COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH AND EDUCATION

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	29 In Favor	3 Opposed	4 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Opposing the lifting of the cap on charter schools statewide or in NYC

WHEREAS: In 1998 the NY State Legislature passed the New York Charter Schools Act, authorizing the creation of up to 100 charter schools; and

WHEREAS: Since 1998 the cap has been raised twice, first to 200 charters in 2007 and then again to 460 charters statewide in 2010; and

WHEREAS: Of those 460, 156 slots still remain unused, with 25 remaining under the cap for New York City; and

WHEREAS: The cap has been lifted twice despite the fact that there has still been no comprehensive, independent evaluation of charter school operations; and

WHEREAS: Audits from the State Comptroller's office have revealed significant problems in 95% of the charters examined, including conflicts of interest, failure to complete required employee criminal history record checks, and inadequate controls over basic financial operations; and

WHEREAS: As part of the 2014 State budget legislation, New York City is the only district in the State or the nation now required to provide free space to all new or expanding charter schools, either by co-locating the charter in a City school building or by paying for rent in private space; and

WHEREAS: Our public school buildings are increasingly overcrowded, with approximately half of all City students, or 490,000 students, currently in over-utilized schools; and

WHEREAS: The average utilization level of elementary schools is 97.5 % and the median rate is 102%, with enrollment projected to continue to grow at all levels; and

WHEREAS: Most experts and observers agree that these figures substantially underestimate the actual level of overcrowding in our schools, and that if the DOE's utilization formula properly accounted for the amount of space needed to expand pre-K, reduce class size, restore art, music and science rooms to their original purpose, and provide students with disabilities with mandated services in dedicated spaces, the reported level of overcrowding would be even higher; and

WHEREAS: According to last year's charter amendments, if new and expanded charters are not given space inside our school buildings, the City has to pay rent for their facilities, or provide $2,775.40 per student starting in 2015-16; and

WHEREAS: When the total cost of charter rent reaches $40 million a year, the State is obligated to cover 60% of the rest; and

WHEREAS: The data shows that charter schools still do NOT enroll their fair share of high-need students, including English language learners and students with disabilities; and

WHEREAS: Charter schools often feature high suspension rates and exhibit abusive and even illegal disciplinary policies; and

WHEREAS: The amendments to the charter law passed in 2010 requiring more accountability on the part of charter schools have not yet been enforced; and

WHEREAS: If the charter cap is raised by 100 and geographical restrictions are eliminated as the Governor has proposed, this could result in up to 250 more charter schools in NYC; and

WHEREAS: Estimates show this change alone could cost taxpayers as much as $838 million per year, with the City obligated to spend $357 million per year, and the State responsible for the remaining financial burden of $476 million per year for charter rent; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The State Legislature should NOT raise the cap on charters statewide or in NYC; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: Our full support should go to our underfunded, overcrowded public school system, not to privately managed charter schools that would drain even more resources from our State and City budgets; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB1 strongly advocates that the State meet its constitutional obligation to fund public schools and provide at least $2.2 billion owed to NYC public schools under the Campaign for Fiscal Equity settlement.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH AND EDUCATION

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	2 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Restoring school funding

WHEREAS: The Governor's plan radically disempowers our principals in the evaluation process for their own teachers by giving them only 15% of the input on the teachers they hired, but whom they supervise on a day to day basis, in a variety of situations; and

WHEREAS: Outside evaluators of unknown origin and experience are given a much higher proportionate weight in evaluating the performance of our teachers based on only a few days a year instead of continuously throughout the school year; and

WHEREAS: The Governor's plan de-incentivizes principals and teachers in underperforming schools, many of which have high-needs children; and

WHEREAS: 50% of a teacher's evaluation would be based on the performance of his/her students on state tests; and

WHEREAS: The relevance of the State tests, which were shrouded in mystery prior to their administration and subsequently found faulty by our educators and education experts, are in question; and

WHEREAS: Other states are moving away from high-stakes testing as are our NYC mayor and School Chancellor; and

WHEREAS: Our Community Education Council District 2 and Community Board 1 have repeatedly expressed opposition to raising the charter school cap and removing restrictions surrounding co-location of charter schools in our City public schools; and

WHEREAS: Withholding funding already owed to our City schools, and making the disbursement of said funds contingent upon acceptance of the Governor's flawed plan is unethical; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB1 strongly advocates that the Governor rescind his education proposal and disburse the Campaign for Fiscal Equity settlement funds as well as the refund from the budget cuts of 2009 immediately as the State is required to do.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY/YOUTH & EDUCATION

BPC VOTE:	9 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BPC PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
YOUTH VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	1 Recused

RE: Battery Park City ballfields permit process

WHEREAS: Two ballfields exist in northern Battery Park City (BPC) and are among the few green spaces where children can play in Lower Manhattan; and

WHEREAS: The establishment of these fields was the result of grassroots advocacy by the Lower Manhattan community which persuaded the Battery Park City Authority (BPCA) to redesignate the site from its original status as a development site to a community amenity site; and

WHEREAS A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed in February, 2001 outlining the establishment and governance of these fields (attached); and

WHEREAS: These fields, along with our schools and parks, became "building blocks" for a strong sense of community, although they still fell short of satisfying the needs caused by enormous growth in our youth population; and

WHEREAS: The fields have served Lower Manhattan's local, non-profit little league, soccer league and school community centers for almost two decades in an inclusive atmosphere in which all local children could be involved; and

WHEREAS: These fields were secured by the community for exactly the purposes that they have served for so long; and

WHEREAS: Working with our elected officials and the BPCA, we won another victory for our community when the fields were converted from natural to artificial turf, which allowed more playing time for the leagues and potential availability for twelve months of the year; and

WHEREAS: In accordance with the MOU, Community Board 1 (CB1) impaneled a Ballfields Task Force which worked successfully with the BPCA on matters relating to usage, maintenance and permits, as well as the conversion to artificial turf; and

WHEREAS: In early 2012, the BPCA and the Ballfields Task Force agreed that BPCA would issue 3-year permits to the Downtown Little League (DLL), Downtown Soccer League (DSL) and Manhattan Youth, granting each organization significant time on the ballfields during their respective seasons, consistent with their historic patterns of use. It was contemplated that these permits would be renewed for a similar term without material changes in ballfields time allocations, provided that the organizations abided by the terms of their permits and provided that the organizations maintained their status as community-based, inclusive youth organizations; and

WHEREAS: Other local organizations, such as the Downtown Football Giants and the Asphalt Green BPC Community Center, have had permits for field usage in recent years that served local children without interfering with the field requirements of DLL, DSL and Manhattan Youth; and

WHEREAS: After the 3-year permits referred to above expired at the end of the 2014 seasons, BPCA decided to open the permitting process for the fields to any group or person wishing to submit a permit application; and

WHEREAS: As a result, BPCA initially and tentatively determined to reduce the DLL field time by over 20% as compared with its field time under the expired 3-year permit. BPCA did not communicate this tentative determination to DLL until mid-February 2015, by which time it was too late for DLL to attempt to find alternative field space. The likely loss of over 20% of its field time meant that DLL faced the prospect of turning away over 20% of the children who had already signed up for the Spring 2015 season; and

WHEREAS: With the assistance of Senator Daniel Squadron's office, DLL and BPCA reached an agreement that restored most of the time that BPCA had tentatively cut from the DLL permit, such that DLL will now be able to conduct its 2015 season without making cuts to its enrollment or season; and

WHEREAS: BPCA has announced that it intends to follow a similar permitting process, inviting the public at large to submit applications for the summer and fall seasons, with the likely result that DSL, Manhattan Youth, the Downtown Football Giants and Asphalt Green may face similar loss of time for field usage for their 2015 permits; and

WHEREAS: The youth population of the CB1 District has grown markedly since the 2001 MOU was signed, and continues to grow at a fast pace today, such that the BPC ballfields are a critical resource for the district's youth population; and

WHEREAS In the past, the collaborative process between CB1 and BPCA, and the priority accorded to local community-based organizations worked well, but the new process for assigning permits creates serious concerns and we must examine it for future seasons (see attached letter); now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB1 strongly calls upon the BPCA to return to the process outlined in the February, 2011 MOU to ensure that local organizations and schools have the priority they deserve with respect to permitted time on the BPC Ballfields; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB1 requests that BPCA similarly return to the multi-year permitting model for the permits to be issued to DLL, DSL and Manhattan Youth, so that these organizations can better plan for their future seasons as the CB1 youth population continues to grow at a fast pace; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB1 requests a joint meeting with BPCA, our elected officials and members of CB1 to discuss this issue, which should be convened as quickly as possible, since summer permits may be reviewed soon and time is of the essence; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

CB1 calls upon Governor Cuomo and our elected officials to work with the BPCA so that a cooperative partnership can be formed to address how best to administer the community assets that they hold in trust for the public.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Restaurant Associates LLC application for restaurant liquor license for 1 World Trade Center, 34th and 35th floor

WHEREAS: The applicant, Restaurant Associates LLC, applied for a restaurant liquor license for 1 World Trade Center, 34th and 35th floor; and

WHEREAS: The square footage of the establishment is 70,000 with 66 tables and 236 seats; and

WHEREAS: There will be no background music; and

WHEREAS: The applicant does not intend to apply for a sidewalk café license or cabaret license; and

WHEREAS: The applicant has stated that there are no buildings used primarily as schools, churches, synagogues or other places of worship within 200 feet of this establishment; and

WHEREAS: The applicant has stated that there are no establishments with on-premises liquor licenses within 500 feet of this establishment; and

WHEREAS: The operation hours are 7 a.m. – 10 p. m. seven days a week; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB 1 *opposes* the granting of liquor license for 1 World Trade Center, 34th and 35th floor, Restaurant Associates LLC, *unless* the applicant complies with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: One New York Plaza, application for a liquor license for Chipotle Mexican Grill of Colorado, LLC

WHEREAS: The applicant, Chipotle Mexican Grill of Colorado, LLC, applied for a restaurant liquor license for One New York Plaza; and

WHEREAS: The square footage of the establishment is 823 with 6 tables and 18 seats; and

WHEREAS: There will be background music; and

WHEREAS: The applicant does not intend to apply for a sidewalk café license or cabaret license; and

WHEREAS: The applicant has stated that there are no buildings used primarily as schools, churches, synagogues or other places of worship within 200 feet of this establishment; and

WHEREAS: The applicant has stated that there are establishments with on-premises liquor licenses within 500 feet of this establishment; and

WHEREAS: The operation hours are 11 a.m. – 10 p. m. seven days a week; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB 1 *opposes* the granting of liquor license for One New York Plaza, Chipotle Mexican Grill of Colorado, LLC, *unless* the applicant complies with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 11 Park Place, application for a wine and beer license for AAA Pizza Coro. d/b/a Little Italy Pizza

WHEREAS: The applicant, AAA Pizza Corp. d/b/a Little Italy Pizza, applied for a restaurant wine and beer license for 11 Park Place; and

WHEREAS: The square footage of the establishment is 1,000 with 15 tables and 40 seats; and

WHEREAS: There will be no background music; and

WHEREAS: The applicant does not intend to apply for a sidewalk café license or cabaret license; and

WHEREAS: The applicant has stated that there are no buildings used primarily as schools, churches, synagogues or other places of worship within 200 feet of this establishment; and

WHEREAS: The applicant has stated that there are establishments with on-premises liquor licenses within 500 feet of this establishment; and

WHEREAS: The operation hours are 10:30 a.m. – 7 p. m. weekdays and 11:00 a.m. – 5 p.m. weekends; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB 1 *opposes* the granting of a wine and beer license for 11 Park Place, AAA Pizza Corp. d/b/a Little Italy Pizza, *unless* the applicant complies with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 185 Greenwich Street, application for a restaurant liquor license for Greenwich Street Café, d/b/a Epicerie Boulud

WHEREAS: The applicant, Greenwich Street Café, d/b/a Epicerie Boulud, applied for a restaurant liquor license for 185 Greenwich Street; and

WHEREAS: The square footage of the establishment is 2,400 with 7 tables and 20 seats; and

WHEREAS: There will be background music; and

WHEREAS: The applicant does not intend to apply for a sidewalk café license or cabaret license; and

WHEREAS: The applicant has stated that there are no buildings used primarily as schools, churches, synagogues or other places of worship within 200 feet of this establishment; and

WHEREAS: The applicant has stated that there are no establishments with on-premises liquor licenses within 500 feet of this establishment; and

WHEREAS: The operation hours are 7 a.m. – 9 p. m. weekdays and 9 a.m. – 9 p.m. weekends; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB 1 *opposes* the granting of liquor license for 185 Greenwich Street, Greenwich Street Café, d/b/a Epicerie Boulud, *unless* the applicant complies with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Stone Street Community Association – Pedestrian Mall

WHEREAS: Stone Street Community Association has applied for a street activity permit for Stone Street Pedestrian Mall for Friday, March 13, 2015 to Sunday, November 15, 2015, 11am-11pm on Stone St. between Broad St. and Hanover Square and Mill Lane between South William St. and Stone St.; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB 1 *does not oppose* the application submitted by Stone Street Community Association for a street activity permit for March 13, 2015 to Sunday, November 15, 2015, subject to the following conditions:

1. New York City Department of Transportation Lower Manhattan Borough Commissioner's Office (LMBCO) reviews the application and determines that it is compatible with nearby construction activity that is expected to be simultaneously underway, and
2. Traffic control agents are deployed as needed to ensure that there is no significant adverse impact from the event on traffic flow, and
3. Clean-up will be coordinated with the appropriate City Agencies, and
4. Bands and persons with megaphones are not situated along the route such that they disturb residents, and
5. Pedestrian and vehicular traffic in and out of all garages downtown remain open at all times.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	2 Opposed	1 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	24 In Favor	10 Opposed	2 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 115 South Street, application for rooftop addition

WHEREAS: This application is for a substantial rooftop addition on an 1839 row house in the heart of the South Street Seaport Historic District, between Beekman Street and Peck Slip, and

WHEREAS: The existing structure, virtually matching and once conjoined with its neighboring row house, is five stories, and the proposal asks for a two-story addition on the back and a one-story addition on the front of the house, rising a total of 26 feet from the current roof line, and

WHEREAS: The addition would be set back 22 feet from South Street, and not visible directly across South Street, and

WHEREAS: It would be highly visible looking north along South Street, as well as from Peck Slip, although it will be blocked eventually by a larger addition on another building already approved and under construction, and

WHEREAS: The structure is game-changing when looking from the Brooklyn Bridge, a view the Landmarks Preservation Commission had asked about but is not strictly germane to normal consideration, and

WHEREAS: The materials proposed, including innovative fiber cement board along with zinc, are pleasing, if busy, and the mechanicals will be interestingly screened, although the proposed railing must be reworked, and

WHEREAS: The dissenting Landmarks Committee members objected to the proposal's visibility looking north, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application with the exception of the railing design.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 71-73 Franklin Street, application for façade restoration and rooftop addition

WHEREAS: 71-73 Franklin Street is a 5 story building located in the Tribeca East Historic District between Broadway and Church, according to the Designation Report constructed as two separate buildings with a continuous façade in 1859-61 and "displays elements of both Italianate and Second Empire styles…. The first story retains its original cast-iron storefront framing members including fluted columns and piers which support flat arches with rounded corners. The arches in the center bays of the two building sections are wider than those in the flanking bays." (The column capitals and storefront cornice have been removed.) Inscribed foundry marks reading "J.B. & W.W. Cornell & Co., Iron Works" appear on the bases of the center and eastern piers. Some historic infill of wood-framed doors, show windows, and transoms remains. The vault area in front of the building is faced with metal diamond plate and iron with glass lens bearing an inscribed foundry mark which reads "L.R. Case, 175 Centre St.", and

WHEREAS: While the historic wood storefront infill has been altered from the original, there is some fabric remaining to give indication of the original design intent, and the style of this building is typical of others in the district that can be looked to for examples of similar design, and

WHEREAS: The proposed design is neither a faithful historic restoration nor a contemporary design based on historic proportions and compositions which might be acceptable in the context of the historic streetscape, and

WHEREAS: Some members of the committee found the proposed rooftop addition to be too highly visible and objected to the perforated metal cladding material, especially with the intention that it be illuminated from behind creating a glowing effect over the entire surface of the addition, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB1 recommends that Landmarks Preservation Commission rejects this application and recommends that the applicant consider a more contextually sensitive proposal for the ground floor design.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	9 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 28 Liberty Street, AKA 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, application for alterations to the plaza and storefronts, including the creation of new entrances at sidewalks and plaza levels and alterations to the building's lobby and plaza finishes.

WHEREAS: This application is for alterations to an individual New York City landmark building and public plaza, built in 1964 by Skidmore Owens and Merrill (SOM), encompassing three-quarters of a Lower Manhattan block, and a particularly fine example of modern urban office building architecture and public space design, and

WHEREAS: The proposed new concourse entry along Liberty Street is an improvement to the current steep stairs, and additional plaza and concourse level access points are a welcome addition as long as they do not take away from the strong plaza perimeter, and

WHEREAS: The proposed new building lobby entrance doors (two new sets of doors on Liberty Street, one new set of doors on Nassau Street and one new set of doors on William Street) fit within the original bay widths, use the original storefront details, match the adjacent storefront details and are appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The removal of all the existing non-original planters and their replacement with planters and planter positioning that follow the original architect's details and plaza plans is appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The removal of the monolithic black granite around 80% of the plaza's perimeter and replacement with new storefront assemblies to match the original details of the tower building are appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The proposal for the new plaza parapet does not maintain the design intent of the plaza's original monolithic stout perimeter which created a strong delineation between plaza above and street below. The proposed glass railing and thin band blurs the line between plaza and street and should therefore be redesigned and restored to its original heavy materiality and modernist function, and

WHEREAS: Despite the fact that the current plaza artworks by two of the twentieth century's greatest artists create a strong sense of place in the public space, the proposed third "place-holder" sculpture as presented does not give CB1 enough information to approve such an installation and CB1 therefore requests that the applicant return to CB1 to re-present the actual sculpture design and placement in the plaza, and

WHEREAS: The proposed signage design is appropriately modern in its absence of large plastic backlit corporate logos, concealed connections and simple text-based stainless steel design, and

WHEREAS: The proposed tower lobby ceiling and soffit lighting is an improvement on the current non-original lobby lights and general plaza illumination. The proposed ceiling creates a uniform glow that will be visible from the street, will help illuminate the plaza (eliminating the need for light poles on the plaza) and its reference to the original grid of the lobby ceiling make it an appropriate solution, and

WHEREAS: The proposed illumination of the lobby ceiling extending outdoors to the building's modernist cornice will vivify the lobby and plaza and is a brilliant reflection of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill's interior and exterior landmark Manufacturers Hanover Trust building at 5th Avenue and 43rd street, and

WHEREAS: Some on the committee asked that safeguards be put into place to insure that the radiant light is not oppressive to nearby residents, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this proposal with the exception of the plaza parapet, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB 1 requests that, wherever possible, SOM research its rich catalog of details for 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza to implement details from the original design into all new storefront and plaza finishes including the parapet, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: Safeguards be put into place to ensure that the radiant light is not oppressive to nearby residents.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 363 Greenwich Street, application for storefront replacement and new railing

WHEREAS: 363- Greenwich Street is a 4 story building located in the Tribeca West Historic District between Franklin and Harrison Streets and comprises a portion of the building 363-367 which in total has 75 feet of west facing façade on Greenwich Street, and

WHEREAS: The demised portion of this building referenced by the application is three bays wide, and one of these bays contains an elevator shaft which blocks the entire bay with a solid wall at the ground floor, and this solid wall is currently clad with a non-historic, and in the opinion of the committee unattractive and inappropriate, corrugated aluminum cladding, and

WHEREAS: The proposed design replaces the two "open" bays with an infill that is modern in its materiality and detailing but historically appropriate in its proportion and configuration, and replaces the aluminum cladding with blackened steel panels that again are modern but have a soft patina that will age gracefully over time, and

WHEREAS: The proposed railing is unremarkable and typical of others found in the area, and

WHEREAS: Some members of the committee objected to the off-center placement of the building's address numerals above the entry door and also to the linear cove lighting beneath the horizontal framing at two of the bays, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB 1 recommends that Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application with the respectful request that the applicant reconsider the two objectionable elements of the design as noted above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 272-274 Canal Street, application for storefront renovation

WHEREAS: The applicant is seeking approval for a storefront renovation of two separate buildings designed to match each other and the building next door, and

WHEREAS: The existing buildings are condemned and vacant, and

WHEREAS: There is no historic fabric on the first-floor and the street-level facade is comprised of roll-down gates, and

WHEREAS: The applicant did not bring detailed renderings or material samples for the committee to view, and

WHEREAS: The proposed plain glass and aluminum storefront does not take into consideration massing or materials of the historic storefront, which the committee regards as a missed opportunity for both the community and owner, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB1 recommends that Landmarks Preservation Commission reject this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 37 Harrison Street, application for removal of shutters and enlargement of back dormer

WHEREAS: The applicant is seeking to legalize removal of shutters and enlarge an existing back dormer, and

WHEREAS: Number 37 is distinctive in the district as it has been in this location since 1828, unlike some of the neighboring 19th-century buildings that were relocated to the area, and

WHEREAS: The shutters on the facade most likely were not installed as part of the original building, and

WHEREAS: Wooden shutters would be a recreation of a non-original feature, and

WHEREAS: The proposed enlargement of the back dormer is sensitively designed to maintain the proportion and materiality of original, extant elements of the building and is not visible from the street, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve legalization of the removal of the shutters, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the proposed back dormer.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: PLANNING

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: New York City Phase 1 Application for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development National Disaster Resilience Competition

WHEREAS: At a height of seven feet, Lower Manhattan experienced one of the highest inundation levels in Manhattan during Superstorm Sandy and unfortunately two people in Community District 1 drowned. While great strides have been made in Lower Manhattan in terms of recovery and relief, there is still much that must be done to rebuild and revitalize what was destroyed, and to protect the area in anticipation of future extreme weather events; and

WHEREAS: Nearing the third anniversary of Superstorm Sandy, CB1 remains concerned about both the short-term and long-term time frame because Lower Manhattan remains largely unprotected and faces an increasing potential for extreme weather events as confirmed by experts in the field, along with the subsequent financial damage to Lower Manhattan and the City at large; and

WHEREAS: Although it is 2 ½ years after Superstorm Sandy, the City has not yet allocated any funding for coastal resiliency protection systems in the CB1 area, although the City's Proposed Action Plan accounts for $355 million in new coastal resiliency funding via the HUD Rebuild by Design program, including: $335 million for a massive flood protection system for the East Side of Manhattan. The project will create a multi-layered protective system that will also provide social and environmental benefits to the community; and

WHEREAS: CB1 has long advocated for funding and implementation for resiliency measures in Lower Manhattan. Our prioritized budget requests for Fiscal Year 2016 included that "EDC provide funds for the design and construction of short to medium-term resiliency infrastructure in anticipation of future extreme weather events" (#2) as well as that "EDC provide funds for the design and construction of long-term resiliency infrastructure, such as the 'Compartment C' phase of the BIG U project, in anticipation of future extreme weather events" (#10); and

WHEREAS: Lower Manhattan is in desperate need of immediate resiliency and hardening measures. Existing plans for such measures, such as the Lower Manhattan Multi-Purpose Levee, are long-term projects that will not effectively protect Lower Manhattan for several decades. Resiliency plans for Lower Manhattan were included in the Rebuild by Design BIG U proposal, but $335 million in funding awarded in June 2014 by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is only for the first phase of the project. This phase spans the coast of Manhattan from East 23rd Street to Montgomery Street, all north of

the Brooklyn Bridge, and does not include any protection for the Community Board 1 area. The BIG U proposal contains plans for resiliency infrastructure in "Compartment 3", from the Brooklyn Bridge to the Battery in Community District 1. This proposal includes "Berms in the Battery" at the southern tip of Manhattan, "strategically located so as to protect the ducts of the infrastructure below and create a continuous protective upland landscape" as well as flood protection in the Financial District which would help protect against massive potential damages, including critical infrastructure underneath (BIG U proposal). On June 24, 2014, Community Board 1 unanimously passed a resolution urging "HUD to allocate dedicated funding for both study and implementation of the 'Compartment 3' portion of the BIG U proposal, which would contribute to the overall hardening of Lower Manhattan and assist in bridging the gap between short-term measures such as rapidly deployable flood barriers and long-term strategies like the Lower Manhattan Multi-Purpose Levee;" and

WHEREAS: On June 11, 2013, the City released "A Stronger, More Resilient New York" (SIRR), a comprehensive plan that contains actionable recommendations both for rebuilding the communities impacted by Sandy and increasing the resilience of infrastructure and buildings citywide; and

WHEREAS: The Initiative Summary includes Coastal Protection measure is to "(A) Install an integrated flood protection system in Lower Manhattan" and "(1) Create an implementation plan and design for an integrated flood protection system for remaining South Manhattan areas" (pp. 381-382); and

WHEREAS: In February 2015, Mayor de Blasio announced the release of the New York City Panel on Climate Change's 2015 report, Building the Knowledge Base for Climate Resiliency, providing climate projections through 2100 showing for the first time that sea levels in New York City show an increase of between 11 and 21 inches by the 2050s, between 18 and 39 inches by the 2080s, and between 22 and 50 inches by 2100, with a worst case projection of up to six feet by 2100; and

WHEREAS: CB1 was disappointed to learn that out of the $4.21 billion allocated to the City in the Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery funds, only roughly $1.5 million was awarded to the CB1 area towards resiliency measures for a feasibility study on the east side from the Brooklyn Bridge to the Battery Maritime Building. This is only a small portion of the CB1 area, and nothing has been awarded for implementation; and

WHEREAS: Of the original $16 billion Federal appropriation, there is approximately $1 billion in CDBG-DR funds remaining. The remaining CDBG-DR funds will be distributed via the National Disaster Resilience Competition. The funds in this competition are distinct from the $4.21 billion allocated to New York City; and

WHEREAS: New York City is participating in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) National Disaster Resilience Competition. NDRC is a two-phase process that will competitively award nearly $1 billion in HUD CDBG-Disaster Recovery funds to 67 eligible communities nationwide; and

WHEREAS: In this first phase, the City describes its unmet resiliency needs stemming from Hurricane Sandy. No specific projects will be identified in the Phase 1 application. If HUD accepts the City's first phase application and allows it to move to the second application phase, the City will identify specific projects for which it seeks funds after robust stakeholder engagement; and

WHEREAS: The New York City application for phase 1 of the NDRC focuses on city-wide housing issues, citing that "The City is qualifying its eligibility for NDRC with these Unmet Recovery Needs:

- The City's Build it Back Multi-Family Housing Program to benefit high-need buildings that were damaged during Hurricane Sandy and require resiliency upgrades to protect the majority of low- and moderate-income residents;
- Resiliency needs for multi-family housing at the New York City Housing Authority which was impacted by Sandy and requires the construction of improved storm-water management systems and back-up power generator systems on developments.

Should the City advance to Phase 2 of NDRC, it will be able to replicate and expand upon the innovative resiliency projects already underway such as those funded by HUD through Rebuild by Design."; and

WHEREAS: Furthermore, the application states that "All proposed projects will be in line with the City's goals: to create more resilient and protective coastlines; to upgrade aging infrastructure to be more resilient to extreme weather events; to stabilize neighborhoods by protecting housing for low- and moderate-income residents; and to protect local businesses that were negatively impacted by Hurricane Sandy. The goal is to ensure a more inclusive, fair, and resilient City for the future"; and

WHEREAS: A public hearing on the City's phase 1 application for the NDRC will be held on March 10, 2015; now

THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED THAT: CB1 is disappointed that the significant unmet need in Lower Manhattan is not mentioned in the entire 60-page application; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB1 strongly urges that the City acknowledge the specific ongoing needs of Lower Manhattan in its Phase 1 application for the NDRC with the goal of using potential awarded funds to assist in bridging the gap of funding not yet addressed by other dedicated funding sources.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Street permit application by The Association of Indians in America on Sunday, October 4, 2015, Water Street between Fulton Street and Fletcher Street, John Street between Front Street and Water Street & Front Street between John Street and Maiden Lane

WHEREAS: The applicant has applied for a street activity permit Sunday, October 4, 2015, Water Street between Fulton Street and Fletcher Street, John Street between Front Street and Water Street & Front Street between John Street and Maiden Lane during the hours of 10am – 7pm; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB1 does not oppose the proposed extension of a street activity permit submitted by The Association of Indians in America for a street activity permit for Sunday, October 4, 2015, from 10am – 7pm, subject to the following conditions:

1. The NYC Department of Transportation reviews the application and determines that it is compatible with nearby construction activity that is expected to be simultaneously underway, and
2. Traffic control agents are deployed as needed to ensure that there is no significant adverse impact from the event on traffic flow, and
3. Clean-up will be coordinated with the appropriate City Agencies, and
4. Pedestrian and vehicular traffic in and out of all garages downtown remain open at all times.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Street permit application by The Iron Horse NYC Wounded Warrior Project on Saturday, July 4, 2015, Cliff Street between John Street and Fulton Street

WHEREAS: The applicant has applied for a street activity permit Saturday, July 4, 2015, Cliff Street between John Street and Fulton Street during the hours of 10am – 7pm; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB1 does not oppose the proposed extension of a street activity permit submitted by The Iron Horse NYC Wounded Warrior Project for a street activity permit for Saturday, July 4, 2015, from 10am – 7pm, subject to the following conditions:

1) The NYC Department of Transportation reviews the application and determines that it is compatible with nearby construction activity that is expected to be simultaneously underway, and
2) Traffic control agents are deployed as needed to ensure that there is no significant adverse impact from the event on traffic flow, and
3) Clean-up will be coordinated with the appropriate City Agencies, and
4) Pedestrian and vehicular traffic in and out of all garages downtown remain open at all times.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:*	4 In Favor	2 Opposed	1 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC MEMBERS:	1 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	22 In Favor	10 Opposed	2 Abstained	0 Recused

** Due to the absence of a quorum, the committee vote taken on this resolution is unofficial and for informational purposes only.*

RE: Department of Transportation Street Seats application for space in front of Laughing Man Coffee, 184 Duane Street

WHEREAS: The owner of Laughing Man Coffee ("the Applicant") has applied to the Department of Transportation ("DOT") Street Seats Program to create a 6' x 28' x 3' installation ("the Installation") in the parking lane in front of that business at 84 Duane Street to be used for movable public seating; and

WHEREAS: The Street Seats program enables seasonal public open spaces, generally including seating and tables, at locations where sidewalk seating is not available; and

WHEREAS: The installation will be put in place for six months only, from October 1 to March 31 and the cost of the Installation and its removal will be borne entirely by the Applicant; and

WHEREAS: DOT requires signage on Street Seats Installations to confirm that they may be used by anyone regardless of whether they are a patron of the sponsoring business; and

WHEREAS: The seating and tables will be removed or collapsed when the business is not in operation; and

WHEREAS: At the Tribeca Committee meetings at which the Application was presented, concerns were raised by members of the Tribeca Committee ("The Committee"), Public Members of the Committee and members of the public regarding possible adverse impacts to the safety of pedestrians, in light of two accidents that took place within the past year that involved a pedestrian struck by a vehicle, and the bottle-necking that occurs on this street which compresses the amount of space on the street available to motorists; and

WHEREAS: Concerns were also raised about the visual impact of the Installation in a historic district; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB1 supports the application to the Street Seats program by the Applicant for a six-month period only; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: Following the six month period, the applicant must return to the Committee prior to applying again to the Street Seats program to discuss the results of the program with members of the Committee and the public.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 24, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	1 Opposed	1 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC MEMBERS:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	1 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	33 In Favor	2 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 285 West Broadway, application for an alteration of the liquor license for Haus

WHEREAS: The applicant, PJ150 LLC d/b/a Haus, is applying to extend its hours of operation; and

WHEREAS: This establishment requests an extension by two hours to 4 a.m. of its closing time on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday; and

WHEREAS: There will be no other changes in the Method of Operation; and

WHEREAS: The Community Board 1 (CB1) office is not aware of any complaints about this establishment in recent years and no complaints were raised at the Tribeca Committee meeting on March 11, 2015 when this application was discussed; and

WHEREAS: CB1 received a letter on March 12, 2015 from the Managing and Leasing Agent of 285 West Broadway, the nearby residential building, stating that the applicant has been respectful of neighbors and there have been no complaints from tenants of that building regarding the establishment; and

WHEREAS: The applicant has submitted an application for a cabaret license which will be considered by Community Board 1 when it is referred by the Department of Consumer Affairs for review; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB 1 *opposes* the granting of a liquor license for PJ150 LLC d/b/a Haus for a liquor license for 285 West Broadway *unless* the applicant complies with the limitations and conditions set forth above.