

1 **Clinton/Hell's Kitchen Land Use Committee**

Item # 24

2  
3 July 27, 2016

4  
5 Chair Meenakshi Srinivasan  
6 Landmarks Preservation Committee  
7 1 Centre Street, 9th Floor North  
8 New York, NY 10007  
9

10 **Re: 338 West 39th Street, New York, NY 10018**

11  
12 Dear Chair Srinivasan,

13  
14 A manufacturing loft-style building at 388 West 39th Street is being demolished to  
15 make way for a new hotel. The building was not landmarked, it is not within a historic  
16 district, but it is the first manufacturing loft-style building in the Hell's Kitchen South  
17 section of the Garment District to be razed. Manhattan Community Board 4 (MCB4)  
18 fears it will not be the last.  
19

20 The building at 338 was one of many designed by Parker & Schaffer for the developer  
21 Mack Kanner., who was instrumental in bringing the various garment-related trades  
22 together to form what would become New York's garment center. Kanner is  
23 responsible for many of the area's distinctive manufacturing loft-style buildings. Built  
24 primarily for utilitarian functions, these handsome buildings are notable for their  
25 wedding-cake setbacks, accented with highly decorative cast-stone ornamentation.  
26 Their destruction would be a loss to the architectural and historical fabric of our  
27 neighborhood.  
28

29 MCB4 plans to submit a request for evaluation (RFE) to the Landmarks Preservation  
30 Committee (LPC) to explore establishing an historic district in Hell's Kitchen South.  
31 While we welcome investment in our community, we are committed to preserving our  
32 neighborhood's history, architecture, and unique sense of place. We look forward to  
33 LPC's assistance and guidance in this endeavor.  
34

35 Sincerely,

36  
37 Delores, JD  
38

1 Clinton\Hell's Kitchen Land Use Committee

Item#: 25

2  
3 July XX, 2016

4  
5 John J. Degnan  
6 Office of the Chairman  
7 The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey  
8 4 World Trade Center/150 Greenwich Street, 23rd Floor  
9 New York, NY 10007

10  
11  
12 Dear Chair Degnan,

13  
14 At the July 21st meeting of the Port Authority of New York and New  
15 Jersey Board of Commissioners at 4 World Trade Center in Manhattan,  
16 Congressman Jerrold Nadler, Manhattan Borough President Gale Brewer,  
17 State Senator Brad Hoylman, State Assemblymembers Richard Gottfried  
18 and Linda Rosenthal called for the termination of the Port Authority's  
19 Design + Deliverability Competition ("Design Competition"). Manhattan  
20 Community Board 4 (MCB4) joins with our elected representatives to  
21 urge you to put the brakes on the Design Competition and sit down with  
22 all stakeholders to examine *all* the variables in the vital task of planning  
23 for the projected increase of commuters into Manhattan in the next 20  
24 years.

25  
26 The brush off at the press conference following the Board meeting of the  
27 concerns expressed by the elected representatives of the people of the  
28 west side of Manhattan is regrettable. At the public session you stated that  
29 you do not wish to be Robert Moses. The peremptory dismissal of our  
30 elected representatives' legitimate issues is a page out of the Moses  
31 playbook.

32  
33 At the public session New Jersey Senator Loretta Weinberg in a series of  
34 plaintive anecdotes claimed that a new bus terminal was a "quality of life"  
35 issue for New Jersey commuters. For the people of Hell's Kitchen it is a

1 *life* issue. Demolishing homes, local small businesses, and community  
2 institutions for the comfort and convenience of commuters passing  
3 through can no longer serve as justification for the destruction of an inner  
4 city neighborhood .

5  
6 The air quality in midtown Manhattan already runs afoul of Federal air  
7 quality standards. The proposal to add more carbon emissions to the mix  
8 without studying how to mitigate the current unacceptable and dangerous  
9 air betrays a callous disregard for the health of the people who live in the  
10 vicinity of the bus terminal as well as for commuters passing through.  
11 Your claim that “the air quality in the neighborhood could be helped  
12 because the new terminal would have room for buses to park” is a  
13 surmise, not a fact based on any known environmental study. Facts and  
14 studies are what we need; not speculation.

15  
16 MCB4 urges the Port Authority to halt the design competition and, as  
17 Deputy Mayor Shorris requested in his April 25th letter to you,  
18 Vice-Chair Rechler, and Executive Director Foye, “begin a  
19 comprehensive public engagement and planning process that considers all  
20 possible options for a new terminal and views the project in an  
21 appropriate regional context.”

22  
23 Specifically we demand that the Port Authority before contemplating  
24 siting any new terminal in Community District 4 respect our community  
25 character and comply with existing zoning and prior planning studies. The  
26 Port Authority’s “preferred alternative” calls for the destruction of the  
27 very heart of Hell’s Kitchen South. We will accept no degradation or  
28 destruction of the Hell’s Kitchen community’s visual and functional  
29 assets. We will accept no seizure of private property. We will accept no  
30 demolition of homes and businesses through eminent domain. The history  
31 of the devastation of the Hell’s Kitchen South neighborhood for  
32 transportation infrastructure in the 1920s and in the 1940s and in the  
33 1950s and in the 1960s is not one we have forgotten. We see the scars  
34 every day.

1 Second, the quality of the air around the Port Authority Bus Terminal is  
2 one of the worst in the City. It must be improved substantially before  
3 bringing in more buses, adding more pollution, creating more vehicular  
4 congestion in midtown Manhattan.

5  
6 Third, a rigorous and detailed planning process with all stakeholders must  
7 be undertaken to prepare for the next 50 to 100 years, not just for the next  
8 20. We need to know how projected increased commuter traffic affects  
9 other parts of our district and the City's transportation system, including  
10 specifically the proposed Moynihan Station. We must explore ways to  
11 integrate bus, rail, and subway. And we must have *meaningful* community  
12 engagement on site selection, land use, and design of any proposed public  
13 facility in Community District 4.

14  
15 Chair Degnan: New York City is at a crossroads. There is energy afoot to  
16 build and improve mass transit. You are a vital part of that effort. We urge  
17 you to seize this opportunity, put the design competition on hold, sit down  
18 with New York City's DOT and DCP, NJ Transit and the MTA, Amtrak  
19 and Metro North and the City and our community to create a truly first  
20 class, world class, comprehensive, city and regional transit system.

21  
22 The people of New York and New Jersey deserve no less.

23  
24 Sincerely,

25  
26 Delores, JD

27  
28 CC: Elected Representatives

1 **Waterfront, Parks & Environment Committee**

Item # 27

2  
3 July 27, 2016

4  
5 Mitchell J. Silver  
6 Commissioner,  
7 Department of Parks & Recreation  
8 830 Fifth Avenue  
9 New York, NY 10065

10  
11 **Re: Clement Clarke Moore Park**

12  
13 The Waterfront, Parks and Environment Committee (the “Committee”) of Manhattan  
14 Community Board 4 wishes to thank you for understanding the desire of the Chelsea  
15 community to maintain the height of the fence at Clement Clarke Moore Park (“CCM”),  
16 and for agreeing to maintain the current height of seven feet.

17  
18 At the Committee’s most recent public hearing, numerous members of the community  
19 spoke, universally in favor of keeping the current height of the fence. When the plan for  
20 the renovation of CCM was presented to the Committee last March, the community  
21 reaction (and that of the Committee) was the same, as was previously communicated to  
22 you in our letter dated May 3, 2016.

23  
24 While we understand your feelings about fence heights and the Parks Without Borders  
25 program, the near unanimous feeling of the Committee and the community is that this  
26 program does not work for CCM or the Chelsea community.

27  
28 We appreciate the work of the Chief of Staff to the Manhattan Borough Commissioner,  
29 Steve Simon, in listening to the views of the Committee and the community and in  
30 bringing about the result we were seeking.

31  
32  
33 Sincerely,  
34 CB4  
35 Cc: Corey Johnson

36

2  
3 July XX, 2016

4  
5 Lorelei Salas  
6 Commissioner  
7 Department of Consumer Affairs  
8 42 Broadway  
9 New York, NY 10004

10  
11 **Re: Abandoned Newsstands**

12 Dear Commissioner Salas:

13 Manhattan Community Board 4 (CB4) (Chelsea/Hell's Kitchen/Clinton) is concerned over the  
14 City's Newsstand policy and what it portends for the future. We would like to open a dialogue  
15 with you or your staff on this important issue. We are asking that permanently closed stands be  
16 removed.

17 It is important to understand that we support properly located and operated stands. They provide  
18 a convenience to our neighborhoods and an entry to the business world for many individuals who  
19 would otherwise be left out.

20 Recently, however, we have been faced with a particular problem in our Board area – the  
21 permanent closing of stands and their remaining on the sidewalk, blocking passage and doing  
22 little more than serving as an advertising venue. The details on the two closed stands follow:

23 **Northwest corner of 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 25<sup>th</sup> Street**

24 *A stand has been on this corner for many years. Relatively recently the old, falling-apart*  
25 *stand was replaced by a new JCDecaux stand. It sold relatively little print matter,*  
26 *dealing primarily in candy and soda to students from FIT and Fashion High School. The*  
27 *stand has been closed for most of 2016.*

28 **Northeast Corner of 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and 9th Avenue**

29 *This was a new JCDecaux stand built earlier this year. It finally opened in the spring. At*  
30 *no time were newspapers or magazines displayed or sold. Customers were rarely seen.*  
31 *The only merchandise displayed was candy or soda. About two months ago the stand*  
32 *closed, apparently permanently.*

33 Other stands in our Board area may also be heading for trouble and closing. The trend is not  
34 surprising given the alternatives that have come into play. These include delivery of papers to  
35 residences, replacement of printed media with digital versions and reliance on the Internet or  
36 cable TV for news. The typical newsstand routinely violates the DCA requirement that  
37 newsstands predominantly sell newspapers and magazines. They have little choice.

38 The clouded future for newsstands clearly calls for the City to review its policy, rules and the  
39 provisions of its contract with JCDecaux. Among changes that should be considered is a  
40 restriction on the number of new stands permitted to open and reasonable provisions for removal

41 of stands closed for more than three months. There may also need to be some consideration of  
42 stand financing.

43 The closed stands may not be troubling JCDecaux or the City; after all they both receive  
44 advertising revenue whether stands are open or closed. They are a problem, however, for the  
45 community. We want permanently closed stands removed. There is little or no chance that they  
46 can be successfully reopened. The problem is too endemic.

47 Please consider our problem and take appropriate action to have the offending stands removed.  
48 We would be glad to discuss the matter with DCA. We would also appreciate an opportunity to  
49 discuss the broader, future issue facing newsstands.

50

51

52 Cc – Margaret Forgione

53 Cc Michelle Craven, Senior Executive Director Cityscapes and Franchises

54

55

DRAFT



CITY OF NEW YORK

**MANHATTAN COMMUNITY BOARD FOUR**

330 West 42<sup>nd</sup> Street, 26<sup>th</sup> floor New York, NY 10036  
tel: 212-736-4536 fax: 212-947-9512  
www.nyc.gov/mcb4

**DELORES RUBIN**  
Chair

**Jesse Bodine**  
District Manager

June 22, 2016

Alba Pico, First Deputy Commissioner  
Special Application Unit  
Department of Consumer Affairs  
42 Broadway, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10004

**Re: Newsstand Application for N/W/C of 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 34<sup>th</sup> Street  
Application #: 5666-2016-ANWS**

Dear Deputy Commissioner Pico,

Manhattan Community board 4 (CB4) has reviewed the application for a small newsstand (4'x 12') located on a sidewalk adjacent to the Javits Convention Center.

CB4 supports this application provided that:

- All the stipulations attached and approved in writing by the applicant are made part of the license
- The Department of Transportation performs a study of pedestrian flow during a convention or tradeshow, showing that there is sufficient pedestrian right of way for the volume of attendees. We are particularly concerned because this specific area is used for convention goers to hail taxis.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Delores Rubin in black ink.

Delores Rubin  
Chair

Handwritten signature of Christine Berthet in blue ink.

Christine Berthet  
Co-Chair, Transportation  
Planning Committee

Handwritten signature of Ernest Modarelli in blue ink.

Ernest Modarelli  
Co-Chair, Transportation  
Planning Committee

Cc Department of Transportation

2  
3 July 27, 2016

4  
5 Ms. Margaret Forgione  
6 Manhattan Borough Commissioner  
7 NYC Department of Transportation  
8 59 Maiden Lane, 37<sup>th</sup> Floor  
9 New York, NY 10038

10  
11 **Re: Pedestrian Fatality at West 38<sup>th</sup> Street and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

12  
13 Dear Commissioner Forgione,

14  
15 On Tuesday afternoon, June 6, 2016, on a dangerous stretch of 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, a driver  
16 turning in a vehicle killed a woman, while she crossed 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue with the walk sign in  
17 the pedestrian crossing, at the very busy intersection of West 38<sup>th</sup> Street. It is one more  
18 tragedy in our neighborhood, which has seen already 8 fatalities in recent years, a tragedy  
19 even more so because this could have been easily prevented by a proper street design.

20  
21 Manhattan Community Board 4 urges the New York City Department of Transportation  
22 to immediately initiate a study of the Eighth Avenue corridor that runs that runs between  
23 30<sup>th</sup> Street / Penn Station and 43<sup>rd</sup> Street/ the Port Authority Bus Terminal, to determine  
24 what measures can be implemented to improve pedestrian safety and walkability of the  
25 Avenue. Furthermore we urge DOT to move quickly to implement the findings of this  
26 study and improve the safety of this corridor before another preventable tragedy occurs.

27  
28 We recognize the DOT's commitment to improving pedestrian safety and acknowledge  
29 the recent installations of six Split Lead Pedestrian Interval Signals (LPI) <sup>1</sup>at dangerous  
30 intersections on Eight and Ninth Avenues, and a Split Phase Signal<sup>2</sup>, at the location of  
31 another recent fatality on 40th Street and Ninth Avenue. Despite these efforts this most  
32 recent incident is evidence that much more needs to be done to make the streets of our  
33 neighborhood safe for all, and to achieve the Mayor's Vision Zero Plan.

34  
35 As part of this study CB4 requests that DOT evaluates the capacity of the sidewalks on  
36 this very congested part of Eight Avenue. DOT's Vision Zero Manhattan Pedestrian  
37 Action plan issued in 2014 recognizes that the Eighth Avenue corridor is one of the most  
38 dangerous in the city. This intersection is located on a very congested stretch between  
39 Penn Station and the Port Authority Bus Terminal where the volume of pedestrians far

---

<sup>1</sup> Split Lead Pedestrian Interval (LPI) gives a red light arrow to turning vehicles during the first seconds of the pedestrian crossing phase, then a blinking yellow arrow advising caution to turning vehicles while pedestrian can still cross.

<sup>2</sup> Split Phase Signal gives a red light arrow to turning vehicles for the full period when the pedestrians and bicyclists cross and then converts to a green arrow signal to let cars turn while the pedestrians have a "do not walk" signal, ensuring no pedestrian/car conflicts.

40 exceed the capacity of the sidewalks, forcing pedestrians to walk in the street or in the  
41 bike lane. The volume of pedestrians is such that the bike lane is practically unusable for  
42 bicyclists putting pedestrians and bicyclists in danger. CB4 is on record for asking in  
43 each of its annual Statements of District Needs that the sidewalks be widened.

44  
45 Since June 2012, there have been 181 injuries between West 35<sup>th</sup> Street and West 42<sup>nd</sup>  
46 Streets on 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, including 97 pedestrians and 26 bicyclists (in spite of the presence  
47 of a protected bike lane), and now this fatality.<sup>3</sup>

48  
49 When the 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bike lane was installed in 2012 on this section, the Community  
50 Board sent letters to the DOT to ask for increased pedestrian safety features<sup>4</sup>. We have  
51 continued to ask that split phases be installed along all new bike lane corridors like 6<sup>th</sup>  
52 Avenue.

53  
54 In 2015, our Council Member requested that a number of intersections be studied and  
55 equipped with split phases, including 42<sup>nd</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>, one of the most dangerous  
56 intersections in the city.

57  
58 We ask DOT to urgently study this stretch of 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and immediately apply all  
59 necessary safety measures to improve pedestrian safety and walkability, in particular at  
60 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 38<sup>th</sup> and 42<sup>nd</sup> Streets before another tragedy happens.

61  
62

---

<sup>3</sup> NYC open data <https://data.cityofnewyork.us/Public-Safety/NYPD-Motor-Vehicle-Collisions/h9gi-nx95>

<sup>4</sup>

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/mancb4/downloads/pdf/Resolutions/october%202011/12%20Trans%20Letter%20to%20DOT%20re%208th%20&%209th%20Ave%20Bike%20Lane%20Extension.pdf>

1 **Transportation Planning Committee**

**Item # 31**

2  
3 July 27, 2016

4  
5 Thomas F. Pendergast  
6 Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
7 Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
8 2 Broadway  
9 New York, NY 10004

10  
11 Veronique Hakim  
12 President  
13 MTA New York City Transit  
14 2 Broadway  
15 New York, NY 10004

16  
17 Polly Trottenberg  
18 Transportation Commissioner  
19 NYC Department of Transportation  
20 55 Water Street  
21 New York, NY 10041

22  
23 Margaret Forgione  
24 Manhattan Borough Commissioner  
25 NYC Department of Transportation  
26 59 Maiden Lane, 37<sup>th</sup> Floor  
27 New York, NY 10038

28  
29  
30 **Re: L train closure for repairs – 14<sup>th</sup> Street Surface Transportation Mitigation**

31  
32 Dear Commissioners Pendergast, Trottenberg and Forgione,

33  
34 In order to repair the Canarsie tunnel with Federal Sandy Relief funds, the MTA must  
35 proceed with a 3-year partial closure or 18-month complete closure of the L line between  
36 Bedford and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

37  
38 Manhattan Community Board 4 (CB4) supports an 18-months closure and encourage the  
39 MTA and the DOT to study alternatives to transport commuters during that period : (1)  
40 connecting the L line to one of the other lines in Manhattan to maintain the cross  
41 Manhattan service (2) converting the Williamsburg bridge and 14<sup>th</sup> Street into a Transit  
42 Priority Corridor. A careful study of impact on adjacent residential streets and  
43 development of mitigation measures must be part of the final plan.

44  
45 CB4 also urges the MTA to take advantage of the line closure to effect long needed  
46 station improvements on the West Side. We are asking the DOT and MTA to return to

47 our committee to present the findings of their study as well as mitigation measures and  
48 improvements they propose.

49  
50 Since 1990, ridership on the L has more than tripled and is one of the busiest line: every  
51 weekday more than 225,000 commuters from neighborhoods across Brooklyn rely on the  
52 L train to get them into Manhattan. In Manhattan, more than 50,000 customers use the L  
53 each day for crosstown service.

54  
55 In 2012, Super storm Sandy flooded with salt water the 92-year-old tubes all the way to  
56 the ceiling, damaging the Canarsie tunnel lining and vital infrastructure and systems. The  
57 magnitude of the work needed in the Canarsie Tunnel is too great for night and-  
58 weekend-only closure. The damage significantly shortened the useful life of the tubes  
59 inside the tunnel and while ad hoc repairs continue to be made, wholesale reconstruction  
60 must be done and the window to use the Sandy Recovery Federal funding is closing  
61 rapidly.

62  
63 That leaves MTA and the commuters with two options for getting the work done:

- 64 • Closing the entire tunnel for 1.5 years from Bedford Avenue in Brooklyn to 8<sup>th</sup>  
65 Avenue in Manhattan with a service reduced to 8.5 minutes frequency  
66 Running a shuttle train in Manhattan only is not feasible because train cars would  
67 have no access to inspection and maintenance facilities. So, it would be  
68 impossible to conduct mandatory train inspections or to repair trains
- 69 • Closing one track at a time for a total of 3 years, with very limited service (8  
70 minute frequency between Lorimer and Rockaway, no service between Lorimer  
71 and Bedford in Brooklyn and 12-15 minute frequency between Bedford and 8<sup>th</sup>  
72 Avenue in Manhattan with no stop at 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue). A single-track closure would  
73 allow for only about one in five riders to be accommodated. This service will also  
74 be closed two nights a week for inspections, and there's a risk of unplanned  
75 closures for repairs due to the condition of the tube.

76  
77 While no long-term closure would start before January 2019, planning must proceed  
78 immediately with one or the other option. Additionally, substantial prep work will be  
79 required prior to 2019 that will have significant impacts on riders.

80  
81 MTA has started to develop an alternate transportation plan:

- 82  
83 • Subway: Under both scenarios, M/J/G trains get additional capacity and free out-  
84 of-system transfer would be provided at certain locations. Other options to add  
85 service are also being explored.
- 86  
87 • Ferry service is being considered between Williamsburg and 20th Street in  
88 Manhattan for the two-track closure scenario. Connecting bus service (M14 SBS,  
89 M23 SBS and M34 SBS) would be provided in Manhattan. The East River Ferry  
90 (which is not part of the MTA system) includes service between Williamsburg  
91 and 34th St and Wall Street, also.
- 92 • Bike Share stations are also being considered to increase service though biking.

93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136

- Buses: It is anticipated that in a full closure scenario, there would be an M14 SBS across 14th St, with some of those buses being extended to 20th St in order to connect to a ferry from Williamsburg. An M23 SBS and the M34 SBS would also be extended to connect to a new ferry. Additionally, there would be a bus service between Williamsburg and Manhattan via the Williamsburg Bridge. The possibility for bus lanes on the Williamsburg Bridge or across 14th Street are being discussed with New York City’s Department of Transportation and dedicated bus lanes will be strongly considered.

CB4 supports the 18 months complete closure option, as it appears that the partial closure will deliver only 25% of the needed service, resulting in a longer impact period with no less disruption in level of service.

We also suggest that MTA explore the possibility of connecting the L Line tracks in Manhattan to any one of the A,C,E,B,D,F,M,N,Q,R or W lines which would allow the trains to be serviced in another subway yard. While this would obviously be a difficult and expensive project, it would allow trains to provide cross- Manhattan service with needed access for inspection and maintenance. In turn this would provide mitigation for the impending 14<sup>th</sup> Street traffic problem as well as provide for future emergencies on the L line. The MTA staff at the transportation committee meeting said they would seriously explore this possibility and we urge that they do so.

CB4 also supports giving full priority to bus and bike services on the Williamsburg Bridge and the 14th Street corridor to facilitate the movement of commuters provided that a study of traffic diversion and mitigation measures supports the viability of such an option for an 18 months duration.

To accommodate the expected volume, it is possible that double bus lanes may be required in both directions and car traffic may not be able to co exist. Dedicated lanes should also be installed on the bridge and bike lanes should be given a high priority on the routes.

- However, in our district 15<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> Streets are residential low-rise streets with a number of schools. These residential streets cannot become a highway for cross town traffic and trucks. For the plan to work it will be critical to evaluate how to plan deliveries and to divert private car traffic away from the corridor and from the adjacent residential streets; traffic calming devices will have to be implemented to prevent thru traffic from using those streets. This closure cannot put residents’ safety at risk.

We noted that some improvements are proposed to the stations in Brooklyn and on the East side. The MTA will have unimpeded access to more than three route miles of track and six stations for 18 months. During that time, there will be no trains and no riders to contend with, a situation that would expedite repairs and improvements to the system.

137 The Regional Plan Association has studied needed improvements and we support their  
138 recommendations<sup>1</sup> for our district:

- 139 • All stations should be rehabilitated and brought to a state of good repair.
- 140 • Make 6<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue stations ADA accessible
- 141 • Reopen the pedestrian underpass between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenues, a long standing  
142 request of CB4
- 143 • Increase capacity by
  - 144 ○ Rebuilding the 8th Avenue station in Manhattan which limits severely the  
145 number of trains run on the line: rebuild the L train's terminal, creating  
146 space for train storage and turning trains; reconfigure the transfer to 8th  
147 Avenue station/ IND line, with direct connections to the southern end of  
148 the 8th Avenue A, C and E platforms, provide a western ADA-accessible  
149 entrance to the street between 8th and 9th avenues
  - 150 ○ Improve 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue Station: Circulation: Improve corridor to 7th Avenue  
151 IRT station. Widen stairs from platform to PATH/IND transfer.

152 We look forward to work with MTA and DOT to review the detailed plan, the necessary  
153 local mitigation envisioned for the duration of the project and the improvements proposed  
154 for the West side stations.

155  
156 CC Veronica Vanterpool  
157 Mike replogle DOT  
158 RPA  
159 Bill Borrock  
160 Elected

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://library.rpa.org/pdf/RPA-A-New-L-Train-for-New-Yorkers.pdf>

2  
3 July 27, 2016

4  
5 Margaret Forgione  
6 Manhattan Borough Commissioner  
7 NYC Department of Transportation  
8 59 Maiden Lane, 37th Floor  
9 New York, NY 10038

10  
11 Veronique Hakim  
12 President  
13 MTA New York City Transit  
14 2 Broadway  
15 New York, NY 10004

16  
17 **Re: M23 Select Bus Service Proposal**

18  
19 Dear Ms. Forgione and Ms. Hakim,

20  
21 Manhattan Community Board 4 (CB4) appreciates that DOT and MTA came back to the  
22 board in response to our letter dated May 9, 2016 to propose a final design before  
23 implementing the M23 Select Bus Service river to river during the summer.

24  
25 CB4 supports the overall plan, although we strongly object the placement of the fare  
26 payment machines in their current configuration and request that it be changed to allow  
27 users on scooters and wheelchairs – and all other users - to safely pay their fare.

28  
29 Select Bus Service (SBS) is installed on nine routes in New York City including the  
30 M34A in Community District 4 (CD4) district. SBS Travel time is faster by up to 23% on  
31 Avenues, and a safer street design leads to up to 20% reduction in overall crashes.  
32 The current M23 corridor serves 15,000 daily passengers, residents in areas far from the  
33 subway, and an additional 28 express buses. The line connects with 9 subway/rail lines  
34 and 14 bus routes. However buses on the current route are not moving during 51% of  
35 their travel time – they are either loading passengers at bus stops or stopped in traffic. In  
36 CD4 the segments between 7th and 9th Avenues are the slowest, but not as slow as the  
37 segments from Broadway to 1st Avenue where speeds of less than 4 mph affect the whole  
38 route.

39  
40 **Improved Commuter experience:** We were pleased to hear that a bench will potentially  
41 be installed at 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and bus clocks would be installed at

- 42
- 43 • EB 11<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> Avenues
  - 44 • WB 8<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> Avenues Avenue

45 We continue to hear negative comments on the fare collection system from all users in  
46 our district, and particularly from users of scooters and wheel chairs: The location of the

47 fare payment machines makes it extremely difficult if not dangerous for these users to  
48 maneuver their scooter on the very narrow gangway adjacent to the moving traffic.

49  
50 We request that you locate the payment appliances as close as possible to the curb with  
51 the user interface facing the buildings. This configuration uses much less space on  
52 sidewalks that are already too narrow for the volume of pedestrians and provides a much  
53 more comfortable experience for the users, especially wheelchair users

54  
55 **Improved Safety:** CB4 thanks the DOT for studying crashes on 23th Street and we are  
56 pleased to hear that midblock crossings are not an issue.

57  
58 While DOT will continue to study addition of signals and traffic safety measures at the  
59 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue intersection, CB4 continues to request that a turn bay and a split phase be  
60 installed with a red arrow for north turning eastbound movements. At a minimum, a  
61 trailing green arrow signal should be installed.

62 This area is teeming with visitors to the High line and to the Gallery district. It is critical  
63 that their safety not be compromised by the design of the corridor.

64  
65 **Improved Bus Flow:** While DOT is unable to create turn lanes, to prevent vehicle back  
66 up from the right turns in the 34th Street bus lane, we are pleased that DOT is  
67 investigating day-lighting at the right turn locations, which will help free up the bus  
68 lanes.

69 CB4 is also pleased that New York City Transit will increase the service frequency and  
70 thus decrease the number of buses at the West side terminus.

71  
72 In the absence of bus loading sidewalk extensions that are the norm on 34th street – CB4  
73 recommends that the bus stop area on the road along the curbside, be painted in the same  
74 dark red paint as the bus lane, and be enforced by cameras to dissuade vehicles from  
75 parking there.

76  
77 CB4 also recommended that the maximum time allowed by the loading regulations be  
78 shortened from the current 3 hours to 1 hour. We believe the current regulation  
79 encourages parking instead of loading and contributes to the double-parking issues. We  
80 urge DOT to perform a pilot in our district and publish the results.

81  
82 CB4 appreciates being consulted and generally supports the plan for the 23rd Street SBS,  
83 while we request that the fare payment system be relocated.

1 **Transportation Planning Committee**

Item # 33

2  
3 July 27, 2016

4  
5 Alba Pico, First Deputy Commissioner  
6 Special Application Unit  
7 Department of Consumer Affairs  
8 42 Broadway 5th Floor  
9 New York N.Y. 10004

10  
11 **Re: Newsstand Application S/E/C 11th Avenue & W. 36th Street**

12  
13 Dear Deputy Commissioner Pico,

14  
15 Manhattan Community Board 4 (CB4) supports the application for a newsstand on the southeast  
16 corner of Eleventh Avenue and West 36th Street. After reviewing the location CB4 has  
17 determined that the sidewalk at the requested location is extremely wide with minimal  
18 obstructions and even with the newsstand, necessary clearance for pedestrians will remain.  
19 MTA has opposed this application as expressed in a letter to CB4, suggesting that stray paper  
20 from the stand will interfere with the ventilating fans in their building. Without a representative  
21 from the MTA we are unable to determine the severity of their claims and ask that DOT  
22 investigate to determine if there is a real danger. We found the newsstand to be consistent with  
23 required guidelines. Furthermore, we believe this newsstand will be a valuable resource to  
24 passengers using the new 7 Train station less than a block from this location and the many  
25 developments under way in nearby Hudson Yards.

26  
27 As always, thank you for your consideration

28  
29 Sincerely,

30

1 **Transportation Planning Committee**

**Item #34**

2

3 July 27, 2016

4

5 Alba Pico, First Deputy Commissioner

6 Special Application Unit

7 Department of Consumer Affairs

8 42 Broadway 5th Floor

9 New York N.Y. 10004

10

11 **Re: Newsstand Application S/W/C 44<sup>th</sup> Street & 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

12

13 Dear Deputy Commissioner Pico,

14

15 Manhattan Community Board 4 (CB4) supports the application for a newsstand on the southwest  
16 corner of Eighth Avenue and West 44th Street. After reviewing the location CB4 has

17 determined that the sidewalk at the requested location is extremely wide with minimal

18 obstructions and even with the newsstand, necessary clearance for pedestrians will remain.

19 We found the newsstand be consistent with required guidelines.

20

21 Sincerely,

22

DRAFT

1 **Transportation Planning Committee**

Item # 35

2  
3 July 27, 2016

4  
5 Alba Pico, First Deputy Commissioner  
6 Special Application Unit  
7 Department of Consumer Affairs  
8 42 Broadway 5th Floor  
9 New York N.Y. 10004

10  
11 **Re: Newsstand Application N/W/C 50th Street and Eighth Avenue**

12  
13 Dear Deputy Commissioner Pico,

14  
15 Manhattan Community Board 4 (CB4) opposes the application for a newsstand on the northwest  
16 corner of Eighth Avenue and West 50th Street. After reviewing the location CB4 has  
17 determined that the sidewalk on Eighth Avenue -- the requested location -- is extremely  
18 congested with pedestrian traffic and street furniture. A newsstand would aggravate an  
19 already difficult situation. CB4 has opposed this location several times in the past for similar  
20 reasons.

21  
22 The Transportation Planning Committee that considered the matter also recommended  
23 opposition because the applicant did not attend the committee meeting.

24  
25 As always, thank you for your consideration.

26  
27 Sincerely,  
28

2  
3 July 27, 2016

4  
5 Hon. Margery Perlmutter, Chair  
6 Board of Standards and Appeals  
7 250 Broadway, 29th Floor  
8 New York, NY 10007  
9

10 **Re: BSA Cal. # XXX-XX-BZ - Variance for 142 West 19<sup>th</sup> Street**

11  
12 Dear Ms. Perlmutter:

13  
14 On the recommendation of its Chelsea Land Use Committee, and after a duly noticed public  
15 hearing at the regular Board meeting on July 27, 2016 Manhattan Community Board No. 4  
16 (CB4), by a vote of XX in favor, XX opposed, XX abstaining and XX present but not eligible to  
17 vote, voted to recommend approval of an application under ZR 72-21 to permit the construction  
18 of a building with a total building height precluded by ZR 23-692 with the condition that the  
19 total height of the building be reduced to eight-stories, pending BSA review of the applicant's  
20 economic analysis and the determination of the minimum required variance.  
21

22 **Background**

23  
24 The premises are a four-story plus cellar mixed use building located in a C6-3A district. The  
25 applicant proposes to build a new ten-story plus cellar residential building with an FAR of 7.10  
26 and a total height of 100 feet. The proposed building complies with C6-3A bulk requirements,  
27 but because the lot is less than 45 feet wide, the "Sliver Law," ZR 23-692, restricts the building  
28 to a height no taller than the shortest adjacent building, or 66' 11" in the case of this lot.  
29

30 The applicant seeks a waiver of ZR 23-692 under ZR 72-21 in order to construct the proposed  
31 building, citing hardships due to unfavorable, unique conditions of the lot and the inability to  
32 earn a reasonable return.  
33

34 **Analysis**

35  
36 • **Site Conditions - ZR 72-21(a).**

37  
38 The applicant claims that the irregular shape, narrowness and small size of the lot constitute a  
39 unique set of conditions that creates an unnecessary hardship and practical difficulties in  
40 complying with the underlying zoning.  
41

42 CB4 believes that while an irregularly-shaped lot might be inconvenient and raise practical  
43 difficulties, there is nothing in the shape of the lot that prevents construction. We note that  
44 despite his claims, the applicant proposes to build without changing the shape of the lot.  
45

46 Similarly, since the lot is only the fourth narrowest of the 34 lots examined by the applicant  
47 within a 400' radius and the sixth smallest in terms of area, these conditions do not present truly  
48 unique conditions. Again, the applicant proposes to build without altering either the width or  
49 area of the lot.

50  
51 Finally, the Board believes that the environmental and geological reports fail to establish any  
52 unique conditions that cannot be overcome through remediation and construction methods that  
53 are standard in Manhattan. Any increased costs due to these conditions are included in the  
54 applicant's economic analysis.

55  
56 While the site may present practical difficulties compared to the rare perfect Manhattan lot, the  
57 site conditions constitute at best only a modest argument supporting a claim of undue hardship.

58

59 • **Reasonable Return and Minimal Variance - ZR 72-21(b) and ZR 72-21(e).**

60

61 As we have in the past, we defer to BSA's expertise in determining whether the applicant has  
62 truly demonstrated that the proposed waiver is necessary for the applicant to earn a reasonable  
63 return. We request that BSA consider the following specific points.

64

65 • The floor area of the proposed building is 50% greater than an as-of-right building, which in  
66 turn is 85% larger than the existing building. We question whether a building 275% as large  
67 as the existing building is actually necessary for the applicant to earn a reasonable return.

68

69 • A question was raised during the committee's discussion of the application regarding the  
70 accuracy of the assumed sale prices for new condominium units in this neighborhood. If the  
71 sale prices are understated, as we believe they may be, the applicant's expected return would  
72 be understated as well in the economic analysis. We request that BSA pay particular  
73 attention to the accuracy of the assumed local new construction sales.

74

75 • In light of the above two sections, we question whether the proposed waiver provides the  
76 minimum variance necessary to afford relief. We specifically ask BSA to determine whether  
77 the application would be expected to make a reasonable return if the proposed building were  
78 shortened to eight stories, eliminating the penthouse.

79

80 • **Character of the Neighborhood - ZR 72-21(c).**

81

82 The site is flanked by a six-story building and a seven-story building. The proposed ten-story  
83 building would tower over these, creating a jagged, sawtooth roof line. We believe that reducing  
84 the building to eight stories would better preserve the character of the neighborhood while still  
85 providing the applicant with a one-third larger building than that permitted as-of-right.

86

87

88 **Conclusion and Recommendation**

89

90 While the applicant presented many letters of support for the project, CB4 believes that he has  
91 presented only a modest argument in support of the findings required to establish undue

92 hardship. We also question whether the proposed project is the minimum variance necessary to  
93 afford relief. In addition, there was significant opposition to the variance at the committee  
94 meeting, both from members of the community and members of the committee itself.

95  
96 We therefore request that *in lieu* of the proposed ten-story building, BSA consider whether an  
97 eight-story building, without the proposed penthouse, would satisfy the required findings under  
98 ZR 72-21. If so, CB4 recommends that BSA approve a waiver to ZR 23-692 permitting the  
99 construction of an eight-story building.

100  
101 Sincerely,  
102  
103 Delores  
104 Lee  
105 Betty

DRAFT

2  
3 July 27, 2016

4  
5 Hon. Meenakshi Srinivasan, Chair  
6 Landmarks Preservation Commission  
7 Municipal Building, 9th floor  
8 One Centre Street New York, NY 10007

9  
10 **Re: 442 West 22<sup>nd</sup> Street**

11  
12 Dear Chair Srinivasan:

13  
14 On the recommendation of its Chelsea Land Use Committee, following a duly noticed public  
15 hearing at the committee's meeting on July 18, 2016, Manhattan Community Board No. 4 (CB4),  
16 at its regularly scheduled meeting on July 27, 2016, voted, by a vote of XX in favor, XX  
17 opposed, XX abstaining and XX present but not eligible to vote, to recommend approval of an  
18 application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) for alterations and additions to  
19 442 West 22<sup>nd</sup> Street with conditions about the proposed penthouse, lighting, and storage of  
20 garbage.

21  
22 Background

23 The building at 442 West 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, which is located in the Chelsea Historic District, is a row  
24 house built in 1846-47 with three floors and a lower level. It has been altered over the years so  
25 that it no longer reflects its original Greek Revival architectural style. The façade was stripped,  
26 window openings made smaller and the front stoop removed. An addition in the rear was  
27 removed and a chimney added.

28  
29 The building was most recently used as Single Room Occupancy structure; it will be converted  
30 into a single family home. At the July 18<sup>th</sup> Chelsea Land Use Committee meeting a man said  
31 that he was currently living in the building and that he was the last remaining tenant.

32  
33 The applicant proposes to restore the Greek Revival features to the brick façade, returning the  
34 windows and entry to their original dimensions, easily discerned in the masonry work,  
35 reestablishing the stoop and removing the rear chimney. A one story penthouse would be added  
36 to the roof along with mechanical equipment and a bulkhead. This penthouse would have  
37 terraces in the front and the back. Also proposed is a two-story full-width rear addition with  
38 balconies and a basement.

39  
40 CB4 Analysis

41 CB4 applauds the applicant's proposed historic restoration, returning this building to its former  
42 elegant appearance, and enhancing this block's integrity.

43  
44 CB4 is comfortable with the rear extension which avoids protruding into the rear yard beyond its  
45 neighbors.

47 Based on views of the mock-up of the proposed penthouse, this addition is very visible from the  
48 north side of the street. Several neighbors complained of the bulky size of the penthouse.  
49

50 The proposed lighting – exterior wall sconces – in the rear could be annoying to nearby  
51 neighbors. The current garbage storage in the front yard is unsightly.  
52

53 CB4 Recommendations

54 CB4 enthusiastically recommends approval of the restoration of the street façade, replacing long  
55 lost historic features. We also recommend approval of the rear addition since it is of a reasonable  
56 size and lines up with the adjacent buildings.  
57

58 Our recommended approval is conditional on the following:  
59

- 60 • The penthouse/bulkhead addition should be altered so it is not visible from the street. It  
61 should either be made smaller, pushed to the rear about 15 feet (where the back terrace is)  
62 or eliminated entirely. To be less intrusive, it should be constructed of a material other  
63 than brick, preferably glass.  
64
- 65 • The several exterior wall sconces on the south elevation should be down-facing cone  
66 lights with bulbs not visible from adjacent properties.  
67
- 68 • The new stoop should be used for storage of garbage containers, out of sight of the public  
69 way, allowing room in the front for a garden.  
70

71 *(In addition to these physical issues, LPC should work with the Department of Buildings to*  
72 *determine the status of the remaining tenant, and whether the building either has or is required*  
73 *to have a Certificate of No Harassment.)*  
74

75 Sincerely,

76  
77 Delores  
78 Lee  
79 Betty  
80

81 CC: DOB  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88

2  
3 July 27, 2016

4  
5 Hon. Meenakshi Srinivasan, Chair  
6 Landmarks Preservation Commission  
7 Municipal Building, 9th floor  
8 One Centre Street New York, NY 10007  
9

10 **Re: 413-435 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street Rooftop Addition, Canopy and Signage Proposal**

11  
12 Dear Chair Srinivasan:

13  
14 On the recommendation of its Chelsea Land Use Committee, at its regular Board meeting on July  
15 27, 2016 Manhattan Community Board No. 4 (CB4), by a vote of XX in favor, XX opposed, XX  
16 abstaining and XX present but not eligible to vote, voted to recommend approval with  
17 recommendations for the proposed alterations to 413-435 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street in the Gansevoort  
18 Market Historic District.

19  
20 Background and Description of Proposal

21 Originally known as the Gillen Building, for its developer, the twelve-bay concrete building was  
22 constructed in 1913-14 and received a fourth-floor addition above its four eastern bays in 1922.

23  
24 The building, which is currently vacant, will have retail uses on the ground floor with offices on  
25 the second and third floors. The applicant proposes to add a 1200 square foot penthouse on the  
26 roof of the fourth-floor addition. This penthouse would be used as a conference room, and would  
27 be set back 43 feet from West 14<sup>th</sup> Street. It would have a grey metal facade which would  
28 contrast with the existing concrete building.

29  
30 A canopy would be added over the building entry. Storefront signage would consist of window  
31 decals and blade signs.

32  
33 CB4 Analysis and Recommendations

34 CB4 finds that the proposed rooftop addition will be minimally visible from the public way and  
35 is set back far enough from the existing street façade and clad in such a recessive manner that it  
36 will not detract from the building's overall composition.

37  
38 We also find the proposed signage and glass-and-steel entrance canopy appropriate, and would  
39 only ask that the canopy be better rendered in perspective to convey its appearance from the  
40 sidewalk so that the Commission might better assess and discuss it. The proposal as presented to  
41 the Board instead relies on a photograph of an existing canopy in the neighborhood to which the  
42 proposed one would be similar but not identical.

43  
44 CB4 has asked the applicant to improve the look of the sidewalk area in front of the building by  
45 adding planters or pots with shrubs and/or flowers. A smaller security camera in the front would  
46 also make the building more attractive. A bike rack would be a welcome addition.

48 CB4 regrets the missed opportunity to retain and make use of rainwater from the building's blue  
49 roof and the new canopy, both of which will instead drain into the storm sewer. CB4 takes this  
50 opportunity to encourage the owner to propose further changes to the building only under a  
51 systematic plan to meet standards such as LEED or Passive House, given the building's large  
52 scale and impactful footprint. Such an approach might more beneficially inform design  
53 directions. For example, restoration of more canopies to the building's south-facing street façade  
54 – which historically had a continuous row of them – might have both preservation merit and  
55 reduce the building's cooling load through shading, offsetting their construction cost. CB4 hopes  
56 in the future to work with the Commission toward solutions which demonstrate awareness of  
57 both their immediate historic context and the City's carbon footprint.

58

59 Sincerely,

60

61 Delores

62 Lee

63 Betty

64

65

DRAFT

1 **Chelsea Land Use Committee**

**Item # 39**

2  
3 July 27, 2016

4  
5 Carl Weisbrod, Director  
6 City Planning Department  
7 120 Broadway,  
8 New York, NY 10271

9  
10 **Re: The Women's Building at 550 West 20<sup>th</sup> Street**

11 Dear Mr. Weisbrod:

12  
13  
14 On the recommendation of its Chelsea Land Use Committee, Manhattan Community Board No.  
15 4 (CB4), at its scheduled meeting on July 27, 2016, voted, by a vote of XX in favor, XX  
16 opposed, XX abstaining and XX present but not eligible to vote, to support the concept of the  
17 Women's Building but not to make specific recommendations on the proposed zoning overrides  
18 until the Board has had the opportunity to review their impact on the community.

19  
20 CB4 is excited that the former Bayview Correctional Facility will be transformed into a center to  
21 support social activism, providing space primarily for nonprofit women's organizations. We are  
22 pleased that the applicant plans to work with the state's Historic Preservation Office on the  
23 redevelopment and that the main building will not be demolished or built over, and that many of  
24 that building's unique historic features are to be preserved, including the seamen's chapel, the  
25 large pool with aquatic mosaics and the Art Deco brick façade.

26  
27 However, the Environmental Assessment prepared for the Women's Building indicates that the  
28 project will require fifteen zoning overrides, including waivers for floor area, building height and  
29 setback, and yard, use and sign regulations. Since CB4 only received a detailed description of  
30 each proposed override and the reasoning behind the requests on July 15<sup>th</sup>, three days before the  
31 July 18<sup>th</sup> Chelsea Land Use Committee meeting, there was not sufficient time for adequate  
32 review and analysis.

33  
34 The Board therefore is unable to support the application for the overrides at this time. Once we  
35 have reviewed the proposed waivers and discussed them with the applicant, we will make  
36 specific recommendations on each request.

37  
38 CB4 appreciates that the NoVo Foundation and the Goren Group have kept CB4 updated on the  
39 progress of the project and have offered the community tours of the building. We look forward  
40 to continued engagement with them as the Women's Building develops.

41  
42 Sincerely,  
43 Delores Rubin  
44 Lee Compton Betty Mackintosh

45  
46 Cc: Karolina, Tatiana, Carrie

2  
3 DATE

4  
5 NAME(S)?

6 Street Activity Permit Office  
7 100 Gold Street, 2nd Floor  
8 New York, NY 10038  
9

10 Re: STREET ACTIVITY PERMIT APPLICATION

11  
12 **Sponsor:** Samaritan Daytop Village Inc.  
13 **Event Producer:** Clearview Festival Productions  
14 **Location:** Ninth Avenue between West 42<sup>nd</sup> and 55<sup>th</sup> Streets (13 Blocks)  
15 **Date:** September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016 (Rain or Shine)  
16 **Times:** Setup 8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. with one hour buffer time  
17 Public Event 11:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.  
18 Breakdown 6:00 p.m. – 7:30 p.m. sharp  
19

20 Dear ????,

21  
22 It is our understanding that the Samaritan Daytop Village Inc. (“Sponsor”) submitted a renewal  
23 application to the Mayor’s Office of Citywide Event Coordination and Management Street’s Activity  
24 Permit Office (“SAPO”) requesting a relocation of its annual Street Fair (“Fair”) from Madison Avenue,  
25 in Manhattan Community Board 5, to Ninth Avenue between West 42<sup>nd</sup> and 55<sup>th</sup> Streets. Sponsor has  
26 hired Clearview Festival Productions (“Producer”) to host the Fair on September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016. The  
27 breakdown of the day is as noted above.

28 Due to the overwhelming traffic and pedestrian congestion, and the numerous fairs that already take place  
29 in this area, Manhattan Community Board 4’s (“MCB4”) Quality of Life Committee (“QOL”) is greatly  
30 concerned about the potential negative impact that the relocation of the Fair may impose on residents’  
31 quality of life, and businesses’ economic well being. Therefore, QOL recommends *denial* of the request  
32 to relocate *unless* the stipulations as noted below and previously agreed upon by the Sponsor and  
33 Producer, are adhered to.

34 Samaritan Daytop Village Inc. is a non-profit organization that provides health and human services to  
35 over 28,000 people each year through a network of more than 40 facilities located throughout New York  
36 City, Long Island and upstate New York. Services include a community ambulatory unit on 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, a  
37 residential center for veterans in recovery on West 43<sup>rd</sup> Street, and a veteran’s housing center on West 44<sup>th</sup>  
38 Street.  
39

40 Stipulations agreed to:

- 41 • Significant advance outreach will be made to area residents and businesses, Block Associations,  
42 and Hudson Yard/Hell’s Kitchen Business Improvement District, whereby Sponsor and/or  
43 Producer will present detailed information about the Fair. (Documentation of outreach  
44 presentation to be forwarded to MCB4 prior to the Fair.)
- 45 • Immediately after the Fair, the above entities will be contacted to provide their feedback on the  
46 Fair’s impact.
- 47 • Sponsor and Producer will attend QOL’s October 2016 Committee Meeting to report the results  
48 of said feedback.
- 49 • Sponsor and Producer will not request permission to hold any future events on 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue if  
50 MCB4 deems that the Fair has had a negative impact on area residents and/or businesses.

- 1 • Producer agrees it will *not* submit any future application to SAPO requesting 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue as a
- 2 location for *any other event*.
- 3 • During setup through breakdown, all designated bike lanes must be 100% clear of obstructions.
- 4 • During setup through breakdown, all affected sidewalks must be 100% clear of obstructions.
- 5 • Bicyclists must dismount when entering the Fair site.
- 6 • A marshal/monitor will be stationed every two blocks to ensure that the Fair is safe and orderly.
- 7 • No alcoholic beverages will be served.
- 8 • Sponsor will host booths every two blocks to provide information about services it offers in the
- 9 neighborhood.
- 10 • Area businesses interested in participating in the Fair will be offered a discounted rental fee of
- 11 \$50 per 10' lot, and they will be given the opportunity to set-up in front of their place of business.
- 12 • Area non-profits and block associations, as well as city agencies, will be invited to participate at
- 13 no charge.
- 14 • Picnic tables will be made available for the public free of charge, regardless of whether or not
- 15 purchases are made.
- 16 • Programming will include interactive games for children.
- 17 • Music will be limited to "less aggressive" instruments, such as the harp.
- 18 • From blocks West 42<sup>nd</sup> to 49<sup>th</sup> Streets (NEED TO VERIFY) Producer (through its "Pop Up"
- 19 division) will offer a non-traditional Fair. Merchandise vendors will be of the arts and crafts
- 20 variety. The food featured will be artisanal and selected via the New York Food Incubator
- 21 Program.
- 22 • From blocks West 50<sup>th</sup> to 55<sup>th</sup> Streets (NEED TO VERIFY) Producer will feature more
- 23 traditional, typical street fair vendors.
- 24 • Booths will be set up toward the middle of the block, outside of the pedestrian islands on the east
- 25 side of the avenue.

26  
27 Sponsor and Producer have acknowledged that MCB4 will only grant a one-year provisional trial, which  
28 will not be renewed if the Fair's impact is deemed to negatively impact the surrounding community.

29  
30 Sponsor estimates a 30% increase in the Fair's revenue at the 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue location, which would benefit its  
31 ever-expanding client list. Producer's formula for the division of the Fair's proceeds are as follows: 20%  
32 of gross revenue is paid to the City of New York, and after expenses are paid (i.e., insurance, sanitation,  
33 advertising, NYPD, etc.), the remaining funds are split 50-50 between the Sponsor and Producer.

34  
35 MCB4 acknowledges that the Ninth Avenue International Food Festival intends to benefit Block  
36 Associations and non-profit organizations in our district through financial donations and pro-bono vendor  
37 spaces.

38  
39 Please feel free to contact Jesse Bodine, MCB4's District Manager if you should have any questions or  
40 concerns.

41  
42 Sincerely,

43  
44 Delores

45 Tina

46 David

47 [Add Signature Block]

48  
49 CC: Samaritan Daytop Village Festival  
50 Clearview Festival Productions

51  
52 Encl: 1) Samaritan Daytop Village Festival - 2016 - New Location  
53 2) Clearview Application

1 **Executive Committee**

2  
3 July XX, 2016

4  
5 Hon. Meenakshi Srinivasan, Chair  
6 Landmarks Preservation Commission  
7 Municipal Building, 9th floor  
8 One Centre Street New York, NY 10007  
9

10 **Re: 334 West 20<sup>th</sup> Street**

11 Dear Chair Srinivasan:

12  
13  
14 On the recommendation of its Executive Committee, Manhattan Community Board No. 4  
15 (MCB4), at its regularly scheduled meeting on July 27, 2016, voted, by a vote of XX in favor,  
16 XX opposed, XX abstaining and XX present but not eligible to vote, to recommend that the  
17 Landmarks Preservation Commission does not vote at its August 2<sup>nd</sup> public hearing and keeps  
18 the hearing open so that CB4 and the public can properly review the application for the  
19 renovation of 334 West 20<sup>th</sup> Street which we only received on Friday, July 22<sup>nd</sup>. The proposal  
20 includes a rooftop addition which is an element that often is of concern to the community. The  
21 Chelsea Land Use Committee would review the application on September 19<sup>th</sup> and the  
22 application would be voted on by the full Board on October 5<sup>th</sup>.  
23

24 Sincerely,

25  
26 Delores  
27 Lee  
28 Betty  
29

30 CC: DOB  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

1 Executive Committee  
2 Item#: 42

3  
4  
5 July 20, 2016

6  
7 William T. Castro  
8 Manhattan Borough Commissioner  
9 NYC Parks Department  
10 Arsenal West  
11 24 West 61<sup>st</sup> Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
12 New York, NY 10023

13  
14 **Re: West 20<sup>th</sup> Street Park Scoping Discussion**

15  
16 Dear Mr. Castro:

17  
18 Manhattan Community Board 4 (MCB4), would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the  
19 detailed presentation of the future West 20<sup>th</sup> Street Park. This site located at 136-140 West 20<sup>th</sup>  
20 Street between 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenues has been envisioned as green space by many members of the  
21 community for some time. Learning that the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) took  
22 possession of the lot on May 1<sup>st</sup> of this year was welcome news to those in the community that  
23 had been advocating for this new park. Despite the area for the park being only approximately  
24 100' x 100', we were delighted to see renderings of all the possibilities for this space including  
25 trees, a possible water feature, stage, public art, a small structure for storage of gardening tools,  
26 seating and play features. There are however a few areas of concern which we would like to  
27 highlight below.

- 28
- 29 • The proposed 4-foot fence consistent with the new Parks without Borders invites the  
30 potential for inappropriate nighttime use of the park and is not viewed favorably by this  
31 community.
  - 32 • MCB4 would like to be assured that the fence be properly secured each night.
  - 33 • Night lighting may be an issue so MCB4 requests that lighting be designed in such a way  
34 as not to penetrate the windows of apartments overlooking the space.
  - 35 • MCB4 would like a well-defined program developed for maintaining the proposed  
36 plantings each season.
  - 37 • Public Art including designs for the blank western wall is welcomed, but the community  
38 would appreciate a more robust process of informing the community and gaining input  
39 from the community about art works in addition to postings on the DPR website.
  - 40 • The Waterfront, Parks and Environment committee was quoted \$500 per foot to build this  
41 Park. MCB4 would like the opportunity to understand how that compares with other  
42 DPR projects.
  - 43 • MCB4 would like to see an appropriate design for infiltration of water in the hopes of  
44 reducing additional runoff into our combined sewer system. In addition, there is an  
45 opportunity for the installation of holding tanks in an already existing below ground  
46 containment space, in particular the basement of the existing building that is to be razed.

- 1       • MCB4 would like clarity as to whether dogs would be allowed in the park understanding  
2       no dog without a leash will be allowed in any case.  
3       • MCB4 has a long-standing policy requiring sidewalks have at least 8 feet of space to  
4       permit the unimpeded flow of pedestrian traffic. The proposed tree plantings and seating  
5       might impinge on this necessary space.  
6

7 Thank you again for having this conversation with our committee. We look forward to seeing the  
8 further development of this park’s design toward the end of the current year.  
9

10 Sincerely,  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 Delores Rubin  
17 Chair

Maarten de Kadt  
Co-chair  
Waterfront, Parks &  
Environment Committee

Lowell Kern,  
Co-chair  
Waterfront, Parks &  
Environment Committee

20 CC: Steve Simon, DPR  
21 George Bloomer, DPR  
22  
23

2  
3

4 July 2016

5

6 Mr. Paul Kiernan

7 and

8 Mr. Michael Kelly

9 Alfies

10 800 9th Avenue

11 New York, NY 10019

12

13 Re: Alfies Bar and Restaurant 800 9th Avenue (West 53 Street)

14

15 Dear Mr. Paul Kiernan and Mr. Michael Kelly:

16

17 Manhattan Community Board 4 (“MCB4”) writes to acknowledge that Mr. Paul Kiernan and Mr.  
18 Michael Kelly appeared before its Quality of Life Committee (“QOL”) on July 11th, 2016. The  
19 meeting was held as a result of numerous requests received from the residents of HK 50-51  
20 Block Association, which is the neighborhood block association whose residents live in the  
21 surrounding blocks from Alfies. Approximately half a dozen residents and representatives from  
22 HK 50-51 Block Association appeared at the meeting.

23

24 MCB4 goal is to work with the both the residents and small businesses owners to find a balanced  
25 and productive approach when quality of life issues arise. MCB4 appreciates and acknowledges  
26 Owner and Management’s expressed good faith and willingness to take immediate action to  
27 rectify the issues raised by the residents. These particular complaints are summarized as follows:

28

- 29 • Improper use of amplified music;
- 30 • Exceeding the number of patrons permitted on sidewalk café as per their Certificate  
31 of Occupancy;
- 32 • Exceeding the hours of operation on sidewalk café as per their previously agreed  
33 Hours of Operation; and
- 34 • Moving the sidewalk trash basket way from the corner

35

36 **EXISTING STIPULATIONS**

37

38 Occupancy and Use

39

40 It is MCB4’s understanding that Alfies has a public assembly permit from the Department of  
41 Buildings (“DOB”) for 74 people (including employees) and a sidewalk café occupancy of no  
42 more than 8 tables and 16 seats. Residents are very concerned that more than 16 people  
43 (including employees) may be permitted access to the sidewalk café premises at any one time.

44

45 Description and Operation of Business

46

1 Accordingly, Alfies is not permitted to have any outdoor speakers, and must adhere to  
2 “Background Music” regulations. Background music is commonly understood to be amplified  
3 music/sound intended as an unobtrusive accompaniment to an activity, such as, in your case,  
4 dining in a restaurant. In any event, Alfies must comply with all relevant New York City codes  
5 and regulations as they relate to sound emanating from your establishment.  
6

7 PROPOSED REMEDIATION

8  
9 Communication with the Block Association

10  
11 During the Quality of Life July 2016 meeting, Alfies Management expressed a willingness to  
12 create a positive working relationship with their neighbors and attend the HK 50\51 Block  
13 Association meetings regularly. In addition, Mr. Michael Kelly agreed to be Alfies’s “point  
14 person” to address constituents’ concerns. Mr. Kelly agreed to work with complainants and  
15 offered his cellphone number (917) 523-4972 as the point of contact when issues arise. Finally  
16 Alfies agreed to return to the Quality of Life Committee in October to report on the progress  
17

18 Noise

19  
20 Management indicated that it intends to remove all outdoor speakers and keep all windows and  
21 doors closed when utilizing amplified sound.  
22

23 MCB4 takes requests and complaints from both residents and business owners seriously, as we.  
24 For your convenience a copy of the signed stipulations has been included in this letter. MCB4  
25 appreciates both the block association and your willingness to work together and look forward to  
26 your attendance at the October 2016 meeting to discuss the results of your efforts.  
27

28 Sincerely,

29  
30 Delores Rubin  
31 Chair  
32 Community Board 4

30 David Pincus  
31 Co-Chair  
32 Quality of Life Committee

30 Tina DiFeliciano  
31 Co-Chair  
32 Quality of Life Committee

33  
34 Enclosure:  
35