

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 16, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HOUSING

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained  
BOARD VOTE: ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION

RE: Graffiti Prevention

WHEREAS: Our Community Board is about to add three more Historic Districts to the already vast number of landmarked buildings, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 is already on record for the various detrimental effects that graffiti is having on the property values, economy, tourism, quality of life and physical destruction of landmarked buildings, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 request that the Police Department focus on this issue and keep CB #1 informed of any arrests, or strategies to keep the problem from growing, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: The Police Department should work with local merchants to serve as eyes on the street at night and supply them with communications to be able to respond more rapidly to catch some of the vandals, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 makes a policy that no solid, metal gates would be allowed on landmarked buildings. The appropriate committee would decide if open slat gates would be appropriate in some circumstances, but that solid gates would be prohibited.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 16, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained  
BOARD VOTE: ADOPTED WITHOUT OBJECTION

RE: 143-145 Fulton St., Application to the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA) for a Special Permit (219-92 BZ)

WHEREAS: Lucille Roberts Figure Salons has applied to the BSA to re-establish a Special Permit to operate a club/physical culture establishment (10 years) at 143-145 Fulton St., and

WHEREAS: CB #1 recommended approval of the initial Special Permit granted by the BSA in July 1984, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has no knowledge or record of complaints regarding the operation of this Lucille Roberts facility, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the BSA approve the above referenced application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 16, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	26 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: 9 Jay St., Application for Certificate of Appropriateness (931778)

WHEREAS: CB #1 appreciates the concept and overall design for the proposed conversion of this former hospital annex building - including the introduction of additional window panels into the bridge over Staple St. -to showroom/living space, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) approve the above referenced application, as amended on February 16, 1993.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 16, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	2 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	15 In Favor	2 Opposed	8 Abstained

RE: 335 Greenwich St., application for a Certificate of Appropriateness (930477)

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: If the Department of Buildings first determines that the proposed greenhouse will not constitute additional floor area (living space) which would be illegal since the building is already "over-built", then CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the above referenced application as submitted.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 16, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	25 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: FY 1994 Preliminary Budget

WHEREAS: The Mayor has released his FY 1994 Preliminary Budget for public comments, and

WHEREAS: This budget fails to provide funding for virtually any of CB #1's capital and expense budget requests, and

WHEREAS: This thorough failure to abide by any of CB #1's recommendations has been the rule rather than the exception over the years, and

WHEREAS: We recognize that the City is in the midst of a serious budget crisis forcing it to cut many desirable programs and projects, and

WHEREAS: This Community Board has been unable for years to obtain one cent of City funding for badly needed park projects we have been recommending including at site 5C, 250 Water St., the site 5C easement, Battery Park, City Hall Park and Duane Street Park, while we see that the City has plenty of money for certain projects not recommended by our Board which the City deems appropriate including \$8.35 million in City funds for the renovation of Foley Square Park, and

WHEREAS: This is but one example of the City's complete refusal to seriously consider our annual budget requests which has effectively turned the Community Board's participation in the budget process into a thorough waste of time and effort, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 expresses its outrage at both the City's refusal to provide funds for this community's most pressing needs and the City's exercise of a budget process which ignores CB #1's requests, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 demands that a full investigation by the Mayor's Office, City Council and the OMB take place to examine why the spirit and intent of the City Charter granting communities and Community Boards a role in the budget process has not been achieved, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 sees no reason to participate in the City's budget process until meaningful reforms are instituted in this process to insure that agencies are far more responsive to Community Board requests and priorities when they determine which programs and projects are funded in each district.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 16, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	18 In Favor	0 Opposed	5 Abstained

RE: NYS DOT Draft Payback Waiver Request

WHEREAS: CB #1 is on record as supporting a good-faith application for a maximum possible payback waiver for the Westway Right-of-Way, and

WHEREAS: NYS DOT's Draft revised Payback Waiver Application appears to contain the same deficiencies that caused disqualification of their 1990 application, so that it does not appear to be in good faith, and

WHEREAS: Instead of submitting specific details which would qualify for a payback waiver, the application offers the Westside Waterfront Panel's non-specific and as-yet not approved recommendations, most of which would disqualify a payback waiver under current regulations, and

WHEREAS: The application does not even seek a waiver for 107 acres of the 330 acre Right-of-Way, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 calls upon New York State to submit a good-faith application for the maximum possible payback waiver, citing specifics and details that seek compliance rather than confrontation with FHWA's standards for a payback waiver, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 calls upon New York State to review the Westside Waterfront Panel final report, delete all designated re-uses such as park-related commercial uses and maritime commercial uses, because by their very nature they disqualify the application for a payback waiver, and working with the affected community boards, replace them with some of the wide range of uses which would qualify for a waiver.