

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 16, 1997

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 22 IN FAVOR 1 OPPOSED 3 ABSTAINED

- RE: **Zoning text amendment to create new special permit for conversions in M1-5 zone**
- WHEREAS: Residential uses are now prohibited in the B1 and B2 areas of the LMM below the third story of any building and in buildings whose lot coverage is greater than 5,000 square feet, and
- WHEREAS: There is a text amendment proposal to enact a new Section 111-50, which would allow residential conversion on any story of a building in the LMM provided that:
- the conversion will not harm the commercial and manufacturing sector of the City's economy
 - the neighborhood in which the conversion is taking place will not be excessively burdened by increased residential activity
 - all dwelling units or joint living-work quarters for artists meet the required standards
 - the conversion not unduly burden existing commercial and manufacturing uses in the building
 - the conversion not harm the commercial and manufacturing character of the surrounding areas; and
- WHEREAS: Approval of this section will also eliminate the following requirements previously in effect for residential conversions:
- that there has been a one-year good-faith effort to rent the space for which residential conversion is sought to a mandated use at fair market rent
 - city, state and federal economic programs have been explored
 - commercial and industrial tenants are given the opportunity to remain in the spaces at fair market rent, and
- WHEREAS: Part of the unique character of Tribeca North, which is currently in the B1 and B 2 areas of the LMM district, derives from the unique mix of industrial, commercial and residential uses, and the character of this mixed-use neighborhood would change significantly if it became solely or even predominately a residential district, and

WHEREAS: Increased residential use would require an increase in services and amenities in Tribeca North to support an increased population, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 is supportive of residential uses in Tribeca North, provided that the neighborhood remains hospitable to commercial and manufacturing uses, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

The Department of City Planning should strengthen the proposal by adding a requirement that the Commission must find that there is no evidence that the landlord forced commercial or manufacturing tenants to vacate floor area through harassment, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

Proposed finding (b) should be revised so that viable commercial buildings currently used for active commercial purposes be reviewed preferentially for maintenance as commercial buildings, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

DCP should work with CB #1 and those who live and work in Tribeca North to review existing zoning and propose fair and thorough revisions that nurture and protect the unique evolutionary development of this mixed use neighborhood while planning for future needs, including a gradual increase in population along with appropriate amenities and supporting services.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 16, 1997

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 24 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **BSA application for 19 Beach Street**

WHEREAS: The proposed application to build a new 10 story building at 19 Beach St. meets the BSA standards tests for a waiver, and

WHEREAS: The design of the building is sensitive to the character of the neighborhood and adjacent to the historic district, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 is not opposed to the BSA application for a new 10 story residential building.

98.res.dec.97

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 16, 1997

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

EXECUTIVE VOTE: 10 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 2 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED

- RE: **Floating Dock at North Cove**
- WHEREAS: The Community Board, in receipt of public notice issued April 1, 1997, has reviewed the original application made to the Army Corps of Engineers to install two commercial floating piers by Watermark Associates, Inc., the operator of the North Cove Marina within Battery Park City, and
- WHEREAS: The Community Board resolved that such proposal could adversely affect the residential population immediately adjacent to the project site and foresaw other potential problems (see attached resolution), and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 requested in April that the Army Corps conduct a public hearing on this matter, and
- WHEREAS: The Community Board is now in receipt of an amended proposal submitted by Watermark Assoc. to expand the size of the commercial floating pier on the south side while abandoning the proposal to construct the floating pier on the north side to the marina, and
- WHEREAS: Such amended application, on its face, appears more detrimental to the residential population which resides immediately adjacent to the south enlarged proposed pier and appears likely to accommodate larger vessels than would have been possible under the original application, and
- WHEREAS: Once more, Watermark Associates was invited to speak to the Battery Park City Committee and declined to send a representative to explain and review the application, and

WHEREAS: The Army Corps of Engineers gave the Community Board less than two weeks to respond to this amended application completely frustrating any serious efforts to properly ascertain the impact of such amendment on the community, and

WHEREAS: It appears that the impact to the marine neighbors and our commercial neighbors were properly investigated and respected but to our astonishment and dismay a public hearing has not been scheduled to ascertain the extent of negative impact of either proposal to the residential neighbors of this pier, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 strongly objects to the revised application by Watermark Associates Inc. for a floating dock structure adjacent to the North Cove and calls on the Army Corps of Engineers to reject this application, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 is appalled that neither the Army Corps nor the applicant has afforded this community an adequate opportunity to review and comment on this critical matter, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 once more vehemently demands that a public hearing on this matter be held and that all potential negative impacts be properly assessed, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 demands that the BPCA not approve this totally objectionable floating dock proposal from an applicant which has an extremely poor record of responsiveness to community needs and concerns, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

No physical or operational changes be implemented at the North Cove without full consultation with Community Board #1.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 16, 1997

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 17 IN FAVOR 1 OPPOSED 9 ABSTAINED

RE: **195 Hudson St., proposed residential conversion and accessory parking garage**

WHEREAS: We were asked to review the proposed residential conversion of 195 Hudson St. based on a proposed zoning text amendment sponsored by the developers of 195 Hudson St., and

WHEREAS: The proposed zoning text amendment would create a new special permit for conversion in the M1-5 zone and mandates a different standard of review than what now exists, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: The Department of City Planning should review this proposal based on Community Board #1's comments on the proposed zoning text amendment if it is approved, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 is not opposed to residential conversion of 195 Hudson St., if the Department of City Planning finds under (b) of Section 111-50 that the conversion will not harm the commercial and manufacturing character of the surrounding area. In conducting its review, we ask DCP to pay special attention to the location of the building and type of space within, because this building may be suitable to commercial or retail uses desirable for the neighborhood, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: The conversion not unduly burden existing commercial and manufacturing uses in the building.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 16, 1997

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 22 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **Pier 17 South Street Seaport**

Issue to review: Permanent approval for existing temporary ticket booth.

WHEREAS: The committee reviewed the overall open space utilization on piers 16 & 17 in light of this application to make the NY Waterway summer ticket booth permanent and have it serve as the ticket booth for the new winter ice skating rink, and

WHEREAS: The committee heard testimony that talks between NY Waterway, South Street Seaport Museum, Seaport Marketplace Inc. and EDC to share a single ticket sales structure, as requested in the Board's July '96 resolution have never occurred, and

WHEREAS: The committee heard testimony that both the Pilot House and the Container Cafe structures on the piers are currently empty, and

WHEREAS: The existing ticket structure is located at the center of the view corridor as you approach the pier and significantly obstructs the water vista, and

WHEREAS: The existing structure, itself unobjectionable, does not have a very maritime design and does not harmonize well with the other existing structure on the piers, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the overall proliferation of small undistinguished structures on Pier 16 & 17 to be very troubling and destructive to the feeling of vista, open space and history so powerfully conveyed by the unencumbered piers (see attached map), now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC disapprove the application to legalize the ticket booth as submitted, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC review the overall proliferation of small undistinguished structures on Pier 16 & 17 and, since the parties do not seem to be able to negotiate with one another, provide strong direction and review of the process and compel the parties to prepare and have approved a joint Masterplan for the open space on Pier 16 & 17 before any further structures are legalized or erected.

98.res.dec.97

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 16, 1997

**COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: ARTS, URBAN PLANNING & DESIGN
AND FINANCIAL DISTRICT**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 11 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED

RE: **Whitehall Ferry Terminal**

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 is on record in support of the reconstruction of the Whitehall Ferry Terminal, and

WHEREAS: In May 1997, CB #1 adopted a resolution which conditioned our support for the demapping of nearby Peter Minuit Plaza upon the agreement by the City to maintain a distance of at least 190 feet between the Battery Park playground and all bus loading zones and layover areas, and

WHEREAS: The preliminary design plan for the Whitehall Ferry Terminal put forth by the City raises doubts as to whether this minimum 190 foot separation is being maintained, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 believes that the decision to simply put the words "Staten Island" on the façade of the new terminal in very large letters creates confusion and the words themselves are unnecessarily large, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 conditionally supports the preliminary design plans for the Whitehall Ferry Terminal provided that the City:

- Verifies that the 190 foot distance between the bus area (for loading and layover) and the Battery Park playground is maintained.
- Revises the signage on the terminal resulting in signage which more accurately identifies this building in a less garish manner.
- Agrees to return to CB #1 for further review and discussion as revisions are made to the design.