

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	37 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Community Board Notification Act (NYS Senate bill S. 41)

WHEREAS: State government, acting through its own agencies or in contract with other organizations, provides a complete range of services on a local level, and

WHEREAS: Unlike the very public planning process prescribed in the City Charter for New York City government actions, the State often acts without any real public review, and

WHEREAS: The "Community Board Notification Act" would require state agencies and state funded organizations to notify the appropriate community board whenever they are buying, selling, leasing or renovating property, and

WHEREAS: Such notification would make Community Boards aware of new programs, changes in existing programs and the cessation of program services, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 wholeheartedly supports and urges the immediate adoption of NYS Senate bill S. 41.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	9 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	22 In Favor	15 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Restoration of Pier 26

WHEREAS: The Manhattan Borough President's Office and the Hudson River Park Conservancy have submitted a NY Jobs Bond Act application for funding to stabilize and restore Pier 26 in Tribeca, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 is extremely disturbed that there was a grossly inadequate community consultation process for the review of this and other NY Jobs Bond Act applications, and

WHEREAS: The failure to provide the Community Board with this application prior to the committee meeting, the insufficient presentation offered in committee, and the inability of the applicant to provide us with critical details of this proposal leaves the Board without the answers to many important questions and concerns, and

WHEREAS: The NYS Legislature must nonetheless immediately identify the projects which will be funded by the Bond Act if it is approved by the voters on November 3rd, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has always supported the restoration of Pier 26 for community use and would like to see the DOT tow pound and auction center relocated from the pier, and

WHEREAS: The Hudson River Park Conservancy has committed, in writing not to submit any final Job Bond Act application for stabilization and revitalization of these piers without the prior review and approval of CB #1, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 supports funding for the repair and restoration of Pier 26 subject to the following conditions:

- 1) CB #1 must fully participate in determining the scope of restoration for the

pier

- 2) CB #1 must fully participate in identifying the future use(s) of the pier
- 3) The restoration work for Pier 26 will not proceed until CB #1 has fully approved the scope of work and future use plans for the pier, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 will only approve a future application which calls for community use of Pier 26 and no development on the pier, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 insists that in the future we be fully consulted well in advance on any and all proposals for work in our neighborhood.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	28 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Lower Broadway/Lower Manhattan Mixed-Use District Study

WHEREAS: On May 6, 1988 Community Board #1 submitted a request to the Dept. of City Planning to lower the current high density zoning within Tribeca east of the LMM District, and this request was presented with the aim of preserving the existing scale and historic district character of the neighborhood, and

WHEREAS: To date DCP has not responded to our request, despite extensive supporting documentation from CB #1 (enclosed) and significant community support including a petition signed by 1200 neighborhood residents requesting downzoning of the area, and

WHEREAS: Certain members of CB #1 attended briefing sessions at DCP with the understanding that DCP would work seriously toward implementing our request, and

WHEREAS: It soon became apparent that DCP was not going to respond to CB #1's request but was distorting it in order to study issues beyond the scope, boundaries and objectives of CB #1's request, and

WHEREAS: DCP's recently released "discussion document" ignores our downzoning request and merely presents three narrow options, all of which are not only detrimental to preserving the existing character of the area but are also not in context with the existing Tribeca West Historic District and the proposed Tribeca East and Tribeca South Historic Districts, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 requests that DCP withdraw its Lower Broadway/Lower Manhattan Mixed-Use District Study "discussion document" and respond in great detail and without further delay to our original request for downzoning of Tribeca east of the LMM District, which would preserve the existing scale and historic character of the neighborhood.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	26 In Favor	1 Opposed	1 Abstained

RE: 22 Ericcson Place, New York Blood Center, Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness (C of A)

WHEREAS: CB #1 acknowledges the complexity of the task, and fully appreciates the sensitive treatment reflected in the proposal by the architects Platt and Byard to transform a former warehouse into functional office space, all the while preserving the historical and architectural essence of the building, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1, in general, wholeheartedly supports the project as presented and recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the above referenced application for a C of A, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: While believing the large size of the window openings to be appropriate, CB #1 asks only that the architects take another look at the proposed color of the window frames and the complexity (number of divisions) of the window panes.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: COMBINED SOCIAL SERVICES AND  
SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	27 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained

RE: CIS Counseling Center, 150 Nassau Street

WHEREAS: CIS Counseling Center has requested letters of support to include in its applications for licenses to the NYS Division of Substance Abuse Services (DSAS) and the NYS Division of Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse (DAAA), and

WHEREAS: Possession of these two licenses will enable CIS to provide counseling services to additional clients, and specifically, allow the center to respond to the needs of formerly alcohol and/or chemically dependent persons, and

WHEREAS: CIS has committed to conduct further outreach, in particular to Lower Manhattan's residential communities, to advise them of the array and availability of services provided by the Center, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that DSAS and DAAA approve the licenses applied for by CIS Counseling Services.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	37 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Capital and Expense Budget Requests for FY 1994

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the budget requests for our district as prioritized on the attached.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

BOARD VOTE:            28 In Favor            0 Opposed            0 Abstained

RE:                    Tribeca Historic Districts

WHEREAS:            The NYC Landmarks Commission originally scheduled for public hearing four Tribeca Historic Districts in June 1989, and

WHEREAS:            CB #1 overwhelmingly supported the proposed designation of these districts and in fact urged that their boundaries be enlarged, and

WHEREAS:            Only one Tribeca Historic District, "Tribeca West" has been actually designated by the commission, and

WHEREAS:            CB #1's early and continuing support for the creation of these districts was echoed in a recent survey in which 71% of Tribeca residents called the preservation of historic districts a high priority, and

WHEREAS:            The efforts by our community and our Community Board to assist the LPC with volunteer work date back to 1984, and in fact the earliest consideration of Tribeca for district designation dates back to the 1970's, and

WHEREAS:            Each day brings with it the threat of losing more of the historic fabric which helps create Tribeca's unique sense of place and contributes to making it a true encyclopedia of 19th century urban commercial architecture, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT:                CB #1 urges the LPC to move quickly and without further delay to designate the three remaining Tribeca historic districts, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT:                CB #1 urges that the LPC devote the same level of attention to the individual Tribeca landmarks proposed for designation over two years ago.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HOUSING

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	20 In Favor	0 Opposed	8 Abstained*

RE: Interim Rent Guidelines for Lofts

WHEREAS: The NYC Loft Board should equitably uphold the provisions of the Loft Law for those owners and tenants covered by the 1987 Amendment to the Law, and

WHEREAS: The proposed interim rent increase regulation fails to acknowledge the tenants' rights to regulated rent since 1987, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 requests that the NYC Loft Board reconsider its proposed regulation to adequately reflect the tenants' rights to fair and regulated rent.

\*including C. Delaney for cause.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HOUSING

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	27 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained

RE: Equity in real estate taxes

WHEREAS: The Co-ops, condos and rental buildings of Lower Manhattan are already assessed at one of the highest proportional value of market value to assessed value in the entire City of New York, and

WHEREAS: It is clear to even the Department of Finance's own studies that the inequities against all co-ops, condos and rentals (Class II property) within the City of New York are severe when compared to single family houses (1-2-3 family houses and everything in Class I properties), and

WHEREAS: The Department of Finance has completed a study showing how all residential housing can be merged more fairly into one class (with full market value as the assessed value), and

WHEREAS: The State legislature will first look to a home rule message from the City Council and the Mayor, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 urges that the City Council and Mayor's Office immediately act on trying to rectify the inequities between Class I and Class II properties, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

The State Legislators representing New York City expeditiously act on this proposal.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HOUSING

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	26 In Favor	1 Opposed	1 Abstained

RE: Change in the 80-20% IRS Ruling

WHEREAS: Lower Manhattan is one of the neighborhoods where the ground floor value (assessed or market value) is usually more than 20% of the value of the entire building, and

WHEREAS: It is the 80-20% rule that must be met in order for co-ops to use the IRS deductions on mortgage interest and real estate taxes like houses and condos, and

WHEREAS: The form of co-ops as compared to condominiums is mostly a New York City form of housing not common in any other state of the Union, thus giving the NY legislators the need to take the lead, and

WHEREAS: The City of New York must assess the entire co-op building with one tax assessment for both the store and the upper residential floors, and

WHEREAS: Any part of the stores' assessed value that is over the 20% figure is shifted to the upper floor residential shareholders, forcing the residents to pay the tax burden of the store, and

WHEREAS: Many of these ground floor stores are under long term leases from the sponsor of the co-op conversion plan and cannot be changed for many years to come, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 urges all federal legislators representing New York City (but especially areas like Lower Manhattan with extremely valuable ground floor space) to explore changing the wording of the 80-20% fixed percentage rule to be more flexible to allow the store's tax burden to be passed through from the store to the co-op, and

BE IT  
FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT:

The State Attorney General's Office should better expose this problem to future shareholders in future co-op conversions, and should work toward trying to get a judicial or legislative modification to former co-op plans that have this problem.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: CITY SERVICES

COMMITTEE VOTE:	11 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	28 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Increased Police Presence in CB #1

WHEREAS: For the past several years CB #1 has repeatedly requested that the NYPD-1st Pct. increase the number of police officers on the street in the district's residential neighborhoods, particularly during evening, night and weekend tours, and

WHEREAS: In response to the Board's request a succession of 1st Pct commanders has promised that with the advent of "Community Policing" this request would be realized, and

WHEREAS: Two years into "Community Policing", the Community Board sees little, if any, evidence of an increased police presence in its residential neighborhoods, particularly evenings, nights and weekends, and

WHEREAS: The current pattern of deployment seems to evidence little recognition on the part of the 1st Pct. and the Manhattan South Patrol Borough Command of the undeniable and unprecedented growth in Community Board's residential population (up 134.1%, 1970-80; up 59.4%, 1980-90), and the opening of Battery Park City's multi-billion dollar financial complex which operates 24 hours a day, and

WHEREAS: As long as its members can remember, there have been only 2 patrols cars assigned to the entire district at night, and because this situation continues, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 continues to receive reports and expressions of concern over growing crime by residents of Independence Plaza, Tribeca, Battery Park City, the South Street Seaport vicinity and Southbridge Towers, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 again urges the 1st Pct and the Manhattan South Patrol Borough Command to immediately deploy/redeploy substantial additional numbers of police officers to the streets in CB #1's residential communities particularly evenings, nights and on weekends.