHEREAS** the applicant’s design is a vast improvement over the two previous applications; the minimalist design is more contextual and less intrusive;

**WHEREAS** *however* because the canopy does not step down as the stairs descend, there is no protection from rain, wind and snow; the applicant has presented a design for a canopy looks more appropriate but the applicant has also presented a design for a canopy that doesn’t work;

**WHEREAS** the material for the canopy, frosted plexiglass, stains easily over time and yellows over time; glass would have been a better material;

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

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 36 in favor, 3 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

**Item 2: 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** 210 East 62<sup>nd</sup> Street had their application for a Certificate of Appropriateness approved by Community Board 8 in 2016;

**WHEREAS** 210 East 62<sup>nd</sup> Street received a Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A) in 2017 for a rooftop addition and a rear extension;

**WHEREAS** the construction was not in compliance with the drawings approved by the Landmarks Commission and the Department of Buildings;

**WHEREAS** 210 East 62<sup>nd</sup> Street submitted an application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) for a C of A for the as-built condition that was not approved;

**WHEREAS** 210 East 62<sup>nd</sup> Street submitted a new application for a roof addition, rear yard extension, and interior renovation;

**WHEREAS** 210 East 62<sup>nd</sup> Street is a four-story building above grade with a basement, three floors above the basement, and a cellar below the basement;

**WHEREAS** the as-built condition has a rooftop addition that is the full width of the lot as approved, but is 2'-6" higher at the peak;

**WHEREAS** the new application reduces the size of the rooftop addition to make it less visible;

**WHEREAS** the newly proposed rooftop addition ranges in width from 7'-5" at the front to 6'-3" at the rear, is 2'-1" further from the front, is 2'-0" lower than the as-built roof, but 6" higher than the approved rooftop addition or 1'-6" higher with the elevator penthouse;

**WHEREAS** this change in the size of the rooftop addition reduces the visibility of the proposed rooftop addition in relation to the built condition as seen from Third Avenue;

**WHEREAS** the floors on the interior have been incrementally raised so that the top of the third floor is 1'-7" higher than the approved floor and the roof is 3'-2" higher than the approved roof;

**WHEREAS** the bulk of as built condition is enlarged not just by the bulkhead but by the additional 3'-2" of height across the whole roof;

**WHEREAS** the current application maintains the cornice at the original and approved height;

**WHEREAS** the third floor is 1'-7" closer to the cornice due to the raising of the floor;

**WHEREAS** the third floor was raised above the sill of the third-floor windows and the first and second-floor windows were set closer to the sills than in the approved design;

**WHEREAS** the approved rear yard addition extends 16'-6" into the rear yard and the proposed rear yard addition will extend 16'-7" into the rear yard;

**WHEREAS** the rear yard addition interrupts the "donut" with its unprecedented bulk;

**WHEREAS** a reconsideration of the approved design and a review of the current proposed design make clear that the rear yard addition is not appropriate and should not have been approved by CB8 and LPC;

**WHEREAS** the top of the proposed rear yard addition will be 2'-3" higher than the approved height, adding substantially to the bulk;

**WHEREAS** this additional height will exacerbate the intrusion of the rear yard addition into the "donut";

**WHEREAS** the additional height of the roof and the additional height of the rear yard addition add considerable bulk to the building, which will be visually apparent;

**WHEREAS** the top of the cornice and the top of the roof are at about the same height;

**WHEREAS** the cornice functioned as the parapet in the approved design, prior to the roof being raised, now the applicant proposes that a glass railing be added to provide the required 42" high parapet on the front of the building;

**WHEREAS** the roof at the rear of the building and the rear addition are also being provided with a contemporary glass railing to create the required 42" high parapet;

**WHEREAS** the sight line from directly across the street just touches the top of the glass railing in the front, this modernist railing, which is not perfectly transparent, will act like a mirror and be reflective dependent upon lighting conditions;

**WHEREAS** the glass railing will be seen obliquely from a variety of viewpoints;

**WHEREAS** the LPC and DOB violations, fines, and encroachments are well documented and include excavating the cellar without authorization, underpinning adjacent properties without authorization, and overlapping adjacent properties;

**WHEREAS** the applicant did not protect the building from the weather thereby allowing the building to deteriorate and to create a blight in the Treadwell Farm community;

**WHEREAS** the DOB and HPD had to issue an emergency declaration order for dangerous and unsafe conditions;

**WHEREAS** the applicant stated that it was in the interest of the neighbors to have the applicant make the proposed change to reduce the size and height of the rooftop addition and complete the construction as quickly as possible—but not include other corrective work to the rest of the built condition;

**WHEREAS** the community stated that constructing the project right is much more important than constructing it fast;

**WHEREAS** the as-built condition and the current proposal add significantly to the height and bulk of the approved design;

**WHEREAS** the changes in the heights of the floors change the relationships from interior and exterior as seen in and/or out through the windows, with the third floor higher than the window sill;

**WHEREAS** the experience of the as built condition as it relates to the relationship of the floors to the windows will be inappropriate and disproportionate in relation to the original design of the house and the approved design;

**WHEREAS** the egregious actions of the applicant demonstrate a complete disregard for the Treadwell Farm community and the Landmarks Preservation Commission;

**WHEREAS** the applicant has had five years to comply with the requirements of the 2017 Certificate of Appropriateness and has not;

**WHEREAS** the applicant has not committed to the LPC in this new application that it will demolish the inappropriate construction;

**WHEREAS** the built condition with the adjustments proposed in this new application are not contextual and appropriate within the Landmark District;

**WHEREAS** the status of this project mandates the LPC to revoke the 2017 Certificate of Appropriateness due to the applicant's not building the approved design, allowing the historic fabric of the building to deteriorate, and not committing to re-building in compliance with the approved design;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that this new application for a Certificate of Appropriateness is **DISAPPROVED**.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan unanimously approved this resolution by a vote of 39 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

**b) Women and Families Committee – P. Gayle Baron and Margaret Price, Co-Chairs**

**WF-1 Item 1 Approval**

**Item 1: Salary Transparency Act**

**WHEREAS** women in New York State are paid a median 86 cents for every dollar a typical male earns; and

**WHEREAS** this pernicious earnings gap harms women's standard of living, both during their working years and in retirement; and

**WHEREAS** the City of New York, along with seven U.S. states, has passed a Salary Transparency Law to help close the gender wage gap; and

**WHEREAS** the upcoming Salary Transparency Law would require employers of four or more workers to post, internally and externally, the salary range of their job openings, and

**WHEREAS** this public advertisement of the salary range of an open position greatly reduces the possibility of wage discrimination based on such factors as gender and race; and

**WHEREAS** the New York City Council is considering a bill, Int. 134, that would alter and weaken the Salary Transparency Law by making it applicable only to employers with 15 or more workers, exempting remote work and delaying the law's implementation to November; therefore,

**BE IT RESOLVED** that Community Board 8, Manhattan, strongly objects to the provisions of Int. 134 and urges the City Council not to alter the existing Salary Transparency Law, which is due to take effect May 15.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 36 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

**c) Technology Committee – Vanessa Aronson and Rebecca Dangoor, Co-Chairs**

**TN-1 Item 1 Failed Motion to Table**

**TN-2 Item 1 Approval**

A motion was made to table item 1, which failed by a vote of 20 in favor, 20 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause

**Item 1: Reverse Location and Reverse Keyword Search Prohibition Act (NY State Assembly Bill A84A)**

**WHEREAS**, conventional warrants require probable cause to seize or search an individual;

**WHEREAS**, a reverse location search warrant allows law enforcement to collect data on everyone in a certain area during a certain time;

**WHEREAS**, probable cause is not a prerequisite when it comes to reverse location search warrants;

**WHEREAS**, this enables law enforcement to go on a fishing expedition;

**WHEREAS**, historically, this mass collection of data has yielded nothing to further efforts to prosecute a particular crime;

**WHEREAS**, reverse location search warrants enable law enforcement to use the information collected to prosecute individuals for other crimes than the crime that initiated the warrant in question;

**WHEREAS**, citizens whose rights to privacy are violated by this type of warrant are never informed of this breach of privacy;

**WHEREAS**, those who are prosecuted for unrelated crimes and their attorneys are not informed of the use of a reverse location search warrant in obtaining said information;

**WHEREAS**, Community District 8 Manhattan has been subjected to this violation of privacy;

**WHEREAS**, we have still not been informed as to the totality of the private information that was subject to that prior search;

**WHEREAS**, any potential use of data collected by reverse location search warrants could be deemed unconstitutional under the fourth amendment due to the fact that this type of warrant enables indiscriminate sweeps and provides no guidance on what law enforcement can and cannot do with the data once it is obtained;

**WHEREAS**, in a city as dense as New York, this type of geofence warrant could turn up data on hundreds if not thousands of people in a single time;

**WHEREAS**, when everyone is accordingly considered a potential suspect, the chance of wrongful arrest skyrockets;

**WHEREAS**, reverse search warrants are dangerous and exemplify dystopian technology;

**WHEREAS**, S.08183/A.10246A would ban the use of reverse search warrants in the state of New York;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that Community Board 8 Manhattan calls on the State Legislature to pass and the Governor to sign S.08183/A.10246A into law;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that Community Board 8 Manhattan intends to use all methods in our power to ensure those in our community whose privacy was violated previously as a result of the use of a reverse location search warrant will be informed of the fact that the Manhattan District Attorney's Office has a catalogue of their private information.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 35 in favor, 0 opposed, 5 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

**d) Social Justice Committee – Sarah Chu and Saundrea I. Coleman, Co-Chairs**

**SJ-1 Item 1 Approval**

**Item 1: Supporting the Clean Slate Act (S.1553C/A.6399B)**

**WHEREAS**, people who have experienced incarceration continue to experience discrimination in housing and employment sectors even after they have served their time;

**WHEREAS**, research has shown that housing and employment support people's ability to continue their contributions to society and prevent recidivism;

**WHEREAS**, we believe that the stigma of incarceration should not be a perpetual punishment for people who are rejoining their communities;

**WHEREAS**, we believe, as a community, that we are more successful when we support one another and set our returning community members up for success;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, CB8 supports the Clean Slate Act (S.1553C/A.6399B) as proposed by advocates and policymakers to ensure our communities grow stronger together; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, CB8 would also support a shorter timeframe between the completion of a sentence and the sealing of a person's conviction than the three years prescribed for a misdemeanor conviction and seven years prescribed for a felony conviction as indicated in Clean Slate Act (S.1553C/A.6399B).

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 35 in favor, 0 opposed, 4 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

**e) Transportation Committee – Charles S. Warren and Craig M. Lader, Co-Chairs**

**TR-1 Item 1 Unanimous Approval**

**Item 1: Accessible Pedestrian Signals and Determining Priority Locations for new signals in Community District 8**

**WHEREAS**; Accessible Pedestrian Signals are a critical safety measure for persons with visual impairments and many other pedestrians; and

**WHEREAS**; Community District 8 has a disproportionately low percentage of intersections equipped with accessible pedestrian signals; and

**WHEREAS**; only 15 intersections within Community District 8, or 5% of the districts intersections, have accessible pedestrian signals, compared to the entire borough of Manhattan in which 9% of intersections have accessible pedestrian signals; and

**WHEREAS**; Community District 8 has 11% of Manhattan's signalized intersections, but only 6% of the borough's intersections equipped with accessible signals; and

**WHEREAS**; a Federal judge has ordered New York City to install 9,000 accessible pedestrian signals over the next 10 years, including 147 in FY 2022, 400 in FY 2023 and 500 in FY 2024; and

**WHEREAS**; New York City Department of Transportation is soliciting input from the public as to where accessible pedestrian signals should be installed; and

**WHEREAS**; in order for New York City to be a truly equitable place, all intersections ideally should have accessible pedestrian signals as soon as possible; and

**WHEREAS**; Community District 8 has many intersections where accessible pedestrian signals are needed, especially in high activity locations and areas where pedestrian safety enhancements should be prioritized, including by subway stations, schools, hospitals, houses of worship and other major institutions;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that Community Board 8 requests that New York City Department of Transportation prioritize installation of accessible pedestrian signals in Community District 8 at the



following locations: near subway stations, near hospitals, near schools, near houses of worship, and near other major community institutions.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan unanimously approved this resolution by a vote of 41 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

**f) Congestion Pricing Task Force – Alida Camp and Craig Lader, Co-Chairs**

**CP-1 Item 1 Unanimous Approval**

**Item 1: Requesting the Traffic Mobility Review Board comply fully with the Open Meetings Law**

**WHEREAS;** The Traffic Mobility Review Board (“TMRB”) is the New York State entity tasked with making recommendations regarding the central business district toll amounts and recommending a plan for credits, discounts, and/or exemptions for tolls paid; and

**WHEREAS;** TMRB recommendations will be provided to the Triboro Bridge and Tunnel Authority for approval; and

**WHEREAS;** the TMRB will need to hold meetings to discuss issues and make decisions with respect to rules; and

**WHEREAS;** the Open Meetings Law was enacted because “the public has the right to attend meeting of public bodies, listen to debate and watch the decision-making process”; and

**WHEREAS;** the Open Meetings Law applies to public bodies, defined to include entities consisting of two or more people who conduct public business and perform a governmental function for New York State; and

**WHEREAS;** the people’s right to witness and observe the governmental decision-making process in action is basic to our society. Access to public portions of meetings of public bodies must be protected and maintained; and

**WHEREAS;** the congestion pricing law will have an effect, and unintended consequences on residents and businesses in Manhattan and other New York City Boroughs;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** that the Traffic Mobility Review Board comply fully with the Open Meetings Law, hold all meetings as public meetings, and allow the public to witness its deliberations and decision-making process.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan unanimously approved this resolution by a vote of 41 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

**g) Small Business Committee – Alida Camp and Valerie Mason, Co-Chairs**

**SB-1 Item 1 Approval**

**Item 1: Seat at the Table Resolution**

**WHEREAS,** CB8 has been supportive of the temporary Open Restaurants Program created during the COVID 19 pandemic and applauds the City for implementing a program which saved 100,000 jobs; and

**WHEREAS**, although the Open Restaurants Program enhanced the quality of life in our district in many ways during the COVID 19 pandemic, issues have been raised by the community including noise, garbage, vermin, safety concerns and the encroachment of sidewalk space by restaurants which should be fully addressed in the rules and design guidelines prior to implementation of the permanent Open Restaurant Program; and

**WHEREAS**, on April 4, 2022, the Sanitation, Small Business, Street Life, Transportation and Zoning and Development Committees of Community Board 8 Manhattan met jointly to discuss the City's Open Restaurant Program; and

**WHEREAS**, in February, 2022, the NYC Council approved zoning text changes eliminating sidewalk café regulations and expanding the area where outdoor dining can be considered to all NYC neighbors, the first step in making the Open Restaurant Program permanent; and

**WHEREAS**, Supreme Court Judge Nervo has issued an order halting implementation of the Open Restaurant Program until a further study is done on environmental impact citing that dining sheds have at a minimum impacted traffic and noise levels, and may have significantly impacted sanitation; and

**WHEREAS**, the program is set to take effect next year with various city agencies currently working to write rules which will govern the Open Restaurant Program; and

**WHEREAS**, Community Boards, on behalf of the community members who have been and will be affected by the Open Restaurant Program, have an inherent interest in the rules concerning Sidewalk Cafes and Open Restaurants – enclosed, unenclosed and small; and

**WHEREAS**, Community Boards should have "a seat at the table" and should have meaningful input to help draft proposed rules which will govern the permanent Open Restaurant Program; and

**WHEREAS**, in the past, enforcement of the existing rules, drafted during the COVID 19 emergency, has been very lax, necessitating that the lead agency communicate with all stakeholders on rules and then enforce them; and

**WHEREAS**, both the public and business owners have an interest in a successful program;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that Community Boards be permitted to have meaningful input in the rule making process by providing comments, ideas and suggestions before rules covering the Open Restaurant Program are in an advanced draft; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that Community Boards be permitted to review and comment on design guidelines in the early stages of development of such guidelines as "one size does not fit all".

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 22 in favor, 19 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

**h) Street Life Committee – Abraham Salcedo, Chair**

**SL-1 Items 1a-i Unanimous Approval**

**Item 1a: Happy Chef 1712 Corp, dba Cascate, 1712 Second Avenue (Between 88th and 89th Streets)** - New Application and Temporary Retail Permit 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 as well as agreeing to cease use of the rear yard by 10pm daily; therefore

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

**Item 1b: BJROCK 1664 INC, dba pending, 1664 First Avenue (Between 86th and 87th Streets) - New Application and Temporary Retail Permit 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 agreed to i) turndown music after midnight, ii) close all doors and windows by 10pm daily, iii) to not have any live music, iv) to provide a phone number to the community board which will be provided to the public to contact in the event of any issues and such number will be available during operating hours of the establishment and will be to an individual who has the authority to resolve such issues, and v) when there is to be a comedy night, the establishment will provide security to limit noise, as well as congregating in front of the establishment;

**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.**

**Item 1c: Five Iron Golf NYC LLC, dba pending, 1681 Third Avenue (Between 94th and 95th 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 agreed that when there is to be live music for private events, the establishment will provide security to limit noise, as well as congregating in front of the establishment;

**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.**

**Item 1d: Lispenard Fish LLC, dba Two Wheels, 1382 Second Avenue (Between 71<sup>st</sup> and 72<sup>nd</sup> Streets) - New Application for Wine, Beer, & Cider**

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for 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.**

**Item 1e: Mercato Rustico LLC, dba pending, 1300 Madison Avenue (Between 92nd and 93rd Streets) - New Application and Temporary Retail Permit for Wine, Beer & Cider**

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for 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.**

**Item 1f: Suki Ichiro Japanese LLC, 1694 Second Avenue (Between 87th and 88th Streets)-** New Application and Temporary Retail Permit for Wine, Beer & Cider

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for 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, AND agreed to remove the enclosed sidewalk establishment or modify it to be in line with applicable law, therefore,

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

**Item 1g: India Palace Inc, 401 East 62nd Street (Between First and York Avenues)-** New Application for Liquor, Wine, Beer, and Cider

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for 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.**

**Item 1h: Enzo Group NYC INC, 1645 Third Avenue (Between 92nd and 93rd Streets) -** New Application and Temporary Retail Permit for Liquor, Wine, Beer & Cider

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for 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.**

**Item 1i: Enzo Group NYC INC, 1649 Third Avenue (Between 92nd and 93rd Streets)-** New Application for Liquor, Wine, Beer & Cider

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for 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.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan unanimously approved these resolutions by a vote of 41 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

**i) Street Fairs Committee – Wilma Johnson and Barbara Rudder, Co-Chairs**

**SF-1 Items 1,3,5-12,15 Approval**

**SF-2 Items 4 and 13 Approval**

**SF-3 Items 2 Approval**

**SF-4 Items 14 Unanimous Approval**

**Items 1,3,5-12,15**

**1) Friendship Walk Carnival** – Full Street Closure at East 77th Street between York and First Avenues. Sunday, May 15, 2022, from 10am to 3pm.  
Approved

**3) Ramaz Block Party** – Full Street Closure at East 78th Street between Madison and Park Avenues. Thursday, May 5, 2022, from 10am to 4pm.  
Approved

**5) Brick Church Strawberry Festival** – Full Street Closure at East 92nd Street between Park and Madison Avenues. Sunday, May 15, 2022, from 12pm to 3pm.  
Approved

**6) The Episcopal School Family Day Preschool Block Party** – Full Street Closure at East 69th Street between Madison and Park Avenues. Thursday, May 19, 2022, from 3:30pm to 5:30pm.  
Approved

**7) PS 198 Spring Carnival** – Full Street Closure at East 95th Street between Third and Lexington Avenues. Saturday, May 21, 2022 from 11am to 3pm.  
Approved

**8) Brick Church End of Year Party** – Full Street Closure at East 92nd Street between Park and Madison Avenues. Thursday, June 2, 2022, from 11:30am to 5pm.  
Approved

**9) Birch Wathen Lenox Spring Fair** – Full Street Closure at East 77th Street between Second and Third Avenues. Friday, June 3, 2022, from 9am to 3pm.  
Approved

**10) CSH Street Fair** – Full Street Closure at East 91st Street between Fifth and Madison Avenues. Thursday, June 9, 2022, from 12pm to 4pm.  
Approved

**11) Convent of the Sacred Heart (CSH) Senior Class Celebration** – Full Street Closure at East 91st Street between Fifth and Madison Avenues. Tuesday, June 14, 2022, from 3pm to 7pm.

Disapproved

**12) St. James Church Homecoming Picnic**– Full Street Closure at East 71st Street between Madison and Park Avenues. Sunday, September 11, 2022, from 11:30am to 2pm.

Approved

**15) PS267 Spring Fling** – Full Street Closure at East 63rd between Second and Third Avenues. Sunday May 1, 2022, from 10am to 4pm.

Approved

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved these resolutions by a vote of 39 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

**Items 4 and 13**

**4) Hunter College Elementary School Spring Carnival** – Full Street Closure at East 95th between Madison and Park Avenues. Saturday, May 7, 2022, from 10am to 4pm.

Approved

**13) Hunter College High School** – Full Street Closure at East 95th Street from Madison and Park Avenues. Monday, June 13, 2022, from 12pm to 2pm.

Disapproved

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved these resolutions by a vote of 38 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions and 1 not voting for cause**

**Item 2**

**2) Marymount Manhattan Strawberry Fest** – Full Street Closure at East 71st between Second and Third Avenues. Wednesday, May 4th 2022, from 12pm to 3pm.

Approved

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 40 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

**Item 14**

**14) Central Park Precinct Community Block Party** – Full Street Closure at East 60th Street between Fifth and Madison Avenues. Sunday, October 2, 2022, from 10am to 6pm.

Approved

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved unanimously approved this resolution by a vote of 41 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause**

9. Old Business

10. New Business

*Russell Squire, Chair*

Name	Attendance	LM-1 Item 1 (Disapproval)	LM-2 Item 2	WF-1 Item 1	TN-1 Motion to table	TN-2: Item 1 Resolution	SJ-1 Item 1	TR-1 Item 1	CP-1 Item 1	SB-1 Item 1	SL-1 Items 1a-i	SF-1 Items 1,3,5-12,15	SF-2 Items 4 & 13	SF-3 Item 2	SF-4 Item 14
ARONSON, VANESSA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ASHBY, ELIZABETH	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BARON, P. GAYLE	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BARTON, LOWELL	Absent														
BIRNBAUM, MICHELE	Present	Yes	Yes	Abst	Yes	Abst	Abst	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
BORES, LORI ANN	Present						Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BORRERO, TAINA	Excused														
BROWN, LORAINÉ	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CAMP, ALIDA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
CHU, SARAH	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
COHN, ANTHONY	Excused														
COLEMAN, SAUNDREA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DANGOOR, REBECCA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	NVFC	Yes	Yes
FARBER, FELICE	Present	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
FREELAND, BILL	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
HARTZOG, EDWARD	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
HELPERN, DAVID P.	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
JOHNSON, WILMA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
KRIKER, PAUL	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
LADER, CRAIG	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
LAMORTE, REBECCA	Present				No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MASON, VALERIE	Present	Yes	Yes	Abst	Yes	Abst	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MEYERSON, EVAN	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MORRIS, GREGORY	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PARSHALL, JANE	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PATCH, PETER	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PHILIPS, JOHN	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Abst	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PIERSON-PANES, HARRISON	Absent														
POPE-MARSHALL, SHARON	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
POPPER, RITA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PRICE, MARGARET	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
RODRIGUEZ-THOMA, YMA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ROSE, ELIZABETH	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abst	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
RUDDER, BARBARA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SALCEDO, ABRAHAM	Absent														
SANCHEZ, WILLIAM	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SCHNEIDER, M. BARRY	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SIGAL, RAMI	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SPAGNOLETTI, COS	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SQUIRE, RUSSELL	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
STRONG-SHINOZAKI, LYNNE	Absent														
TAMAYO, MARCO	Present	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
TEJO, CAROLINA	Present	Yes	Yes	Abst	Yes	Yes	Abst	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WALD, ADAM	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WALSH, ELAINE	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abst	Abst	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WARREN, CHARLES	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WEINER, SHARON	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abst	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Total Yes	41	36	39	36	20	35	35	41	41	22	41	39	38	40	41
Total No		3	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	19	0	2	2	1	0
Total Abstain		0	0	3	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Not Vote For Cause		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Total Votes		39	39	39	40	40	39	41	41	41	41	41	41	41	41