

Valerie S. Mason  
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, April 17, 2024 - 6:30 PM**

**This meeting was conducted in a hybrid format in person and via Zoom  
Ramaz School - Heyman Auditorium  
125 East 85th Street (Between Park and Lexington Avenues)**

**MINUTES:**

**Community Board Members Present:** Michael Anderson, Elizabeth Ashby, P. Gayle Baron, Jennifer Bayer Michaels, Michele Birnbaum, Lori Bores, Alida Camp, Juno Chowla-Song, Sarah Chu, Anthony Cohn, Saundra Coleman, Lindsey Cormack, Felice Farber, Billy Freeland, Ed Hartzog, Bradley Hershenson, David P. Helpern, Sahar Husain, Wilma Johnson, Paul Krikler, Craig Lader, Valerie Mason, John McClement, Evan Meyerson, Jane Parshall, Sharon Pope-Marshall, Rita Popper, Peggy Price, Elizabeth Rose, Barbara Rudder, Abraham Salcedo, Will Sanchez, Jack Sasson, Judy Schneider, Robin Seligson, Russell Squire, Marco Tamayo, Adam Wald and Chuck Warren, and Sharon Weiner.

**Community Board Members Virtual:** Taina Borrero (Work Travel), CJ Mossman (Health), and John Philips (Family Caregiving).

**Community Board Members Excused:** Bill Angelos and Addeson Lehv.

**Community Board Members Absent:** Rebecca Lamorte and Cos Spagnoletti.

**Total Attendance: 43**

**Chair Valerie S. Mason called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.**

**1. Public Session**

- Christina Delfico representing iDig2Learn spoke about updates on Roosevelt Island.
- Julie Burke spoke in opposition to the opening of a wine bar at 164 East 88<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Andrew Fine representing the E-Vehicle Safety Alliance spoke in opposition to e-bikes.
- Paul Foschi spoke in favor of the revocable consent application at 38 East 75<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Evelyn David spoke in opposition to the Congestion Pricing Program.
- Maggie Leahman spoke in favor of pedestrian safety.
- Mubeen Siddiqui representing Muslims Volunteers For New York spoke about that organization's updates.
- Motoko Shoboji spoke in favor of borough priority for Manhattan residents in the high school admissions process.
- Maureen Herzog spoke in favor of borough priority for Manhattan residents in the high school admissions process.
- Lisa Marks spoke in favor of borough priority for Manhattan residents in the high school admissions process.
- Stephanie Sterling spoke in favor of borough priority for Manhattan residents in the high school admissions process.

- Smita Day spoke in favor of borough priority for Manhattan residents in the high school admissions process.
- Jax Schott spoke in favor of borough priority for Manhattan residents in the high school admissions process.
- Silvina Dutruel spoke in favor of borough priority for Manhattan residents in the high school admissions process.
- Marcus Kupferschmidt spoke in favor of borough priority for Manhattan residents in the high school admissions process.
- Michael Fermaglich spoke in favor of borough priority for Manhattan residents in the high school admissions process.

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**

- State Assembly Member Rebecca Seawright
- State Senator Liz Krueger
- Council Member Keith Powers
- Representative Jerry Nadler
- State Senator Jose Serrano
- Assembly Member Alex Bores
- Council Member Julie Menin
- New York City Comptroller Brad Lander
- Manhattan District Attorney Alvin Bragg

6. **Chair’s Report – Valerie S. Mason**

Chair Valerie S. Mason gave her report.

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

District Manager Will Brightbill gave his report.

8. **Committee Reports and Action Items**

A. **Landmarks Committee – Anthony Cohn and David Helpert, Co-Chairs**

- LM-1: Item 1
- LM-2: Item 2
- LM-3: Item 3
- LM-4: Item 4
- LM-5: Item 5

Item 1: **61 East 77th Street (Upper East Side Historic District) – Christopher J. Stone – A Neo-Federal style building with Beaux-Arts style features designed by Harde and Hasselman and constructed in 1916. Application is to replace the existing front stoop to remove a step at the entry door and add a step to the outer steps to the sidewalk, replace the existing entry doors with touch pad-activated doors complying with ADA requirements, provide a walkway over a former window areaway behind an existing fence, and provide an ADA handicap lift at the east end of this areaway.**

**WHEREAS** 61 East 77th Street is a Neo-Federalist style building with Beaux-Arts style features;

**WHEREAS** 65 East 77th Street is a modern addition to the 77th Street building;

**WHEREAS** the purpose of the application is to make the stairs at the stoop code compliant, eliminate the unsafe step up at the entrance doors, and provide accessibility for people with disabilities;

**WHEREAS** the existing front stoop and railings are symmetrical in front of the original 61 East 77th Street building;

**WHEREAS** the stoop will be reconstructed by adding one step to the front and three steps to create a platform at the top that is at the same elevation as the interior lobby;

**WHEREAS** the four steps will move the stoop towards the curb by seven inches;

**WHEREAS** the four existing pillars are symmetrical about the front of the original East 77th Street building;

**WHEREAS** the pillars are connected by metal picket fences that terminate at piers in the building's façade;

**WHEREAS** the modern addition is tied to the original building at the ground level by continuing the plane and materiality of the front wall and the cornice at the top of the front wall;

**WHEREAS** the lift for people with disabilities will be in front of the modern addition;

**WHEREAS** the lift will be over an existing areaway;

**WHEREAS** the equipment for powering the lift will be concealed by a freestanding wall and column that is in line with the pillars;

**WHEREAS** the wall and column replicate the coursing of the wall of the modern addition;

**WHEREAS** the column is about the same height as the pillars and the wall is set down from the column;

**WHEREAS** the pillars have projecting caps, the new column has a flush cap, and the wall has no cap;

**WHEREAS** the lift is 4'-8" wide and the space in front of the lift is 5'-0" wide to enable a wheelchair to turn around;

**WHEREAS** six vertical posts are eliminated from the eastern fence of the stoop to enable a walkway from the lift to the platform at the top of the stoop;

**WHEREAS** the posts in the existing fences terminate in arrow heads;

**WHEREAS** the new column and wall are connected to the easternmost post by a concrete base with a recess for trash and a metal fence above;

**WHEREAS** the connecting metal fence is similar to the existing fences but without arrowheads;

**WHEREAS** new metal handrails are added at either side of the steps and a new metal handrail is added at the center of the steps;

**WHEREAS** the stoop and the walkway will be concrete in a grey color already approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission;

WHEREAS the lift will be black to match the color of the fences and railings;

WHEREAS the changes to the stoop and the addition of the lift are discretely integrated into the composition of the building;

WHEREAS this project is appropriate and contextual within the historic district;

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

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

Item 2: 817 Fifth Avenue (Upper East Side Historic District) – Presentation Prepared by Christina Redmond, R.A. of Midtown Preservation Architecture & Engineering, P.C. – A Neo-Renaissance style building designed by George B. Post & Sons and constructed in 1924. Application is for a Window Master Plan.

WHEREAS 817 Fifth Avenue is an apartment house at the southeast corner of Fifth Avenue and East 63rd Street and contributes to the character of the Upper East Side Historic District; and

WHEREAS the applicant wishes to implement a Window Master Plan to assure uniformity of window replacement in the future; and

WHEREAS the applicant is to be commended for attempting to implement a Window Master Plan; and

WHEREAS the proposed Master Plan will mandate single-lite tilt-and-turn aluminum windows on the Fifth Avenue side and one-over-one double-hung aluminum windows on the East 63rd Street side; and

WHEREAS the proposed windows will have a clear anodized aluminum finish; and

WHEREAS the existing windows are uniformly tilt-and-turn on the Fifth Avenue façade and predominately one-over-one double-hung on the 63rd Street side; and

WHEREAS the original windows in the building were six-over-six wood windows; and

WHEREAS the proposed Window Master Plan will preserve and enshrine an awkward juxtaposition between the street-facing facades; and

WHEREAS the existing tilt-and-turn windows are, despite their long-standing presence on the building, inappropriate to the style and period of the original construction; and

WHEREAS the proposed finish is inappropriate to the style and period of the original construction;

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

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

Item 3: 41 East 74th Street (Upper East Side Historic District) – Sherida E. Paulsen, FAIA – A Queen Anne style building designed by James E. Ware and constructed in 1879, with a façade alteration by Gurdon S. Parker in 1941. Application is for an alteration of the street façade, including realigning the lowest two stories, a new face brick and stone base, new stone cornice, window replacements, and a new stoop, as well as for a full height extension, a two-story addition, and an adjusted grade in the rear yard.

WHEREAS 41 East 74th Street is a building with no significant architectural detail;

**WHEREAS** the building had lost its ornamentation over time;

**WHEREAS** this lack of detail creates an opportunity to introduce a style for the building that fits with the range of styles on the Street;

**WHEREAS** the renovation starts with the realignment of the floors;

**WHEREAS** the basement level will be raised to be flush with the sidewalk and increase the ceiling height in the cellar;

**WHEREAS** the second floor will be raised to make up for the height lost on the first floor by raising the cellar level;

**WHEREAS** the cellar will be extended by excavating under the rear yard;

**WHEREAS** an “L” shaped stoop will be added to the front of the building echoing the stoop that was originally built;

**WHEREAS** the stoop will not extend out further than the original stoop;

**WHEREAS** the outer edge of the stoop will align with the edge of the areaway of the building next door to the east;

**WHEREAS** the edge of the stoop will be ten feet from the curb;

**WHEREAS** the sills of the second-floor windows will be raised six inches;

**WHEREAS** the stucco and one layer of face brick will be removed from the existing façade;

**WHEREAS** a new layer of brick will be applied to the façade;

**WHEREAS** a new limestone cornice will be installed;

**WHEREAS** the new cornice will project and mask the view of the new bulkhead;

**WHEREAS** the windows will be double hung, one over one, to match the original windows;

**WHEREAS** the major materials include medium-colored red and brown brick, limestone stoop and base, red oak wood doors, cast stone sills and lintels, white windows, and black iron railings;

**WHEREAS** the rear of the building will be reconfigured to eliminate the narrow extension;

**WHEREAS** the top three floors will be set back to align with the façade of the building to the east;

**WHEREAS** the bottom two floors will be set forward of the upper floors to create a 30-foot rear yard;

**WHEREAS** the rear yard, which was at the original basement level, will be raised to be at the new first floor level;

**WHEREAS** the ground floor will have full height windows;

**WHEREAS** the windows above will be double hung, one over one, wood windows;

**WHEREAS** the major materials include medium-colored red and brown brick, cast stone sills and lintels, black windows, and a stucco bulkhead:

**WHEREAS** this redesign looks to the history of the building, the neighboring buildings; and the street;

**WHEREAS** this project is appropriate and contextual 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 32 in favor, 10 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

Item 4: **650 Park Avenue (Upper East Side Historic District) – CTA Architects – A no style building designed by John M. Kokkins and constructed in 1962-1963. Application is a proposal to redesign the bottom two floors of street facades.**

**WHEREAS** 650 Park Avenue is an apartment house at the southwest corner of Park Avenue and East 67th Street and is a “no style” building within the Upper East Side Historic District; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant wishes to redesign the elements of the lower two floors to more closely resemble the original, unexecuted design; and

**WHEREAS** the Office of Emery Roth and Sons originally designed the building and produced the perspective views upon which this application is based; and

**WHEREAS** the Architect of Record, John M. Kokkins, was also the owner of the construction company that built 650 Park Avenue, and made changes to the original design, presumably for cost reasons; and

**WHEREAS** the existing Park Avenue façade is white brick with dark granite at the first floor and portions of the second floor at the entrance, with some white marble accents at the center three bays; and

**WHEREAS** the existing East 67th Street façade is entirely of white brick, with almost none of the originally designed “ornament”; and

**WHEREAS** the canopy at the main entrance on Park Avenue is not the original design and the canopy at the service entrance and garage entrance on 67th Street appears to be the original design; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant proposes to recreate the original design with a thick black marble band at the first floor window heads and to replace the dark granite pilasters at the entrance with black marble; and

**WHEREAS** the balance of the first floor on the Park Avenue and 67th Street façades will be white marble with a black marble base, as in the original design; and

**WHEREAS** the thick black marble band will continue along the 67th Street façade to the garage entrance; and

**WHEREAS** the canopies will be replaced with more “period appropriate” designs; and

**WHEREAS** the existing planter will be pulled away from the corner, reduced in height, and faced with white marble; and

**WHEREAS** sconces will be placed at the corner and at the entrances; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has proposed great improvements to the lower section of the building; and

WHEREAS the applicant proposes changes much in keeping with the period and character of the existing building;

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

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

Item 5: 1115 Fifth Avenue (Carnegie Hill Historic District Expanded) – Henry S. Jessup – A Neo-Renaissance style building designed by J.E.R. Carpenter and constructed in 1925-26. Application is for the reconstruction of the ca. 1929 glass penthouse enclosure as well as alterations to the south and east penthouse elevations.

WHEREAS the building was constructed in 1925-26;

WHEREAS the glass penthouse was installed in 1929;

WHEREAS the glass penthouse was supported directly on the Fifth Avenue parapet;

WHEREAS the original penthouse had a high portion to the south and a lower portion to the north;

WHEREAS the fenestration and roofing went through a series of alterations that included the addition of two shorter bays to the north;

WHEREAS the existing structure will be replaced with a steel structure with short cantilevers to support the new windows;

WHEREAS supporting the windows independent of the parapet will enable the parapet to be repaired;

WHEREAS the new fenestration will have a series of heavy vertical mullions expressing the new columns that sit on the existing beams and thinner mullions that subdivide the glazing;

WHEREAS the glazing will be a combination of fixed glass and inward opening casements;

WHEREAS the taller windows will have a transom;

WHEREAS the taller fenestration will turn the corner to create a glass corner at the southwest corner of the building, similar to the original condition;

WHEREAS the heights above the parapet of the south and north sections of the new glass facade will be 14'-8" and 10'-4 3/4" respectively, closely matching the original heights;

WHEREAS the heights of the existing closure walls will be slightly higher than the glass facades;

WHEREAS a new window will be placed in the south façade to align with the window below;

WHEREAS the existing window to the east of the new window will be re-sized so that the two windows in the Penthouse and the two windows below will be the same;

WHEREAS there are terraces to the north and east;

WHEREAS the massing and the visibility of the penthouse are unchanged;

WHEREAS multi-pane windows and door on the secondary east elevation will be changed from multi-pane windows to single pane windows, to be more consistent with the Fifth Avenue windows;

**WHEREAS** the window wall along Fifth Avenue will closely match the original height;

**WHEREAS** the cornice will be narrow, and the cornice and mullions will be dark in color;

**WHEREAS** this reconstruction of the glass penthouse enclosure is similar to the original;

**WHEREAS** the existing tall and short portions have different window types and cornices;

**WHEREAS** the reconstruction of the glass penthouse creates an ordered façade;

**WHEREAS** this project is appropriate and contextual within the historic district;

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

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

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

TR-1: Item 1  
TR-2: Item 2

Item 1: **Queensboro Bridge South Outer Roadway Conversion**

**WHEREAS;** NYCDOT is proposing the conversion of the South Outer Roadway of the Queensboro Bridge to a pedestrian pathway; and

**WHEREAS;** Community Board 8 passed a resolution in January 2020 asking NYCDOT to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of converting the South Outer Roadway to a dedicated pedestrian pathway to allow bikes and pedestrians to be separated; and

**WHEREAS;** the current pedestrian route across the Queensboro Bridge is via a shared bike/pedestrian pathway on the North Outer Roadway that is extremely dangerous for pedestrians due to the high speeds of bikes as they descend towards the exits; and

**WHEREAS;** the 8,000 average daily vehicles using the South Outer Roadway is less than the combined bike and pedestrian traffic on the Bridge; and

**WHEREAS;** the impacts on congestion resulting from the closure of the South Outer Roadway to vehicles are expected to be minimal; and

**WHEREAS;** NYCDOT is proposing a series of changes to 59th Street to ensure safe pedestrian access to the South Outer Roadway while maintaining required vehicular access to existing parking garages and NYCDOT maintenance facilities; and

**WHEREAS;** NYCDOT is conducting further study to determine the feasibility of a midblock crosswalk on 59th Street adjacent to the proposed entrance to the South Outer Roadway pedestrian pathway; and

**WHEREAS;** ensuring that all access points are fully accessible and safe for all users is essential;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** that Community Board 8 Manhattan supports the plan, as presented by NYCDOT, to convert the South Outer Roadway of the Queensboro Bridge from a vehicular use to a dedicated pedestrian pathway;



**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that Community Board 8 Manhattan requests that NYCDOT include a midblock crosswalk on 59th Street that is fully accessible and has traffic control in place.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 39 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**Item 2: Revocable Consent Application to construct, maintain and use a fenced-in areaway with steps at 38 East 75th Street**

**WHEREAS**; 38 East 75th Street is seeking a revocable consent to construct, maintain and use a fenced-in areaway;

**WHEREAS**; the proposed areaway would be in conjunction with a recentering of the front entranceway of the property; and

**WHEREAS**; the proposed fence would extend 4'7"; beyond the property line, bringing it in line with the adjacent properties; and

**WHEREAS**; the proposed effective sidewalk width will be 6'; and

**WHEREAS**; 6' of clearance was perceived as insufficient for pedestrians, especially those who are pushing strollers or using wheelchairs; and

**WHEREAS**; limiting public right of way on this block was not going to provide a benefit to the general public;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that Community Board 8 Manhattan disapproves the revocable consent application to construct, maintain and use a fenced-in areaway with steps at 38 East 75th Street.

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 39 in favor, 3 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**C. Street Life Committee – Lindsey Cormack and Abraham Salcedo, Co-Chairs**

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

SL-2: Item 2A

SL-3: Item 4A

SL-4: Item 1C

**Item 1A: Chef Adriano Inc., dba TBD, 1198 First Avenue (Between East 64th and East 65th Streets) New Application and Temporary Retail Permit for Wine, Beer and Cider**

**WHEREAS** this is a New application for a Wine, Beer, and Cider License and Temporary Retail Permit; 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; therefore

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

**Item 1B: MakeThai Inc., dba Grata Thai, 1099 First Avenue (Between East 60th and East 61st Streets) New Application and Temporary Retail Permit for Liquor, Wine, Beer and Cider**

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

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

**WHEREAS** the applicant agreed to the stipulation that the rear yard will not be used unless the applicant has the lawful right to do so, such as by a certificate of occupancy or letter of no objection, and

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

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

**Item 1D: Nomad 373 LLC., dba Rafael, 973 Lexington Avenue (Between East 70th and East 71st Streets) New Application and Temporary Retail Permit for Liquor, Wine, Beer and Cider**

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

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

**WHEREAS** the applicant agreed to the stipulation that the rear yard will not be used unless the applicant has the lawful right to do so, such as by a certificate of occupancy or letter of no objection, and

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

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

**Item 1E: Cilantro East NYC LLC., dba Cilantro NYC, 1712 Second Avenue, (Between East 88th Street and East 89th Street) New Application and Temporary Retail Permit for Liquor, Wine, Beer and Cider**

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

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

**WHEREAS** the applicant agreed to the stipulation that the rear yard will not be used unless the applicant has the lawful right to do so, such as by a certificate of occupancy or letter of no objection, and

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

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

**Item 3A: Arturos Park Inc., 1617 York Avenue (Between East 85th and East 86th Streets) 30 Day Waiver Renewal 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 and; therefore

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

**Item 3B: Taste of Shanghai Restaurant Inc, 242 East 79th Street (Between Second and Third Avenues) 30 Day Waiver Renewal 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 and; therefore

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

**Item 3C: Beautemps Inc dba Momokawa, 1466 First Avenue (Between East 76th and East 77th Streets) 30 Day Waiver Renewal Application for Liquor, Wine, Beer and Cider**

**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 and; 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 42 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**Item 2A: Yorkville Mansion Inc., dba Mansion Restaurant, 1634 York Avenue (Between East 86th and East 87th Streets) Class Change Application for Liquor, Wine, Beer and Cider**

**WHEREAS** this is a class change application to a Liquor, Wine, Beer, and Cider License from 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 and; therefore

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

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 41 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions, and 1 not voting for cause.**

**Item 4A: Cove Collective Corp 221 East 86th Street (Between Second and Third Avenues) - Application to the Office of Cannabis Management for a New Provisional Adult-Use Retail Dispensary License**

**WHEREAS** this is a new application for a retail dispensary; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has not submitted any documentation to Community Board 8; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant was previously laid over from December 2023, January 2024, February 2024, and the March 2024 Street Life Meetings and

**WHEREAS** this applicant was invited to the April 2024 Street Life Committee Meeting on March 14th and follow up emails were sent to the applicant on March 21st, 25th, 27th, 28th, 29th, and April 1st, and Community Board 8 called the applicant on March 29th and April 1st and 2nd, and

**WHEREAS** the applicant did not appear at the April 2024 Street Life Committee meeting; therefore

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

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

**Item 1C: Fork and Cork LLC., dba Bar Vivent, 164 East 88th Street (Between Third and Lexington Avenues) New Application and Temporary Retail Permit for Wine, Beer and Cider**

**WHEREAS** this side street block is zoned R8B, and the current retail spaces on the block were grandfathered as permitted,

**WHEREAS** members of the public spoke in opposition to the establishment of a wine bar midblock on a quiet side street whose current commercial establishments are only non-food and do not have evening hours

**WHEREAS** the proposed wine bar is to be located at a site that was formerly a dry cleaning establishment,

**WHEREAS** the building was built prior to 1938 so it has no certificate of occupancy

**WHEREAS** the applicant proposes to use the rear yard for additional table service and serve customers until 11:00 pm

**WHEREAS** there was concern as to whether the proposed use of the rear yard was lawful

**WHEREAS** the applicant acknowledged that its proposed use was not as of right and they were seeking approval from the Department of Buildings

**WHEREAS** applicant does not have a certificate of occupancy, and does not have a department of building approval or letter of no objection to its proposed novel use

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

**Community Board 8 Manhattan approved this resolution by a vote of 22 in favor, 17 opposed, 2 abstentions, and 0 not voting for cause.**

**9. Old Business** – No items of Old Business were discussed

**10. New Business** – No items of New Business were discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:59 PM

*Valerie S. Mason, Chair*

