

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 25, 1994

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained*
BOARD VOTE:	28 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained

*R. Landman for cause

RE: CB #1 Comment on the Citywide Statement of Needs FYs 1995 and 96

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 endorses the following as its response to the Citywide Statement of Needs - FYs 1995 and 96:

I. Response to Proposed City Facilities:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELESS SERVICES

1. **New Agency Headquarters** (p. 30)

Although no specific location is identified, CB #1 supports (in concept) the proposed consolidation and location of a new central administrative headquarters to replace three current temporary locations.

The potential siting of this office within CB #1, however, must not be accompanied by the assigning of any "designated" on street parking spaces to Department personnel. Streets in CB #1 are already overwhelmed by "designated" and "privileged" parking. City agencies routinely leave city-owned vehicles - particularly disabled ones - parked on streets within CB #1 for periods of up to several days. Because these vehicles are obviously not subject to the same ticketing and towing activities as privately owned vehicles, they remain on the streets. Their presence regularly prevents the Department of Sanitation's cleaning of streets with mechanical brooms in these "designated" and metered street parking areas.

DEPARTMENT FOR THE AGING

2. **Consolidation of Agency Offices** (p. 119)

Community Board #1 believes that users of DFTA's services would be better served by the reopening of the five borough field offices which were closed three years ago, and that this should be the agency's goal. Recognizing, however, that because of current serious budgetary constraints this goal is not immediately achievable, and

although no specific location is identified, CB #1 supports (in concept) DFTA's proposed consolidation of three existing offices at a single new location. This move would at least allow the Department's clients access to all services under a single roof. Any site which is chosen, however, should be optimally "consumer friendly", i.e. easily accessible to bus and subway lines, have ample waiting areas for clients, and to the greatest extent possible, services to clients should be delivered at ground floor level offices.

The potential siting of this office within CB #1, however, must not be accompanied by the assigning of any "designated" on street parking spaces to Department personnel. Streets in CB #1 are already overwhelmed by "designated" and "privileged" parking. City agencies routinely leave city-owned vehicles - particularly disabled ones - parked on streets within CB #1 for periods of up to several days. Because these vehicles are obviously not subject to the same ticketing and towing activities as privately owned vehicles, they remain on the streets. Their presence regularly prevents the Department of Sanitation's cleaning of streets with mechanical brooms in these "designated" and metered street parking areas.

BOARD OF EDUCATION

3. Proposed Leasing of Space for Two New High Schools (p. 138)

Note. *The Board of Education is not bound by the SON process.*

While CB #1 recognizes the need of additional high schools we are concerned that our district may be approaching saturation for such facilities. Currently there are five public high schools housing over 6500 students in CB #1. It should be noted that none of these is a community high school serving our district. We also strongly believe that any new space leased by the Board of Education should be assigned to an elementary school to serve students from our district. Our need for elementary school space is described in greater detail in item #1 below.

It should also be noted that at the time CB #1 was formulating its response to the SON-1995 & 96, CB #1 was not able to secure from the Board of Education information about the nature, size and specific locations of these two proposed schools. Community Board #1 is in wholehearted support of the contents of the recent letter of Manhattan Borough President Ruth Messinger to the chancellor of the Board of Education (1/3/94) in which she decries the "inadequate community notification in the Board of Education's site selection process," at the same time making specific recommendations for changing and institutionalizing the process.

II. Facilities Requested by CB #1:

BOARD OF EDUCATION

1. New Elementary School

PS 234 moved to its newly constructed facility in September 1988. When planned it was expected to accommodate the elementary education needs of the growing

population in Lower Manhattan well into the next century. This year, however, the school is already 20% over capacity. Our only other elementary school, the Early Childhood Center, is now also 20% over.

Meanwhile, our local toddler population continues to mushroom and our overall residential population is predicted to double again in the next few years. Incredibly, the same City and State agencies which promoted the growth of Lower Manhattan have made no provision for new schools to serve our burgeoning population.

Lower Manhattan, therefore, is already in need of a new elementary school, and with each succeeding year the demand increases. This need is uniformly recognized by the community, its leaders, local educators, parents, and Community School Board #2.

For the short term, the City and Board of Education should lease space and convert it into a school. There are millions of square feet of vacant space in Lower Manhattan. The long term solution is to realize construction of one or more free-standing schools. (Refer also to CB #1 Capital Budget request FY '95, Tracking Code: 3019401A.)

BOARD OF EDUCATION

2. Intermediate School

There is no intermediate school within Board #1. Upon graduation all CB #1 students are forced to commute to intermediate schools elsewhere in Community School District #2. Given CB #1's current very large population of pre-school and elementary school students, there will be a vastly increased demand for intermediate school seats in the near future. Accordingly, the construction of an intermediate school within Community Board #1 is critically needed. (Refer also to CB #1 Capital Budget request FY '95, Tracking Code: 3019006A.)

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

3. City Water Tunnel #3, Site Shaft 30-B at 250 Water St.

CB #1 reiterates its strong support for the designation of 250 Water St. as the site for DEP water tunnel Shaft 30-B and its subsequent conversion into an urgently needed park for the east side of our district. DEP engineers have consistently identified 250 Water St., a vacant parking lot, as the preferred site and agency. Spokesman Ian Michaels has said that "It's empty land, and its great geology, nice solid rock rather than soft landfill. Using an alternative site could easily cost an extra \$10 million". In spite of this, the City has continued to unsuccessfully seek out alternative sites which promise to be more costly and which cannot be converted into the badly needed park for our community. The DEP budget is sufficient to obtain this site and build the park on it when completed. The City's tentative plans to support the conversion of nearby office buildings into residences would also be enhanced by

this park. The City should, therefore, take immediate steps to obtain the 250 Water St. site for these vital municipal purposes.

Note: Siting of Shaft 30-B at 250 Water St. was previously supported in CB #1 responses to SONs, FYs 1992 & 93, 93 & 94 and 94 & 95. Also refer to CB #1 Capital Budget request for FY '95, Tracking Code: 3019402A.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

4. Construct Lower Manhattan Bus Distribution Facility

The number of commuter and tour buses and commuter vans entering and parking in Lower Manhattan continues to grow, exacerbating already extremely serious pollution and congestion problems. The city pays very little attention to this problem and has not addressed the short and long term parking issues associated with these vehicles. According to a report, **Lower Manhattan Bus Distribution Facilities Study** published by NYC DOT in May 1988, 725 express buses entered Lower Manhattan daily. The study projects up to 925 buses by 1995 and 1165 by 2005. In addition, hundreds of tour buses enter the district every day. These buses already contribute significantly to traffic pollution and congestion and pose pedestrian hazards. Many of these buses currently lay over along West St. When the reconstruction of West St. (Route 9A) begins, this area will no longer be available for this purpose. The Community Board is heartened that the recently released **Plan for Lower Manhattan** recommends the Battery Parking Garage as a terminal for express bus passengers, although it is seen as a "long-term rather than immediate prospect". Meanwhile, Community Board #1 continues to strongly endorse the conclusion of the DOT report which recommends creation of a passenger terminal with bus storage facilities at the current Battery Parking Garage site. (Refer also to CB #1 Capital Budget request FY '95, Tracking Code: 3018803A.)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 25, 1994

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA WASHINGTON MARKET

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	21 In Favor	0 Opposed	2 Abstained

RE: 416-424 Washington St., Proposed Hudson Hotel

WHEREAS: In its resolution of 10/19/93, CB #1 opposed the proposed Hudson Hotel, specifically in the matter of the developers' application for a Certificate of Appropriateness before the Landmarks Preservation Commission, and

WHEREAS: The FDIC, after the collapse of the American Savings Bank, has never put the property on the market or up for public auction, and

WHEREAS: The internal structure of the building (416-424 Washington St.) may lend itself to as-of-right occupancy, a joint living-work quarters or other residential use, and

WHEREAS: Real estate representatives have indicated that the building is marketable for residential use, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 urges the FDIC to release the building for public bidding, specifying that its use be for living-working quarters or another compatible conforming use over a commercial ground floor, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: If residential use is determined to be prohibited by existing zoning, Community Board #1 would find a variance for residential use supportable, in that it would involve a minimal variance compared with the massive zoning variance that would be required were the hotel project to be built in this specially zoned Tribeca North Historic District.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 25, 1994

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA HISTORIC DISTRICTS

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

RE: 58-60 Reade St., Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to legalize an awning sign which reads: "Anbar Shoes/Shoe Steal * 227-0253 * Brand Name Designer Shoes at Discount Prices * Handbags * Hosiery * 964-4017", which was installed in March 1993.

WHEREAS: The sign awning is a large, yellow canvas awning which extends the entire length of the front facade of the building and was installed without permits, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 does not want to set a precedent of this kind of sign, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission consider the application to legalize the sign awning, as submitted, wholly inappropriate.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 25, 1994

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA HISTORIC DISTRICTS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	20 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: 254-260 Canal St., Application ("Report") to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness

WHEREAS: The NYC Transit Authority proposes to install two elevator bulkheads on the sidewalk in front of a landmark building at the S/W corner of Canal St. and Lafayette St., now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission consider the application to install the elevator bulkheads, as submitted, wholly inappropriate to be placed in front of this landmark building.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 25, 1994

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EAST RIVER WATERFRONT AD-HOC

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

RE: East River Waterfront Restoration

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 strongly supports the rehabilitation of Piers 9, 11, 13 and 14 and the adjacent City-owned property to allow for greater public access to the East River waterfront, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 has created the East River Waterfront Ad-Hoc Committee to produce an integrated re-development plan for the East River Waterfront of this Community Board district, and

WHEREAS: The Committee has been meeting for many months with local residents, business interests, waterfront users, elected officials, and the Economic Development Corporation in an effort to develop a consensus plan for the redevelopment of the East River waterfront which attempts to address the sometimes conflicting interests and needs of these groups, and the EDC has been notified of the need for their planning effort to include and reflect the input, ideas and directions provided by Community Board #1, and

WHEREAS: Any renovation plan for the East River waterfront should, among other things, make the waterfront more accessible and appealing to residents, workers and visitors; minimize or eliminate uses which would have a negative impact on this community; and generate sufficient income to pay for the maintenance and security needs of the waterfront area, as well as complement the existing Seaport, and

WHEREAS: The Seaport Community Coalition has submitted a community based plan which addresses use, management, economic and zoning issues pertinent to re-developing this unique and historic waterfront area, and

WHEREAS: The Seaport Community Coalition, East River Waterfront Plan - A Community Vision complies with and reflects the numerous existing Community Board #1 resolutions concerning use, zoning, and construction at the waterfront and in the water, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board is grateful to the Seaport Community Coalition for its in-depth research and analysis of the East River waterfront and has incorporated many of its recommendations into this resolution, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 appreciates that the EDC has indicated a willingness to work with the Community Board toward developing a waterfront plan acceptable to the community, and

WHEREAS: The City's new waterfront zoning precludes new pier and platform development for other than public recreational or maritime uses, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 feels that there is a tremendous opportunity to create an attractive and feasible East River Waterfront re-development plan which addresses the needs of residents, workers and visitors and would make a major contribution towards the economic revitalization of Lower Manhattan which this area urgently needs, provided that all the parties support a compromise, consensus waterfront plan, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 adopts the Seaport Community Coalition's East River Waterfront Plan - A Community Vision as submitted (dated 11/29/93) as the guiding framework within which the EDC and other NYC agencies will work towards re-developing the East River waterfront and strongly urges that the following elements be incorporated into the City's East River Waterfront restoration plan:

1. A broad, continuous waterfront esplanade, consistent with the Manhattan Borough President's waterfront plan, running from the Downtown Heliport to the Brooklyn Bridge providing open access to the water edge so the public can enjoy the quiet of the river.
2. Public access to all piers (including a minimum 15' clear and unencumbered space around the north, south, and east edges), aprons, marginal streets (including the entire esplanade).
3. The special Manhattan Landing District should be eliminated.
4. Downzoning of all piers, aprons and marginal streets to prevent any structure more than one to two stories high and to insure public open space (a minimum of 65% of all piers, aprons and marginal streets).
5. Elimination of parking under the FDR Drive south of Pier 15 to Pier 9, as current lease agreements expire and limiting renewal options to one year, and that no new parking leases or agreements be issued for this area.

6. The first priority will be to maximize maritime/waterborne uses along the piers.
7. Provide open public space to include activities and accommodations for children, senior citizens, as well as the physically challenged (eg. park, ballfields, playground, fishing, recreational boating (rowboats), model boat sailing, picnic/seating space)
8. The park on Peck Slip be exchanged for an equally sized usable park space elsewhere in the Seaport area.
9. If maritime/waterborne demand and/or revenue cannot sustain the piers, other users will be considered that contribute positively to the community and are economically viable. Acceptable commercial uses (only as needed to fund on-going repairs, maintenance, security and debt):
 - marinas, power boat and sailing vessels
 - dinner cruises
 - waterside, maritime related restaurants (indoors or outdoors) that provide unencumbered use of the water and are acceptable to the community
 - maritime workshops
 - outdoor ice skating rink
 - fitness center
 - kayaking and canoeing facilities
 - commercial fishing boats
 - sailing charter boats
 - bicycle rental and sales
 - candy or ice cream stores
 - fishing tackle or equipment rental or sales
 - art craft shops
 - excursion sport fishing
 - boat showroom or sales in water or on pier
 - outdoor theater
 - temporary fairs with events acceptable to the community
 - water taxi routes
10. Acceptable institutional uses:
 - U.S. Coast Guard demonstrations
 - aquarium
 - science museum
 - sailing schools
 - nautical museum
 - not-for-profit sailing programs
 - historical exhibits
11. Unacceptable uses:

- amplified music
- structures over two stories high
- nightclubs
- amusement parks

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 25, 1994

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	26 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Newspaper Vending/Dispensing Machines

WHEREAS: Newspaper vending machines have become an eyesore, nuisance, and an obstruction, and

WHEREAS: Many of these vending machines are assumed to be unauthorized, and they impede pedestrian traffic, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 insists that owners maintain these dispensing machines free of litter and in proper working order, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 requests that the Department of Transportation (DOT) take action to advise the owners of these machines of their responsibilities to maintain them in a condition free of litter and in proper working order, and that machines not in use be removed, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: DOT invoke any and all rights and remedies available including removal.