

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 Meeting
PUBLIC HEARING
Wednesday, October 19, 2022 - 6:30 PM
Conducted Remotely via Zoom**

MINUTES:

Community Board Members Present: Mohit Agrawa, Bill Angelos, Vanessa Aronson, Elizabeth Ashby, P. Gayle Baron, Michele Birnbaum, Lori Boses, Taina Borrero, Loraine Brown, Alida Camp, Sarah Chu, Anthony Cohn, Saundra I. Coleman, Lindsey Cormack, Rebecca Dangoor, Felice Farber, Bill Freeland, Edward Hartzog, David P. Helpern, Sahar Husain, Wilma Johnson, Paul Krikler, Craig Lader, Addeson Lehy, Valerie Mason, John McClement, Evan Meyerson, Gregory Morris, Jane Parshall, John Phillips, Margaret Price, Abraham Salcedo, William Sanchez, Judy Schneider, Rami Sigal, Cos Spagnoletti, Russell Squire, Marco Tamayo, Carolina Tejo, Adam Wald, Chuck Warren, and Sharon Weiner

Community Board Members Absent: Sarah Chu (Excused), Rebecca Lamorte (Excused), Sharon Pope-Marshall (Excused), Rita Popper (Excused), Barbara Rudder (Excused), Lynne-Strong-Shinozaki (Excused), Anju Suresh, and Sharon Weiner (Excused)

Total Attendance: 41

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

1. Public Session

- Matthew Bauer provided updates regarding the Madison Avenue BID.
- Cal Zeng spoke on behalf of Grow NYC and their Stop 'n' Swap program.
- Elizabeth Rose Daly spoke on behalf of the Frick Collection.
- Beth Davies on behalf of Green ABCs spoke in favor of the 3rd Avenue redesign.
- Chelsea Formica spoke against a 5G pole being near her apartment.
- Trevor Stahelski representing the 828/850 Madison Avenue Application thanked the Street Life committee for their support.
- Phyllis Weisberg on behalf of 10 E. 70th Street spoke in favor of the stipulations for the Robin Birley club application.
- Liam Jeffries spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Laura Moscahlades spoke against the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Marylou Avanzino spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Maria Danzilo on behalf of One City Rising spoke against the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Ghideon Ezaz spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Guy Blumberg spoke against the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Laura Sankey spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Barak Friedman spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Samir Lavingia spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Lynda Hansen spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Andrea Pedersen spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Steve Chao spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee's Third Avenue redesign resolution.

- Michael Toomey spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Andrew Hyatt spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- David Warren spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution
- Erik Marzolf spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Andrew Rosenthal spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Daniel Hanggi spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Heather Dewey-Hagborg spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Hindy Schachter spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Dylan Kennedy spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Andrew Fine spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Sebastian Hallum Clarke spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Devin Gould spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Juno Chow-Sun spoke in favor of the Transportation Committee’s Third Avenue redesign resolution.
- Lo van der Valk representing Carnegie Hill Neighbors spoke against the 1045 Park Avenue landmark application.
- Mubeen Siddiqui on behalf of Muslim Volunteers for New York, invited everyone to a Rupert Park beautification event.
- Saundrea I. Coleman, co-chair of the CB8 Social Justice Committee, let the public know about events.
- Alida Camp, chair of the CB8 Arts Committee, spoke about the October 2022 art show.

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 Julie Menin
- Council Member Keith Powers
- State Senator Liz Krueger
- Congresswomen Carolyn Maloney
- State Assembly Member Dan Quart
- State Assembly Member Rebecca Seawright
- Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg
- State Senator Jose Serrano

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

Chair Russell Squire gave his report.

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

District Manager Will Brightbill gave his report

8. **Committee Reports and Action Items**

A. Transportation Committee – Craig Lader and Chuck Warren, Co-Chairs

TR-1: Item 1

Item 1: Third Avenue Complete Street Design and Safety Improvements

WHEREAS; Third Avenue traverses Community District 8 between 59th and 96th Streets; and

WHEREAS; Third Avenue is 70' wide, accommodating 5 moving lanes of general traffic and 2 parking lanes; and

WHEREAS; there is excess capacity on Third Avenue that promotes vehicular speeding; and

WHEREAS; Third Avenue has a very high incidence rate of pedestrians killed and injured;

WHEREAS; Third Avenue doesn't feature a bike lane, yet still is a busy bike corridor that is unsafe for cyclists; and

WHEREAS; Third Avenue is a heavily utilized bus corridor, with over 150 buses operating during each peak period; and

WHEREAS; Bus speeds on Third Avenue bus routes are among the slowest in Manhattan; and

WHEREAS; Third Avenue's design is a relic of now outdated best practices and in need of a redesign that prioritizes safety for all users; and

WHEREAS; Community Board 8 has called for an expanded network of protected bike lanes following a series of recent cyclist fatalities; and

WHEREAS; NYCDOT has committed to transforming Manhattan's entire Third Avenue Corridor to prioritize safety of pedestrians and cyclists; and

WHEREAS; the poor safety record of Third Avenue in Community District 8 has resulted in NYCDOT proposing its segment to be the first to be improved; and

WHEREAS; NYCDOT data indicates that there are far fewer severe injuries to pedestrians when protected bike lanes are present, with seniors seeing the largest amount of benefits;

WHEREAS; NYCDOT's proposal for a complete street design would include a protected bike lane; and

WHEREAS; the proposed Third Avenue redesign would create a dedicated bus lane that would provide faster and more reliable service throughout Community District 8; and

WHEREAS; the presence of sidewalk islands and the reduction of general traffic lanes would significantly shorten the crossing length for pedestrians; and

WHEREAS; NYCDOT traffic analysis indicates that there will still be sufficient vehicular capacity even after 2 lanes of traffic are converted to bus and bike lanes; and

WHEREAS; enforcing double parking, especially commercial vehicle unloading in moving lanes is critical to preventing congestion, regardless of the number of moving lanes available to general traffic; and

WHEREAS; Community Board 8 considers the safety of users of its transportation network to be paramount; and

WHEREAS; prioritizing enforcement of all traffic modes will be essential to attaining the safety benefits that a complete street design is intended to achieve;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Community Board 8 Manhattan supports the plan presented by NYCDOT to implement a Third Avenue complete street design with bus, bike and pedestrian improvements between East 59th and East 96th Streets.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Community Board 8 Manhattan requests that enforcement of all traffic laws be prioritized on Third Avenue for all modes, including enforcement activities related to but not limited to illegal double parking, warehousing activities by commercial vehicles, moving violations of general traffic and bikes including speeding, running red lights and failure to yield, and illegal parking or standing in bus lanes.

Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 26 in favor, 13 opposed, 2 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause

B. Congestion Pricing Task Force – Alida Camp and Craig Lader, Co-Chairs

CP-1: Item 1 – **Unanimous Approval**

Item 1: **Identification of policy recommendations to the TMRB regarding potential congestion pricing impacts on persons with disabilities**

WHEREAS; New York State established a Central Business District Tolling Program, enacted into law in the FY 2020 New York State Budget; and

WHEREAS; the Central Business District Tolling Program would impose fees for vehicles crossing into or out of Manhattan’s Central Business District Program, defined as the local roadway network below and inclusive of 60th Street;

WHEREAS; the congestion pricing law enacted says “No qualifying authorized emergency vehicle as defined pursuant to section one hundred one of this chapter or a qualifying vehicle transporting a person with disabilities shall be charged a central business district toll if it enters or remains in the central business district. Application for such toll exemption shall be made in such manner as prescribed by the Triborough bridge and tunnel authority and shall contain such information as the authority may reasonably require”; and

WHEREAS; the congestion pricing law enacted says “The Triborough bridge and Tunnel Authority shall be authorized to provide additional credits, discounts and exemptions informed by the recommendations of the traffic mobility review board and a traffic study that considers impact”; and

WHEREAS; the existing language from the FY2020 Budget law would exclude many persons with disabilities from being exempted from a congestion fee, unless they were being transported in the limited category of “qualifying vehicles” or using a paratransit service such as Access-a-Ride; and

WHEREAS; there are vehicles operated by certain services that specifically serve persons with disabilities but wouldn’t be considered a “qualifying vehicle” for exemptions under the narrow language of the budget law; and

WHEREAS; the Congestion Pricing Environmental Assessment acknowledges that some persons with disabilities “may need to use nonqualifying vehicles to access healthcare and medical facilities”, who will incur “an additional cost to access medical facilities and healthcare facilities” if they cross the toll zone boundary; and

WHEREAS; Access-a-Ride is not sufficient for persons with disabilities to rely upon for their daily mobility needs and is an inefficient and costly system to operate for taxpayers; and

WHEREAS; the Environmental Assessment’s finding that there will be no significant impacts on persons with disabilities doesn’t account for the clear impacts that such populations will face, even if they don’t reach the level of a “significant impact” as defined by NEPA; and

WHEREAS; the level of the tolls to be charged for individual vehicles has yet to be determined, but fees as high as \$23 may have a disproportionate impact on persons with disabilities;

WHEREAS; the Environmental Assessment states that “the greatest cost would be incurred by those who have frequent, regular medical appointments that they drive to (and for whom transit is not an acceptable alternative), and who are not eligible for paratransit or nonemergency medical transportation under Medicaid or other insurance coverage”; and

WHEREAS; there are many situations where residents of Community District 8 who have disabilities and wish to take discretionary trips are unable to take transit due to their mobility impairments; and

WHEREAS; the New York City Subway System is not accessible, with many stations lacking elevators or have elevators that are frequently out-of-service for long-term repairs;

WHEREAS; walking distances that people must travel to access New York City bus stops are often too far for persons with disabilities;

WHEREAS; the New York City Transit System has faced many reliability issues and safety concerns that further make transit more daunting or infeasible as an option for persons with disabilities; and

WHEREAS; the term “person with disability” should be more comprehensively defined for the purpose of congestion pricing, as disabilities may not be apparent, and there is no provision for persons who face a temporary disability and receiving medical treatment to obtain exemptions, even though their disabilities may inhibit their mobility as much as someone with a long-term or permanent disability; and

WHEREAS; the process for applying for and receiving disability license plates would not allow people with short-term disabilities or temporary disabilities from being able to receive exemptions like those who have long-term disabilities; and

WHEREAS; the fees that will be charged to for-hire-vehicles is yet-to-be determined, but the Environmental Assessment includes tolling scenarios in which there would be no daily limits to the number of times a vehicle would be assessed a toll, which is expected to be passed down to passengers; and

WHEREAS; there are already congestion fees applied to TLC vehicles and other for-hire vehicles operating below 96th Street, and additional tolls for crossing the toll zone boundary would be an undue burden on persons with disabilities who rely on such mobility options; and

WHEREAS; no medical patient should be forced to change doctors because accessing their medical provider would necessitate paying a congestion fee, especially for seniors; and

WHEREAS; many New York State and New York City state services and courthouses are located in the congestion zone, which places an undue burden on persons with disabilities who must make in-person trips to access these services and cross into and out of the congestion zone, especially to access world-class medical institutions located in Community District 8; and

WHEREAS; there are no mechanisms in place to ensure that persons with disabilities eligible for exemptions would be able to be reimbursed in a timely fashion;

WHEREAS; the MTA’s poor track record of waste, inefficient investments of revenues and completing projects in a timely and cost-effective fashion necessitates a strong post-implementation plan to hold the MTA accountable, ensure they are meeting key performance metrics, and ensuring that there isn’t irreparable harm being done to the disability community;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Community Board 8 supports the following policies to address issues impacting persons with disabilities that will result from congestion pricing:

(1) The MTA shall impanel a council on mobility for individuals with disabilities to address challenges with using public transit and the impact of congestion pricing on individuals with disabilities.

(2) The MTA shall develop a viable, easy to use and timely method for individuals who are temporarily or permanently disabled, comprehensively defined, to seek exemptions while taking a TLC or for-hire vehicle or while using a personally-owned vehicle. This method should protect privacy and be available online or offline.

(3) The MTA shall report annually on data on how individuals with temporary or permanent disabilities travel into and out of the CBD.

(4) Revenues from congestion pricing shall be heavily prioritized for improving transit access for persons with disabilities, especially by making the subway system fully-accessible.

(5) New York City and New York State shall offer alternatives for individuals who are temporarily or permanently disabled to receive city or state services currently located in the CBD from paying the congestion pricing, such as through online services or alternative locations for services.

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

C. Street Life Committee – Abraham Salcedo, Chair

SL-1: Items 1B, 1C, 1D, 1E, 1F, 2B, 3A, 3B, 3C – **Unanimous Approvals**

SL-2: Item 1A Substitute

SL-3: Item 2A

Item 1B: **UME NY INC, dba UME, 1154 First Avenue Middle Store (Between 63rd and 64th 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.

Item 1C: **Corp to be formed, dba tbd, 1825 Second Avenue (Between 94th and 95th 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; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the application is **APPROVED**, subject to:

Item 1D: **Lamar NYC, LLC, dba Dulce Vida Latino Bistro, 309 E. 83rd Street (Between First and Second Avenues)** – New Application and Temporary Retail Permit 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

Item 1E: **Beluga Whale Sushi Inc., dba Ajsai Japanese Cuisine, 795 Lexington Avenue (Between 61st and 62nd Streets)** – New Application and Temporary Retail Permit 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

Item 1F: **Myconian House LLC., dba Myconian House, 25 E. 83rd Street (Between Madison and Fifth Avenues)** - 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 stipulate that they will file with the DOB, comply with ADA requirements and work with neighboring residents to resolve any ventilation issues; 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 2B **Tripti Inc., dba Moti Mahal Delux, 1149 First Avenue (Between 62nd and 63rd Streets)** –Class Change for Liquor, Wine, Beer & Cider License

WHEREAS this is a class change 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

Item 3A **Blue Hospitality LLC, dba Gray Hawk Grill, 1556 Second Avenue – 30 Day Waiver** – Renewal Application for Liquor, Wine, Beer & Cider License

WHEREAS this is a renewal 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

Item 3B: **Doria Enterprises NYC LLC, DBA Grace Marketplace 1299 Second Avenue** – 30 Day Waiver Renewal Application for Wine, Beer, and Cider License

WHEREAS this is a renewal 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

Item 3C: : **KOGV LLC dba Avena Ristorante - 22 East 66th Street** - 30 Day Waiver Renewal Application for Liquor, Wine, Beer and Cider License

WHEREAS this is a renewal 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

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

Item 1A: **828/850 Madison Avenue Members' Club Inc, dba TBD, 840 Madison Avenue (Between 69th and 70th Streets)** - New Application and Temporary Retail Permit for Liquor, Wine, Beer & Cider

Following the October 11, 2022, Street Life Committee, neighbors and the establishment agreed to revised stipulations. A motion was made to include these stipulations in the final resolution.

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

WHEREAS members from the public voiced their views both in objection and in support of the application; and

WHEREAS the applicant has engaged in a dialogue with the residents of the surrounding buildings; and

WHEREAS the applicant and the residents of the surrounding buildings have agreed to the attached draft stipulations to which the applicant will adhere; and

WHEREAS the applicant has also stipulated to continue to work with the residents to resolve any open areas of concern from the residents, in particular with respect to engineering, acoustic and odor; 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

Please find the full resolution, including the amended stipulations, at the following [link](#).

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 2A: **Shake Shack 152 E. 86 LLC, dba Shake Shack, 154 E. 86th St (Between Third and Lexington Avenues)** - Corporate Change for Wine, Beer & Cider License

WHEREAS Community Board 8 asks all entities submitting a corporate change application to the SLA to appear before the Street Life Committee to answer questions that board members or the public may have; and

WHEREAS most applicants to appear before the board, including many neighborhood small business that do not have a large number of employees; and

WHEREAS Shake Shack informed the CB8 board office that they would not appear before the committee because they were a large corporation with many locations; and

WHEREAS CB8 reiterated that the request is one we make of all applicants and that we could not make an exception and politely requested that they appear before the committee; and

WHEREAS Shake Shack explicitly refused to appear and stated that they would go over the head of CB8 and directly to the SLA; and

WHEREAS the correspondence is attached to this resolution; and

WHEREAS CB8 believes all applicant should be treated the same and appear before the committee whether they are a large corporation or a small local business; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the application is **DISAPPROVED**.

Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 37 in favor, 4 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause

Please find the communication with Shake Shack and the full resolution [here](#).

D. Landmarks Committee – David Helpern and Jane Parshall, Co-Chairs

LM-1: Items 1 and 2

LM-2: Motion To Table Item 3 – Failed

LM-3: Item 3 – **Approval**

Item 1: **3 East 78th Street (Metropolitan Museum Historic District)** - *Scott Koniacko, AIA* - A Francois Premiere Revival building designed by C.P.H. Gilbert and constructed in 1897-1899. Application is for changing two un-seeable windows on the fifth floor to a sliding door.

WHEREAS 3 East 78th Street is a Francois I (King of France 1515-1547) or “High Renaissance” revival-style building designed by C.P.H. Gilbert and constructed in 1897-1899.

WHEREAS C.P.H. Gilbert was one of the architectural giants of late 19th and early 20th century townhouses and mansions;

WHEREAS at the 5th story at 3 East 78th Street there is a gabled window consisting of 2 transom windows with sash windows below;

WHEREAS the applicant proposing replacing the sash windows and the center mullion that divides them with a sliding door that extends down for an additional 15” (from 4’4” to 5’8” — the change in height from the underside of the transom — so that the 3’6” balcony is more accessible;

WHEREAS the proposed window to be changed into a sliding door is not visible from the public way;

WHEREAS the existing stonework/carved limestone will not be violated;

WHEREAS the existing railing framing the 3’6” balcony is 36” high; to meet code requirements, the existing balcony will be built up by 6”;

WHEREAS the 6” addition to the existing balcony will be mounted on the inside of the existing railing for balcony and thus invades and disturbs original historic fabric;

WHEREAS it was never the intention of the architect that the balcony be used;

WHEREAS the 5th floor window is central to the composition of the front elevation, even though invisible from the public way;

WHEREAS removing the center mullion and changing the window to a sliding door is not appropriate for a building of this caliber and violates the original intent of the architect:

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

Item 2: **22 East 81st Street (Metropolitan Museum Historic District) - Drew Lang** - A brownstone constructed in 1883-84 by Thom & Wilson. Application is for facade renovation, window replacement, and adding a 3rd window at the 1st and 2nd floors.

WHEREAS 22 East 81st Street is a brownstone designed by Thom & Wilson and constructed in 1883-1884;

WHEREAS 22 East 81st Street was originally a brownstone townhouse but now presents as a modernist design;

WHEREAS the applicant, as part of an overall renovation, proposes to introduce a more traditional look, including the addition of a cornice and string courses at the first and second floors and below the cornice;

WHEREAS as part of the renovation, the applicant proposes to change the cladding on the house to limestone, revert to 3: windows at the 2nd floor where there are now two, and to install two new wood and glass doors at the ground level with a window in between;

WHEREAS all the proposed new windows at the front elevation would be single-pane black painted wood windows with limestone window surrounds;

WHEREAS the proposed new doors at the 1st floor (ground level) would also have limestone surrounds;

WHEREAS the original windows when the house presented as a brownstone were double-hung;

WHEREAS the applicant's proposal for the front elevation presents as timid and bland with a false uniformity and an austerity and lack of texture that is out of context within the historic district;

WHEREAS the applicant's proposal makes no reference to the original historic Brownstone;

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

Community Board 8 Manhattan approved these resolutions by a vote of 37 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause

Item 3: **1045 Park Avenue (Park Avenue Historic District) - Arthur Chabon Architects** - A Colonial Revival building designed by Schwartz and Gross constructed in 1922-1923. Application is for exterior renovations and modifications to penthouse apartment.

A motion was made to table Item 3. The motion to table **failed** by a vote of 7 in favor, 32 opposed, and 1 abstention.

WHEREAS 1045 Park Avenue has a two-story penthouse that was built incrementally;

WHEREAS a one-story penthouse was built initially; a partial second story added over half of the penthouse; and a partial second story added over the other half of the penthouse;

WHEREAS the original single-story penthouse was converted into two, two-story penthouses incorporating the two additions;

WHEREAS the two penthouses were converted into one penthouse;

WHEREAS the current penthouse is an agglomeration of styles and elements;

WHEREAS the renovation of the penthouse provides an opportunity to improve the appearance and the organization of the elements of the penthouse;

WHEREAS the rearrangement of the interiors is being done in concert with the exterior of the penthouse;

WHEREAS interior stairs will be demolished;

WHEREAS all windows and exterior doors will be removed;

WHEREAS the chimney for the second-floor fireplace will be demolished;

WHEREAS the great room on the second floor will be extended to the north;

WHEREAS a new stair in a metal and glass enclosure will be added to the north of the great room on the western side of the penthouse but within the footprint of the first floor of the penthouse;

WHEREAS a large, exterior spiral staircase will be added from the first-floor terrace to the second-floor terrace at the northern end of the penthouse and a small, exterior spiral staircase will be added from the second-floor terrace to the second-floor roof;

WHEREAS the railings of the spiral staircases, the railings on the terrace of the second floor, and the railings on the roof will be black, epoxy coated steel;

WHEREAS minor changes will be made to locations and/or sizes of windows and doors and all windows and doors will be replaced;

WHEREAS new windows will be aluminum clad wood windows;

WHEREAS new windows will be multi-pane top and bottom with clear glazing in the middle;

WHEREAS new windows will be similar to many windows in the building;

WHEREAS new doors will be aluminum clad wood doors with glazing similar to the windows;

WHEREAS windows will be aligned at the tops throughout the penthouse, creating a datum, and the arched windows on the second floor that will be removed will be replaced with windows that align with the new datum;

WHEREAS new doors and windows will be recessed to improve weathertightness and reflect the traditional set-in window relationships to walls;

WHEREAS metal on new doors and windows will have a Kynar coating to match the charcoal gray of the windows in the building;

WHEREAS the wood fireplace in the great room will be relocated and changed to gas;

WHEREAS the fireplace and the flue will be centered on the great room inside and outside;

WHEREAS the walls of the penthouse were originally stucco;

WHEREAS existing stucco will be repaired, and new stucco will be added, all in a smooth finish;

WHEREAS a new wood pergola, painted black, will be added to the northwest corner of the second floor of the penthouse;

WHEREAS the roof of the second floor will become a garden;

WHEREAS the water tower will remain in place;

WHEREAS the mass of the penthouse will be increased by slight changes in plan such as the enlargement of the great room;

WHEREAS the current penthouse is most visible from the northeast and southeast, the increased volume will add minimally to the visible mass of the penthouse from these views;

WHEREAS the visual disorder that was due to the incremental additions to the penthouse will be replaced with a visually ordered composition;

WHEREAS this major renovation of the existing penthouse will provide a coherent architectural statement;

WHEREAS the renovated penthouse will be 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 37 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause

E. Woman & Families Committee – P. Gayle Baron and Margaret Price, Co-Chairs

WF-1: Item 1

Item 1: Affirming Women’s Right to Access Reproductive Care

WHEREAS the Supreme Court’s recent landmark ruling in the case of Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization undermined the right of women to obtain an abortion, marking the first time in America that a broad privacy right was removed by judicial decision; and

WHEREAS, the Supreme Court’s overturning of the right to an abortion prompted a growing number of states to enact legislation to limit or ban the termination of a pregnancy and, in some cases, to punish those who provide an abortion; and

WHEREAS such restrictions on reproductive rights can create significant financial hardships, and potentially, health-threatening risks for women wishing to end a pregnancy in states that prohibit abortion; and

WHEREAS the New York State Legislature is addressing this infringement on women’s and others’ rights, through its proposed Equality Act (S.51002 and A.41002). This proposal would create an amendment to the state’s constitution barring discrimination, as the proposal states, “because of race, color ethnicity, national origin, gender expression, pregnancy, pregnancy outcomes, and reproductive healthcare and autonomy,” therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that Community Board 8, Manhattan affirms women’s right to access the reproductive options and care of their choice. CB8 further supports passage of the Equality Act in New York State, which would create an amendment to the state’s constitution that bans discrimination on the basis of race, color ethnicity, national origin, gender expression, pregnancy, pregnancy outcomes, and reproductive healthcare and autonomy.

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

F. Budget Committee – Felice Farber and Billy Freeland, Co-Chairs

BG-1: Contract for Land Use Consultant Substitute Motion

BG-2: Capital Budget Priorities

BG-3: District Needs Statement and Expense Budget Priorities

Item 1: Contract for Land Use Consultant

A substitute motion was made to vote on Resolution 1 from the Budget Committee Minutes, which had failed to pass at the Committee meeting.

WHEREAS, Community Board 8 Manhattan has previously engaged Tuck Edelstein of Edelstein Architecture P.C. (“Edelstein”) to develop and submit to Department of City Planning an application to create two special use districts with a height limit of 210 feet;

WHEREAS, Edelstein requires a new contract to perform any future work on the application that may be required;

WHEREAS, CB8 members have raised questions about Edelstein’s transparency, communication, and provision of information such as monthly reports, next steps, hours worked, and more;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Community Board 8 is not ending its efforts to support this project, and will vote on encumbering funds at a meeting in November 2022, contingent on Edelstein providing CB8 with a work plan for next steps, all monthly reports that we have asked for (indicating hours worked, activities, accomplishments, and next steps);

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, if Edelstein does not provide that information, CB8 will not continue working with Edelstein and will search for another planner, and no funds will be delivered without receiving the materials requested

Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 23 in favor, 17 opposed, 1 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause

Item 2: FY2024 Capital Budget Priorities

Community Board 8 Manhattan approved the Capital Budget Priorities by a vote of 39 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions and 0 not voting for cause

Item 3: FY2024 Expense Budget Priorities

Community Board 8 Manhattan approved the Expense Budget Priorities by a unanimous vote of 40 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.

Item 4: FY2024 Statement of District Needs

Community Board 8 Manhattan approved the District Needs Statement by a unanimous vote of 40 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.

11. Old Business – No items of Old Business were discussed
12. New Business – No items of New Business were discussed

The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 PM.

Russell Squire, Chair

Name	Attendance	TR-1	CP-1	SL-1 Unanimous Approvals	SL-2 Item 1A substitute	SL-3 Item 2A	LM-1 Items 1&2	LM-2 Item 3 table	LM-3 Item 3	WF-1	BG-1 Substitute Motion to Reso 1	BG-2 Capital Budget	BG-3 Exp Budget and District Needs
AGRAWAL, MOHIT	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ANGELOS, BILL	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
ARONSON, VANESSA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
ASHBY, ELIZABETH	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abst	Yes	No		
BARON, P. GAYLE	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
BIRNBAUM, MICHELE	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abst	Yes	No	No	Yes
BORES, LORI ANN	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BORRERO, TAINA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BROWN, LORAINE	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CAMP, ALIDA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Abst	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
CHU, SARAH	Excused												
COHN, ANTHONY	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
COLEMAN, SAUNDREA	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
CORMACK, LINDSEY	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DANGOOR, REBECCA	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
FARBER, FELICE	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
FREELAND, BILL	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
HARTZOG, EDWARD	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
HELPERN, DAVID P.	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
HUSAIN, SAHAR	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
JOHNSON, WILMA	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Abst	Yes	Yes
KRIKER, PAUL	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
LADER, CRAIG	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
LAMORTE, REBECCA	Excused												
LEHV. ADDESON	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Abst	Abst	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MASON, VALERIE	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abst	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
MCCLEMENT, JOHN	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
MEYERSON, EVAN	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MORRIS, GREGORY	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PARSHALL, JANE	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PHILIPS, JOHN	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
POPE-MARSHALL, SHARON	Excused												
POPPER, RITA	Excused												
PRICE, MARGARET	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
RODRIGUEZ-THOMA, YMA	Absent												
ROSE, ELIZABETH	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
RUDDER, BARBARA	Excused												
SALCEDO, ABRAHAM	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SANCHEZ, WILLIAM	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
SCHNEIDER, JUDY	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
SIGAL, RAMI	Present	Abst	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SPAGNOLETTI, COS	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
SQUIRE, RUSSELL	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
STRONG-SHINOZAKI, LYNNE	Excused												
SURESH, ANJU	Absent												
TAMAYO, MARCO	Present	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
TEJO, CAROLINA	Present	Abst	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WALD, ADAM	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WARREN, CHARLES	Present	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WEINER, SHARON	Excused												
Total Yes	41	26	41	41	40	37	37	7	37	41	23	39	40
Total No		13	0	0	1	4	1	32	0	0	17	1	0
Total Abstain		2	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	1	0	0
Total Not Vote For Cause		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Votes		41	41	41	41	41	40	40	40	41	41	40	40