

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: MASTER PLAN

COMMITTEE VOTE:	3 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	19 In Favor	0 Opposed	12 Abstained

RE: Waterfront Zoning Text Amendment (N 930327 ZRY)

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: The following comprises CB #1's comment on the Waterfront Zoning Text Amendment:

A.

1. The current review of the Waterfront Zoning Text Amendment should be suspended immediately; and
2. A "Notice of Positive Declaration" for the Waterfront Text Amendment's (DCP CEQR 93-036Y) should be issued acknowledging that the Amendment will have "significant effect on the environment".
3. Once a complete Environmental Impact Statement has been completed (as required by a "Positive Declaration") the review of the Waterfront Zoning Text Amendment should resume, however, documents under review should also include all map changes proposed for the City's 578 mile coast line.

B. Should, however, the City Planning Commission persist in continuing and not suspending the current review of the Amendment, CB #1 offers specific input which should be adhered to in the Text Amendment:

1. CB #1 reiterates its position regarding the New York City Comprehensive Waterfront Plan as contained in its resolution of November 17, 1992: "The siting of commercial, non-water dependent uses and so-called 'commercial waterfront-enhancing uses' should not be permitted at or on water's edge and/or over or on the water".
2. CB #1 does not support the development of residential use on piers, platforms and floating structures along its waterfront.
3. Provisions should be included in the Zoning Text Amendment to guarantee access not only to the waterfront but to the water itself, e.g. boat launching

facilities, fishing access...

4. All changes that would result from adoption of the Waterfront Zoning Text Amendment along CB #1's waterfront should be developed to preserve the strong sense of maritime history of Lower Manhattan and the importance of the area's waterfront environment in the development of New York City and its beginning as New Amsterdam.
5. While the desire to improve the visual and aesthetic appeal of the waterfront is admirable, the Design Requirements in the waterfront zoning text are much too specific and potentially would result in far too much uniformity and homogeneity. It would not be appropriate nor desirable to impose them on the diverse shoreline of New York City. Design specifications should be concerned with life safety issues. Any other specific aesthetic requirements, i.e., sizes, materials, etc. should be recommended general guidelines, not specific requirements.
6. The Department of City Planning should reconcile the "Design Guidelines" in the Amendment with existing New York City building and other codes; in some instance they are in conflict. The 15 ft. clearance for piers 1, for example, is less than recommended by the Fire Department.
7. The Waterfront Zoning Text Amendment should include the Special South Street Seaport Historic District and the Special Manhattan Landing District as these two special districts comprise a significant portion of CB #1's waterfront.
8. The City Planning Commission's review should include evaluation of the impact that the Waterfront Zoning Text Amendment will have on residential and commercial establishments in and around the 800 ft. upland area.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

RE: Community Design Process for Hudson River Waterfront Park

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 endorses the following resolution of HRPC's Design Committee and urges that the resolution be approved by the Advisory Board of the Hudson River Park Conservancy:

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: The Advisory Board of the HRPC supports the implementation of a Community Design Process which would maximize public involvement in the design of the Hudson River Park. The components of this Process should be as follows:

1. Each of the three Community Boards within whose District boundaries the Park will exist shall designate a Committee, either specially formed or a Standing Committee of the Board, which shall carry out the functions of the Community Design Process for that segment of the Park.
2. For the purposes of the Community Design Process, there shall be four segments of the Park: 1) Tribeca/Battery Park City (CB #1); 2) Greenwich Village (CB #2); 3) Chelsea and 4) Clinton (both CB #4).
3. The Conservancy shall allocate monies for the hiring of Community Design Consultants. Such monies shall be apportioned equally among the four segments of the Park. Each Community Board shall choose a Design Consultant for each segment or segments. These Community Design Consultants shall be responsible for representing the community's interests in all discussions with the design team employed by the Hudson River Park Conservancy with regard to the design of the Park.
4. Within 60 days of hiring the lead design team for the Park, the Conservancy will issue an RFP for Community Design Consultants to a list of potential candidates agreed to by the Conservancy and the affected Community Boards. The Conservancy and Community Board will then review the responses and create a short list of no more than five candidates, by consensus. The Community Board will select their Community Design Consultant from this short list. The Community Design Consultants will work as subcontractors to the

Conservancy's lead design team.

5. The designated Committees of the Community Board shall take steps to reach out to their respective communities in order to gain a wide range of input with regard to the design of the Park.
6. The Design Committee of the Advisory Board of the Hudson River Park Conservancy shall serve an oversight and liaison function between and among the Conservancy and its design team and the various Community Board committees and their design consultants. Of particular importance in the Design Committee's mission should be to ensure a coherent design philosophy throughout all parts of the Hudson River Park.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	31 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Responsiveness of City Agencies*

WHEREAS: Chapter 70 of the New York City Charter charges each community board with the responsibility to assist and advise city agencies and the City Council with respect to matters relating to the welfare of its district and its residents, and

WHEREAS: Many applications which are presented to city agencies and the City Council must by law first come before the local community board for comment, and

WHEREAS: If each community board is to fulfill its responsibility to advise the City Council on matters which the board has reviewed, it is imperative that the Council be made aware of the board's position on a particular matter before acting thereon, and

WHEREAS: It is essential to the establishment of a proper dialogue between city agencies and each community board that the board be informed of the ultimate decision regarding an application upon which the board has commented, and the reasons behind such decision, especially in those cases in which the agency has seen fit to act contrary to the recommendation of the Board, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 believes that community boards' effectiveness in consulting with city agencies and advising the City Council would be greatly enhanced by the implementation of certain procedural reforms, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 calls upon the City Council, in the interest of giving voice to the residents of each community on matters that directly affect them, to amend Section 7.80 of the Rules of the Council (Reports by Council Committees) to require that on any matter which by law requires community board comment, the committee report include the position taken by the community board, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1, in order to more effectively meet its responsibilities as set forth in the City

Charter, calls for the adoption of a city law requiring that, on any matter which by law requires community board comment, the agency to which such comment is given inform the board of its decision on such matter and the reasons therefor.

* Resolution as adapted from that approved unanimously by CB #6-M on 4/14/93.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	31 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: John Heuss House Drop-in Center for the homeless

WHEREAS: John Heuss House, drop-in center for the homeless, at 42 Beaver St. was established in December 1988 with substantial support from the community and public agencies to serve the homeless population of Downtown Manhattan 24-hours a day, year round, and

WHEREAS: John Heuss House a recognized, model drop-in center provides comprehensive services to particularly reclusive, resistant and vulnerable homeless persons and those for whom the City's shelter system is not appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The center, which has operated successfully since its opening, serves an average population of 102 clients a day and 4 1/2 years after its opening continues to enjoy the full support of the neighboring community, and

WHEREAS: In Spring 1991* the Human Resources Administration threatened to close and fully eliminate John Heuss House and the City's 7 other drop-in centers for the homeless, a move subsequently abandoned, and

WHEREAS: Included in the "Contingency Program" (reductions) of the Fiscal Year 1994 Executive Budget is the proposal to "close drop-in-centers for homeless adults", including John Heuss House, and

WHEREAS: If implemented, this proposal would consign again John Heuss House's clients to Lower Manhattan's South Ferry Terminal, World Trade Center concourse, its parks, streets, subway stations, abandoned warehouse buildings and stoops, (the "Contingency Program" also calls for the elimination of the Homeless Outreach Unit), and

WHEREAS: The Community Board finds this proposed closing of the drop-in-centers duplicitous and disconcerting coming from an administration whose head, as then Manhattan Borough President, championed these centers and specifically worked strenuously to assure the creation of John Heuss House, and

WHEREAS: Should the proposed closing of drop-in-centers be a cruel political ploy to extract

additional revenues from New York State and the Federal Government, CB #1 finds the proposal offensive in that, at minimum, it gives the appearances of being exploitative, i.e., put forth at the expense of perhaps New York City's most disfranchised population, and

WHEREAS: This proposal is pointless, regressive and inhumane and serves to seriously call into question any statements the City administration has made regarding its commitment to homeless people and those who work among them endeavoring to prevent further physical, mental and social deterioration, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 calls upon Mayor Dinkins to immediately and permanently excise from the "Contingency Program" of the FY '94 Executive Budget the proposal to close John Heuss House and the City's other drop-in-centers for homeless adults.

* On April 9, 1991 CB #1 adopted unanimously a similar resolution opposing the threatened closing of John Heuss House and 7 other drop-in-centers.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/LANDMARKS SUB-COMMITTEE

BOARD VOTE: 21 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained

RE: Certificate of Appropriateness Recommendations for 253 Broadway*

WHEREAS: The former Home Life Building is an individual landmark located directly access from City Hall and City Hall Park at the corner of Broadway and Murray St., and

WHEREAS: The ground floor of this building has more signage than is allowed under the Zoning Resolution, and

WHEREAS: The overwhelming amount and inappropriate location of all this signage obscures any sense of the integrity of the building; now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the owner prepare a plan for the ground floor stores, so that signage on both sides of the entrance will be similar. The awnings and existing signs should be removed from the four vertical columns, and the bands over the windows and space between the columns should be designated for signage that conforms with the Zoning Resolution.

* This is the former Home Life Building. The \$10 Real Bargain Store a photographer and \$1,5 Store on the ground floor have covered the entire facade with signs.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 In Favor	0 Opposed	2 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Interim bicycle/pedestrian path along Hudson River

WHEREAS: New York State has allocated approximately \$1.8 million to construct an interim bicycle and pedestrian path along the Hudson River, and

WHEREAS: This 27 foot wide path, which will run from Tribeca to Greenwich Village, will make the westside waterfront much more attractive, and accessible to local residents and others, and

WHEREAS: The path is designed in a simple, functional and attractive manner which should allow for its prompt construction and opening, perhaps by this fall, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the design of the interim bike and pedestrian path put forth by the NYS Department of Transportation and the Hudson River Park Conservancy.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	3 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	12 In Favor	7 Opposed	4 Abstained

RE: Banners along interim path

WHEREAS: The Hudson River Park Conservancy is planning to install a series of banners along the proposed interim bike and pedestrian path which would bear the insignia of the HRPC along with, at the Community Board's option, the name of the adjacent neighborhood, (ie, Tribeca), and

WHEREAS: The purpose of this banner campaign is to increase public awareness that a park is scheduled to be built along the waterfront, and

WHEREAS: The cost of designing, printing and installing such banners is approximately \$23,000 for the 4.5 mile route of the park, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 opposes the installation of such banners as an unnecessary expenditure and asks that the HRPC use these funds for other more worthwhile needs.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

BOARD VOTE: 31 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained

RE: Public Library Funding

WHEREAS: The Mayor and the City Council have proposed that all neighborhood branch libraries, including the New Amsterdam Branch, be open a minimum of six days a week, and

WHEREAS: Branch libraries are in desperate need of funding for books and materials, and

WHEREAS: The Research Libraries and the Central Branch Libraries of The New York Public Library have been forced to reduce hours because of City budget cuts, and

WHEREAS: City funding for literacy programs has been cut by one-third since FY 1990, and

WHEREAS: Scholarship money is needed to hire the new librarians necessary to provide six-days of library service, and

WHEREAS: The residents of CB #1 depend on library doors being open with shelves stacked with books, and the staff necessary to provide essential programs and services, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: The Members of CB #1 congratulate Mayor David Dinkins and Members of the City Council for their efforts to expand library service in our community, and urge the Mayor and the City Council to adopt a budget that allows all branch libraries to be open six days a week, including Saturdays in FY 1994, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: We urge the Mayor and the City Council to increase funding for The New York Public Library to purchase books and materials, to provide six days and expanded hours of service at the Research Libraries and the Central Branch Libraries, to restore funding for library literacy programs, and to provide scholarship assistance to new librarians.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	12 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	31 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Reconstruction of the Concession and Maintenance Building in Battery Park

WHEREAS: The Department of Parks and Recreation has issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the "Reconstruction of the Concession and Maintenance Building in Battery Park to Operate a Restaurant and Snackbar", and

WHEREAS: Under conditions set forth in the RFP, the successful bidder would be required, in part, to:

- a. Construct a large comfort station within the current concession building
- b. Reconstruct and relocate the Park's maintenance office to the current comfort station
- c. Either repair the existing roof or construct an enclosed sit-down restaurant and thus adding a second story to the existing concession building, and

WHEREAS: None of the construction/reconstruction proposed would require the addition of any new buildings in the Park, and

WHEREAS: All designs and work to be performed would require prior approval from the DPR, City Art Commission and other pertinent agencies; and the DPR has agreed to consult with CB #1 prior to approving the final exterior design of the concession building, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 recognizes the need for improving the appearance, both interior and exterior, of the current concession building and the operation of the food concession therein, as well as the need for a larger comfort station, and

WHEREAS: These improvements to the Park cannot be provided from DPR's budget, and their cost would be borne solely by the successful bidder, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves of DPR's issuance of the above referenced RFP.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	12 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	30 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Request for Proposal for a Food Court on the Traffic Plaza of the Staten Island (Whitehall) Ferry Terminal

WHEREAS: The New York City Department of Transportation has issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the "operation of a food court" on the traffic plaza in front of the Whitehall Ferry Terminal (just east of Battery Park), and

WHEREAS: The traffic plaza currently contains trees, benches and a newsstand, and

WHEREAS: Simultaneous with the issuance of this RFP the Department of Park and Recreation is proposing the enlargement of the snackbar and the creation of a sit-down restaurant in the existing concession building within the Park, which is in very close proximity to the traffic plaza where DOT proposes to site the food court, and

WHEREAS: The combination of the existing snackbar outside the Terminal Building, the food concessions in Battery Park and nearby restaurants and delis already provide the working population and tourists with the more than ample food services, and

WHEREAS: The site of the proposed food court is scheduled to be eliminated/alterd as the result the proposed re-mapping of Peter Minuit Park in conjunction with the construction of a new Whitehall Ferry Terminal, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 requests that the New York City Department of Transportation immediately withdraw the above referenced RFP.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: JOINT SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER
AND EAST RIVER WATERFRONT

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

RE: South Street Seaport Museum (SSSM) Renovation of Pier 15 and the Schermerhorn Row Block

WHEREAS: The SSSM wishes to rehabilitate Pier 15 and the remainder of the Schermerhorn Row block, and

WHEREAS: They believe that the most promising means of achieving these goals is to work with the NYS Dormitory Authority which can conduct the necessary financial analysis, engineering studies and float bonds for the project if it is found to be feasible, and

WHEREAS: The Dormitory Authority routinely assists educational and cultural institutions in assessing and carrying out this type of capital construction, and

WHEREAS: Senator Martin Connor and Assemblyman Sheldon Silver are prepared to sponsor and gain the approval of the necessary enabling legislation adding the SSSM to the list of institutions that the Dormitory Authority works with if CB #1 is supportive, and

WHEREAS: The SSSM has agreed to work cooperatively with the Community Board and to come back to us for a full review once the project is analyzed and more clearly defined, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 supports extending the NYS Dormitory Authority's enabling legislation to cover the SSSM.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MAY 18, 1993

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	1 Opposed	3 Abstained

RE: 100 Gold Street

WHEREAS: The City's Department of General Services is seeking approval to purchase the building at 100 Gold St. principally for the consolidation of the Department of Housing Preservation and Development in this structure, and

WHEREAS: The 100 Gold St. building is currently managed by Edward S. Gordon which generally maintains the building and grounds in excellent condition despite difficult subsurface problems in the area, and

WHEREAS: The City's Division of Real Property has insufficient resources to maintain the building or grounds at the current levels and in fact does a poor job of maintaining most of its buildings, and

WHEREAS: 100 Gold St. is adjacent to the Southbridge Towers housing complex, Pace University and NY Downtown Hospital, all of which would be negatively impacted if the City failed to properly maintain the structure and grounds, and

WHEREAS: Bache Plaza (aka Drumgoole Square) would also likely suffer because Prudential Bache now contributes towards the maintenance of this City owned space and with their impending departure there will be insufficient resources to maintain the area, and

WHEREAS: The City has not identified which other agencies will occupy the building nor have they specified whether clients of the agencies will need to come to the building or how frequently, and

WHEREAS: This area is already congested with vehicles displaying City parking permits and the Community Board strongly opposes surrendering any additional curbside space for such vehicles, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 strongly opposes the City's intention to purchase and fully occupy 100 Gold St. unless we receive firm commitments to:

1. Hire an outside management firm to maintain the building and grounds at current levels
2. Provide no additional on-street privileged parking on adjacent and nearby streets
3. Not service agency clients at this site
4. Contribute the necessary funds or identify an alternate means to clean Bache Plaza on a daily basis as it is now.