

2
3 Hon. Meenakshi Srinivasan, Chair
4 Board of Standards and Appeals
5 40 Rector Street
6 New York, NY 10006

7
8 **Re: BSA No. 237-12 BZ**
9 **Special Permit at 220 West 19th Street**

10
11 Dear Ms. Srinivasan,

12
13 On the recommendation of its Chelsea Preservation and Planning Committee, following a site
14 visit by a committee member, and after a duly noticed public hearing at the regular Board
15 meeting on October 3, 2012, Manhattan Community Board No. 4 voted __in favor, __opposed,
16 __abstaining, and __present but not eligible to vote to recommend the granting a special permit
17 to Crunch LLC for a Physical Culture Establishment at 220 West 19th Street.

18
19 According to plans submitted by the applicant, and confirmed by inspection, the facility will be
20 approximately 15,500 square feet distributed over the ground, cellar and second floors. The
21 spaces are appropriate for their stated strength, cardio-vascular and weight training uses, and all
22 floors have provisions for ADA accessibility. The Board particularly appreciates the steps taken
23 by the applicant to minimize noise disturbance of neighbors: the main exercise area on the
24 ground floor is fully enclosed in the interior of the floor and does not have an external wall, and
25 the spinning studio is located in the cellar.

26
27 The Board believes that the facility meets the required findings in ZR 73-03 and ZR 73-36 and
28 will be an appropriate and attractive addition to the community. We thus recommend the
29 granting of the requested special permit.

30
31 As on previous occasions, the Board wishes to state that it sees no reason why this elaborate
32 permit procedure, including a ULURP-like process, is required in a world where gymnasiums
33 and beauty parlors with extended services are common in commercial districts, especially on
34 local retail and service streets. It is an unnecessary burden on applicants, creating major costs
35 and delays, particularly for small businesses that must invest money they often cannot afford,
36 and wastes the time of applicants, Community Boards and the Board of Standards and Appeals
37 alike. Everyone involved has better things to do. Some simple process of authorization after a
38 routine investigation of the applicants would avoid the relatively rare case of abuse and
39 encourage legitimate businesses.

2
3 Stanley Shor
4 Assistant Commissioner
5 New York City Department of Information Technology and Telecommunication (DOITT)
6 2 Metrotech Center, 4th Floor
7 Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201
8 futurephones@doitt.nyc.gov
9

10 October 4, 2012

11
12 Dear Assistant Commissioner Shor:

13
14 Manhattan Community Board 4 (CB4) appreciates that DOITT is requesting public comments on
15 the Request for Information (RFI) for sidewalk based Telecommunication devices. We agree
16 with DOITT that the current “Payphone” devices are outdated and in need of transformation in
17 their amenities, design and placement and are pleased that DOITT is evaluating what changes to
18 implement in the October 2014 new franchise contract.
19

20 In summary, CB4 supports telecommunication devices, provided each one has a significantly
21 reduced footprint and modern amenities including Wi-Fi and touch screen devices, as well as
22 telephone services.

23 There should be fewer Telecommunication devices that include an advertising panel (no more
24 than one location per two-sided block). None of the existing installations should be
25 grandfathered. Site selection should include utilize a process and guidelines similar to newsstand,
26 including Community Board review.
27

28 Below is CB4’s response to the first 5 questions in the DOITT RFI (the final 4 questions are
29 designed for potential franchisees and technology experts):
30

- 31 **1. *What alternative communication amenities would fill a need?*** CB4 supports the
32 incorporation of free Wi-Fi services within a defined radius and for the device internet
33 and phone service to avoid the disruptions currently caused by cable cuts due to
34 groundwork. We envision a small computer touchscreen with one button free access to
35 nearby mass transit, bike share and landmark locations; 911, 311 and 511 contact; and
36 community (including Community Board) events. Amenities for charge could include
37 telephone calls, and cell phone battery recharge - all with time limits of 3 to 4 minutes.
38 Both coin and credit card payments should be allowed.
39

40 Understanding the city’s desire to maintain advertising revenue, the screen could have
41 advertising adjacent to touch screen information and on the full screen while battery recharge is
42 occurring. On the telecommunication installation with advertising panels, the panels should have
43 the capabilities to carry notifications of major emergencies such as hurricanes or evacuations.
44

45 While all installations should include basic services, including 911, 311 and 511 one touch
46 feature, the mix of amenities might vary based on location, need and Community Board
47 recommendations.

48
49 **2. *Should the current designs of sidewalk payphone enclosures be substantially revised?***

50 CB4 requests a substantial redesign of the sidewalk telecommunication devices to a two-
51 panel slim profile fixture, no more than one foot deep, with no pedestrian protections or
52 other overhangs. The devices should be placed so that none of their elements projects
53 more than three feet from the curb.

54
55 These two-sided devices should include a steel and glass design, consistent with existing Cemusa
56 bus shelter and newsstand designs (the devices could also be integrated with them). We
57 recommend that no more than one advertising panel be permitted per block (including
58 intersection). We feel strongly there should not be free standing advertising panels. At a time
59 when the city is seeking, as stated in the DOTT RFI, to reduce sidewalk fixtures this would be a
60 dangerous and unnecessary precedent.

61
62 **3. *What features should be included to make the installations accessible to people with***
63 ***disabilities?***

64
65 Telecommunication devices should be handicapped accessible to the maximum degree possible.
66 This should include vertical sliding display panels to enable wheelchair accessibility, brail
67 numbers and letters, and verbal-to-type conversation features. Specific efforts should be made
68 for any proposed installations located near residences and services for the disabled and
69 neighborhoods that contain a higher percentage of disabled residents.

70
71 **4. *Should the current number of payphones on City sidewalks change and, if so, how?***

72 While there continues to be a need for payphones/Telecommunication devices, far fewer
73 are needed than currently exist. While we could not estimate how many
74 Telecommunication devices may be needed, the estimated 75% reduction in payphones
75 nationally in the last 3 years might be a guiding goal.

76
77 We propose that the placement of telecommunication devices go through a process similar to
78 newsstands, that include Community Board review and approval, as well as well as
79 recommendations for amenities and placement of advertising panels. The new franchise contract
80 in 2014 should not grandfather in current payphone locations and DOITT and/or franchisee
81 recommendation for placement of telecommunications devices should be guided by:

82
83 *a. Safety, Pedestrian Crowding and sidewalk furniture/fixtures:* Several areas
84 have sidewalks that are overcrowded with pedestrians and/or other street
85 furniture and the benefits of the telecommunication devices would be
86 outweighed by the additional pedestrian obstruction. An example is the major
87 retail districts along Eighth and Ninth Avenues in CB4. On Eighth Avenue,
88 one can routinely observe streams of pedestrians walking in the street in the
89 Broadway/hotel midtown district, between the Port Authority and Penn
90 Station and in the central retail corridor of Chelsea. On most of 9th Avenue,

91 the sidewalks were narrowed and the street widened to accommodate the
92 Lincoln Tunnel traffic. In addition many of the buildings have sidewalk trap
93 doors that remain open during most of the day. In the spring, summer and fall
94 there are over 50 sidewalk cafes. As a result the pedestrian path is extremely
95 tight. Yet there are 70 installations on those two corridors.
96 At the same time, 10th 11th and 12th Avenues have wide sidewalks that are less
97 travelled. If properly situated, more telecommunication devices in these areas
98 will be a benefit from a pedestrian safety standpoint.
99

100 *b. Avoiding corner locations:* Most vehicular/pedestrian accidents and fatalities
101 occur while vehicles are turning onto a street or avenue. Turning speeds and
102 pedestrian crossing decisions are often affected by momentary viewing from
103 varying site-lines and angles from various heights and locations. There have
104 been several accidents, including ones that lead to fatalities that occurred at
105 intersections with payphone installations in our Community Board district.
106 We prefer to err on the side of caution and generally restrict
107 telecommunication devices from locations near street corners
108

109 *c. Limiting Telecommunication device per block:* No more than one device on
110 any block (including both sides of the street) should include an advertising
111 panel. Any more than that creates visual clutter and likely has diminishing
112 returns for the advertisers. There seems to be no rationale for installing more
113 than two Telecommunication devices on any given block (including both sides
114 of the street). That should provide sufficient availability for any emergency
115 and sufficient access for anyone seeking information, even in high usage
116 areas.
117

118 *d. Need for telecommunication services:* DOITT should identify census
119 tracts/blocks that have lower telephone ownership rates for potential
120 placements. Also, if the increased amenities are provided, locations near (or
121 attached to) bicycle share locations, major tourist destinations and parks
122 (without advertisements) may be appropriate;
123

124 *e. Current usage:* While data was not available in the DOITT RFI, we feel
125 phone usage (and telecommunication usage in the future) should be used in
126 determining the best need for telecommunication devices at a given location.
127 We hope that information becomes available before the franchise renewal.
128

129 Most importantly, the location decision process should include Community Board review
130 and recommendations, with a 60 day review period. While we understand that this might
131 lead to a one-time relatively high volume of location reviews in advance and immediately
132 after franchise selection in 2014, it will be well worth the effort. Community Boards, and
133 the various businesses and block/neighborhood associations they consult with have
134 substantial knowledge of pedestrian usage, street furniture, areas of crime and safety
135 concerns and specific buildings or areas that may have specific amenity or other
136 telecommunication needs. We also feel this process should be used for recommendation

137 for Telecommunication device removals and that there also should be a process for
138 Community Board initiated removal of devices.

139

1405. **Should advertising panels be limited to printed posters?** Digital panels are now the norm and
141 are much easier to maintain and thus a logical replacement for most printed posters, provided the
142 illumination is at a level that will not impact surrounding residences or ground floor businesses
143 or create pedestrian or driver glare. We strongly object to including moving animation, “news
144 zippers,” video, or frequently changing panels that do cause visual clutter and likely would
145 increase driver (or bicyclist or pedestrian) view time to an unsafe level.

146

147 Other Recommendations

148

149 **1. Information is crucial:** It is important (and appropriate, given the agency’s mission) that
150 DOITT make information on Telecommunication device usage (by amenity) and repair
151 status available on-line for individual installations as well as by Community Board and
152 other geography. This will be crucial for informed Community Board decisions and will
153 increase public understanding about site location and improve usage efficiency. We were
154 disappointed that individual Payphone usage information was not available for review
155 during this RFI process, since it would have been useful in responding to question 4
156 regarding the number of Telecommunication devices. We hope the new
157 Telecommunication devices will enable this information to be collected and available in
158 real time.

159 **2. Continued dialogue with the public in advance of New Franchise Contract:** The
160 current payphone amenities and design have remained largely unchanged for over 50
161 years. It is likely that the new design/amenities will remain in place for a substantial
162 amount of time. Continued community discussion in the form of public hearings,
163 charettes, and presentations should also occur. We had hoped that a design contest with
164 public input would take place. Short of such we hope that any tentative design is brought
165 back for public review and comment before final approval.

166

167 This is particularly important because, as evidenced by DOITT’s technical questions (questions
168 6-9, not addressed in our response) the available technology and thus amenities are partially
169 unknown. In addition, we understand there may be trade-offs – for example touch-screen
170 capacity versus brail availability – and that industry feedback is still required on which devices
171 will be the least likely to be impacted by weather and vandalism. As more is known and the
172 trade-offs articulated and discussed, ideas and preferences can be better defined. We hope
173 DOITT’s process will enable such discussion and Community Board input. .

174

175 CB4 greatly appreciates that DOITT is seeking information from a wide variety of stakeholders,
176 including the time extension provided to enable Community Board responses after the summer.
177 We also appreciate the wide variety of options DOITT is considering on amenities, design and
178 location decision process and the creative thinking the phrasing of the RFI reflects. We look
179 forward to continued discussion and to a positive future for useful public Telecommunication
180 devices.

181

Sincerely yours,

182

183 **Attachment: Current payphone locations recommended not to be included as part of the**
184 **new DoITT Telecommunication franchise agreement.**
185

On 9th Av, NW corner of 9th and 45th St.
On 9th Av, NE corner of 9th and 38th St
On 44th St, SW corner 44 and 9th avenue
SW corner of 10th avenue and 50th St., on 10th
E - midblock 50/49th St., on 10th Av.
SE corner of 26th St. and 9th, on 26th St
SW corner of 25th St. and 6th Av, on 25th
On 8th Avenue, SW corner of 8th and 56th St
On 8th Av, NW corner of 8th and 55th St
On 9th, NE corner of 42nd and 9th Av across from TD Bank
NW corner of 8th Av. and 44th St, on 8th
On 8th Ave, SW corner of 8th and 40th Street
W-Midblock 45/44 on 8th Av.
NE corner of 9th Av and 44th St, on 9th
NW corner of 9th Av and 43rd St., on 9th
NE corner 9th Av and 43rd St, on 9th Avenue
SE corner of 9th Av and 43rd St, on 9th
SW corner, 9th Av. and 42nd St. on 9th
NW corner of 34th St. and 9th Av, on 34th
NW corner of 9th and 37th St, on 9th
NW corner 47th St and 9th on 9th Ave
NE corner of 48th St & 9AV
On 9th avenue: SW corner 43 St.
NW corner of 45th and 9th. On 9th Av.
SE Corner of 9th and 58th, on 9th Av
On 9th, NW corner of 9th and 39th St.
On 9th Av, SW corner of 9th Av. and 35th Street
On 9th Av. SE corner of 9th and 38th St.
On 9th, NE corner of 9th and 39th

On 9th, SE corner of 9th and 37th street
On 9th NE corner of 9th and 39th street
On 9th, SE corner of 9th avenue and 40th street
On 9th, NE corner of 9th and 41st Street
On 9th Av, NW corner of 9th Av and 40th Street
On 9th Av, SW corner of 9th and 41st St.
On 9th Avenue, SE corner of 9th and 56th Street
On 37th Street, 307 West 37th, between 8th and 9th Avenues
On 8th Avenue, NW Corner of 8th and 37th
On 8th Avenue, SW corner of 8th and 38th
8th Ave, NW Corner of 8th and 38th Street
8th Ave, NW Corner of 8th and 39th Street
On 8th Ave, NW Corner of 8th and 39th
SW corner of 8th Av and 44th St., on 8th
SW corner of 8th Av. and 45th St., on 8th
NW corner of 8th Av. and 45th St, on 8th
SW corner of 8th Av. and 46th St, on 8th
NW corner of 8th Av. and 46th St, on 8th
NW corner of 8th Av. and 47th St, on 8th
SW corner of 8th Av and 48th Av, on 8th
NW corner of 8th Av and 48th St, on 8th
NW corner of 8th Av and 49th St, on 8th
SW corner of 8th ave and 50th St., on 8th
NW corner of 8th Av. and 50th St, on 8th
E - Midblock 52/53rd St. on 8th Av
SW corner of 8th Av. and 53rd St., on 8th
NW corner of 8th Av. and 53rd St, on 8th
913 Eighth Avenue @ 54 St
SW corner of 9th Av. and 54th St, on 9th
NW corner of 9th Av. and 53rd St, on 9th
SE corner of 53rd St and 9th Av., on 53rd

SW corner of 9th Av and 53rd St., on 9th
SE corner of 9th Av. and 52nd St., on 9th
SW corner of 9th Av. and 51st St., on 9th
NW corner of 9th Av and 51st St., on 9th
SE corner of 9th Av and 50th St, on 9th
NE corner of 9th Avenue and 49th St., on 9th
SW corner of 9th Av. and 49th St, on 9th
SE corner of 9th Av. and 49th St, on 9th
SW corner of 9th Av. and 48th St, on 9th
SE corner of 9th Av. and 46th St, on 9th
NW corner of 9th Av. and 46th St, on 9th
SE corner of 9th Av and 46th St, on 9th
SW corner of 9th Av and 46th St, on 9th
SW corner of 9th Av and 45th St. on 9th
NE corner of W. 44th and 10th Avenue

186

187 **Please note, many of the above listed installations are at street corners which, as stated in**
188 **the above letter, are not a good location for Telecommunication devices. For some of the**
189 **installations alternate locations not at the corner may be acceptable, pending Community**
190 **Board review.**

191

1 **Transportation Planning Committee**

Item #: 14

2
3 October 3, 2012

4
5 Ms. Margaret Forgione
6 Manhattan Borough Commissioner
7 55 Water Street
8 New York, New York 10041
9 New York City Department of Transportation

10
11 **Re: Parking regulations on W. 43 Street between 9th and 10th Avenues**

12
13 Dear Commissioner Forgione:

14
15 Manhattan Community Board 4(CB4) requests parking regulation changes on the south side of
16 W. 43rd Street between 9th and 10th Avenues, to accommodate the farmers' market that operates
17 during the summer on this side of the street.

18
19 The market started its operation three years ago and has attracted a loyal following in the
20 neighborhood. There are very few sources of fresh produces in this area. The farmers have
21 received a number of summonses, which make it difficult to continue servicing this area and
22 generate a profit.

23
24 The current regulation reads "No Standing Except Trucks Loading and Unloading 7a.m. – 7 p.m.
25 Except Sunday "

26
27 The new regulation we are requesting should read "No standing except for farmers market, 8
28 a.m. to 6 p.m. Saturday, May to November". It is to be installed on the south curb, starting 385
29 ft. 250 ft., ending 423 ft. west of 9th Avenue (between the east and west sides of the 18th & 19th
30 tree pits).

31
32 Sincerely,

33
34
35 Cc: Rich Hunnings, Manhattan Plaza
36

1 **Transportation Planning Committee**

Item #: 15

2
3 October 3, 2012

4
5 Ms. Margaret Forgione
6 Manhattan Borough Commissioner
7 55 Water Street
8 New York, New York 10041
9 New York City Department of Transportation

10
11 **Re: parking regulation on W. 49th Street between 9th and 10th Avenues**

12
13 Dear Commissioner Forgione:

14
15 Manhattan Community Board 4 (CB4) requests that the parking regulations be changed on the
16 north side of W. 49th Street between 9th and 10th Avenues to read: “No Standing 7 a.m.to
17 Midnight including Sunday” , similar to the regulation existing between 8th and 9th Avenues.

18
19 Currently the North side of 49th street is a bus lane and W. 49th street is a busy cross town route.
20 Between 9th and 10th Avenues, the regulation reads “No standing Except Truck loading and
21 unloading 7a.m. to 7 p.m. except Sunday”. There is a schoolyard and there are no businesses on
22 that section of the street. As a result, Charter busses routinely occupy these spaces illegally.
23 They idle and obstruct the bus lane.

24
25 The new regulation would start from the bus stop (close to 9th Avenue) and end at the western
26 boundary of the 441 W. 49th Street property.

27
28 Sincerely,

29
30
31 Cc: Rich Hunnings, Manhattan Plaza
32

2
3 October 3, 2012

4
5 Ms. Margaret Forgione
6 Manhattan Borough Commissioner
7 55 Water Street
8 New York, New York 10041
9 New York City Department of Transportation

10
11 **Re: Unsafe pedestrian crossing at W. 37th and W. 38th Streets, and 10th Avenue**

12
13 Dear Commissioner Forgione:

14
15 Manhattan community Board 4 (CB4) requests the installation of “do not block the box” signs
16 and high visibility markings at the intersections of 10th Avenue with 37th and 38th Streets to
17 provide for safer pedestrian crossings.

18
19 CB4 continues to receive formal complaints from some of the 2,000 residents of the large
20 residential buildings newly built on both sides of 10th Avenue between W. 37th and W. 38th
21 Streets.

22
23 **NJT bus drivers block pedestrian crossings at both W. 37th and W. 38th streets on 10th**
24 **Avenue:** With the buses’ large footprint, a blocked crossing often means that the pedestrian
25 cannot cross at all. As you know it is illegal to gridlock the intersection in New York City. What
26 is less understood is that (1) it is illegal to engage in the intersection if there is not enough space
27 to clear it and (2) both pedestrian crossings must be cleared as well as they are part of the
28 intersection as defined by the law.

29
30 **NJT bus drivers do not yield to pedestrians** who have the right of way while the buses turn
31 right onto 10th Avenue. A recent pedestrian safety report published by New York City
32 Department of Transportation (DOT) identified that most New York City pedestrian fatalities
33 occur at intersections, but also notes that truck and bus drivers who hit pedestrians do so mostly
34 while turning right as their visibility is limited. NJT buses should be equipped with special
35 mirrors on the right side as recommended by the DOT.

36
37 **NJT bus drivers prohibit access to local bus stops:** Other residents have complained that the
38 MTA bus drivers cannot discharge or pick up passengers on 10th Avenue between W. 37th and
39 W. 38th Streets between 4 p.m. and 8 p.m., because of the continuous flow of NJT buses blocks
40 access to the bus stops. Local transit users are left stranded with no alternative transportation
41 options at peak hours.

42 We appreciate your office's help in addressing this intractable problem.

43

44 **[Item 16B is same letter to NYPD, Chief Tully and Item 16C is same letter to NJT, James**
45 **Weinstein, Executive Director]**

DRAFT

2
3 October 3, 2012

4
5 Ms. Margaret Forgione
6 Manhattan Borough Commissioner
7 55 Water Street
8 New York, New York 10041
9 New York City Department of Transportation

10
11 **Re: Signals changes at W. 23rd Street and 11th Avenue**

12
13 Dear Commissioner Forgione:

14
15 Manhattan Community Board 4(CB4) requests pedestrian safety improvements at the
16 intersection of W. 23rd Street and 11th Avenue, where the unusual road configuration and
17 current signal timing do not allow for safe pedestrian crossing of W. 23rd Street.

18
19 The turning east signal on northbound 11th Avenue and the W. 23rd Street signal should
20 be green at the same time. In addition the green arrow to turn east on the southbound 11th
21 Avenue, should be changed from a leading to trailing, to remove the conflicts with the
22 pedestrians.

23
24 A Lead Pedestrian Interval (LPI) should also be installed to protect the south crossing of
25 11th Avenue southbound lanes.

26
27 Considering the complexity of this intersection, the installation of a Barnes's dance may
28 be warranted.

29
30 W. 23rd Street is a two way street that ends at 11th Avenue. North of W. 23rd Street, 11th
31 Avenue flows one-way southbound, and turns two-way south of W. 23rd Street.

32
33 As a result pedestrians who cross W. 23rd Street with the walk signal, are in conflict with
34 northbound drivers on 11th Avenue, who all must turn east at W. 23rd Street and with
35 those southbound drivers who turn east at W. 23rd Street.

36
37 In addition the pedestrians who cross the south crossing of the southbound lanes of 11th
38 Avenue are in conflict with the W. 23rd Street traffic, which is turning south. In both
39 cases the pedestrians do not have any exclusive time to cross without major car conflicts.

40

41 It is worth noting that 11th Avenue joins with the West Side highway a block away and all
42 cars are travelling at fairly high speed. From 1996 to 2008 there were 20 injuries at this
43 intersection. Since then the volume of pedestrians has increased significantly and will
44 continue to do so.

45

46 It is time to fix this intersection.

DRAFT

1 **Transportation Planning Committee**

Item #: 18

2
3 October 3, 2012

4
5 Ms. Margaret Forgione
6 Manhattan Borough Commissioner
7 55 Water Street
8 New York, New York 10041
9 New York City Department of Transportation

10
11 **Re: Pedestrian signal at W. 22nd Street and 11th Avenue**

12
13 Dear Commissioner Forgione:

14
15 Manhattan Community Board 4 (CB4) requests the installation of a pedestrian signal at
16 the South East corner of W. 22nd Street and 11th Avenue facing the 22nd Street pedestrian
17 crossing, to allow pedestrians to cross safely.

18
19 Currently the pedestrian signal is missing at this location. From 1996 to 2008 there were
20 10 crashes at that intersection, resulting in 7 pedestrian injuries.

21
22 In recent years, the volume of pedestrians using this intersection has grown significantly,
23 with the rezoning of West Chelsea. The High line and the Hudson River Park attract
24 larger crowds.

25
26 We appreciate your attention to this matter.

27
28 Sincerely,

1 **Transportation Planning Committee**

Item #: 19

2
3 October 3, 2012

4
5 Ms. Lisa Daglian
6 NYMTC
7 199 Water Street
8 22nd Floor
9 New York, NY 10038-3534

10
11 **Re: Regional Transportation Plan 2040**

12
13 Dear Ms Daglian,

14
15 Manhattan Community Board 4 (CB4) thanks you and the New York Metropolitan
16 Transportation Council (NYMTC) for the opportunity to give our input to the Plan 2040.

17
18 CB4 has seen an explosive growth in residents and businesses due to a number of recent
19 rezoning. Such rezoning' full effect is far from complete with millions more square feet
20 to be built in Hudson Yards.

21
22 At the same time, 30% of the district's land remains dedicated to transportation uses with
23 the Port Authority Bus terminal, Lincoln tunnel, Penn Station, FedEx, USPS and UPS
24 occupying vast tracks of land and being heavy traffic generators.

25
26 The following projects should be included in the 2040 plan:

- 27
28 1. We suggest that safety be the # 1 goal of the plan. With 11,000 injuries annually
29 in New York City, it is clear not safe and imposes on the city an enormous human
30 cost in terms of trauma, healthcare, and productivity. No other industry would
31 tolerate such a lack of safety. In light of recent statistics showing the number of
32 traffic fatalities increasing by 25% in 2011 compared to 2010, it is urgent that the
33 network be engineered for safety above all other considerations.
34
35 a. While Split phase signals have demonstrated to be extremely effective at
36 reducing vehicle/pedestrian conflicts, this feature remains an exception
37 rather than the norm along new bike lanes installations. Not only do these
38 feature save lives, they also improve flow through and reduce honking, a
39 major quality of life issue in the city. We recommend that this feature
40 become standard for all intersections along bike lanes in New York City.
41

- 42 2. A Bus master plan and construction of appropriate facilities somewhere in the city
43 to accommodate three types of buses, which are critical to our economy but are
44 haphazardly located and overwhelm our district. Such plan should include
45 designated routes that avoid residential areas.
46
- 47 a. New Jersey Commuter Bus garage to allow all commuter buses to remain
48 in Manhattan from the time they arrive for the inbound AM commute
49 morning until they pick up their passengers in the PM outbound commute.
50 Currently they return to New Jersey for storage and come back at 4 PM,
51 using precious traffic lanes, queuing and idling in front of residential
52 buildings and blocking traffic on city streets for hours. This operation
53 consumes every day a large number of NYPD traffic agents to control the
54 intersections. The City committed to build such a facility in the Final
55 Environmental Impact Statement of the Hudson Yards rezoning with a live
56 date of 2025, to alleviate various adverse impacts. (Another option would
57 be to move the Bus terminal to New Jersey and extend the subway to the
58 new facility).
59
- 60 b. A Tour & Charter Bus garage to allow buses bringing tourists to the city to
61 park and rest while they wait to go back and pick up their visitors at
62 shows, museums, or other attractions. While the growing tourism has
63 become a key ingredient of our economic strength the infrastructure to
64 bring such tourists has not been properly implemented. (Think Disney
65 World without bus parking). The current curbside spaces are routinely
66 oversubscribed, generating extensive cruising and idling. The City
67 committed to build such a facility in the Final Environmental Impact
68 Statement of the Hudson Yards rezoning with a live date of 2025, to
69 alleviate various adverse impacts.
70
- 71 c. A Terminal for Long Distance Discount Buses. This industry is growing
72 by 30% a year, but in New York, there are no facilities for arrival and
73 departures of such buses. The lines sometimes long of 1,000 passengers
74 overwhelm sidewalks, conflicts with residents and cause loss of customers
75 for adjoining retail stores. Boston, Washington and Philadelphia have all
76 organized a facility for these buses.
77
- 78 3. A new mass transit (rail/subway based) facility to bring New Jersey commuters to
79 Manhattan (replacement for the ARC project) and reduce the reliance on cars and
80 buses.
81
- 82 4. A Cross Harbor Freight Tunnel to reduce the volume of trucks that cross
83 Manhattan.
84
- 85 5. A Subway station on the # 7 line at 41st Street and 10th Avenue. The City
86 committed to build such a station in the Final Environmental Impact Statement of

87 the Hudson Yards rezoning with a live date of 2025, to alleviate various adverse
88 impacts.
89
90 cc DOT, MTA, PANYNJ
91 Elected

DRAFT

1 **Transportation Planning Committee**

Item #: 20

2
3 October 3, 2012

4
5 Beverly Gotay, Deputy Director
6 Special Applications Unit
7 NYC Department of Consumer Affairs
8 42 Broadway
9 New York, NY 10004-1716

10
11 **Re: Newsstand Application, west side of 9th Avenue between W. 16th and W. 17th**
12 **Streets – expedited request**

13
14 Dear Ms. Gotay:

15
16 Manhattan Community Board 4 (CB4) supports Mr. Gyani's application to operate a
17 newsstand in front of the recreational area along side of 400 W. 17th Street New York,
18 NY 10011.

19
20 The newsstand will be 12 ft long and 4ft wide, and will be located on the west side of 9th
21 Avenue between W. 16th Street and W. 17th Street. The location of the proposed location
22 will be between the street lamp, and the third tree pit when walking north up 9th avenue
23 between W. 16th street and W. 17th street.

24
25 The initial location that was submitted in this application was between the second tree pit
26 and the street lamp when walking north up 9th avenue between W. 16th street and W. 17th
27 street.

28
29 This changed location will allow the Fulton of the Future Local Farm Market to continue
30 its operation without interruption on the sidewalk further south.

31
32 We request that the DOT inspection be expedited, as the applicant has been very gracious
33 and flexible to accommodate the changes the community requested and should not be
34 penalized for his good deeds.

35
36 Sincerely

37
38
39 cc: DOT

40

1 **Landmarks Committee**

Item #: 21

2
3 October 3, 2012

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

11
12 **Re: 430 West 22nd Street**

13
14 Dear Chair Tierney,

15
16 Manhattan Community Board 4 is writing about the application by DAS Studio architect,
17 Stefanie Werner for approval of proposed work at 430 West 22nd Street.

18
19 The work consists of lowering of the sill of the existing easternmost window at the parlor
20 floor to match the other two existing windows.

21
22 The property lost its original high front stoop sometime in the 1970's. The window
23 installed at that time is much shorter than the parlor windows.

24
25 The Board recommends approval of this work.

26
27 The Board asks that consideration be given to the use of copper in the planned
28 replacement of the roof leader, visible from the street side. Presently a galvanized pipe; it
29 is a jarring note. Copper will blend with the warm color of the brick façade.

30
31 Sincerely,

32
33 Pamela Wolff, Co-Chair
34 Landmarks Committee
35 Manhattan Community Board 4

1 **LANDMARKS COMMITTEE**

Item #: 22

2
3 October 3, 2012

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

11
12 **Re: 449 West 21st Street**

13
14 Dear Chair Tierney,

15
16 Manhattan Community Board 4 at its October 3, 2012 Full Board meeting voted on a
17 recommendation with conditions for an application for approval of proposed work at 449
18 W. 21st Street.

19
20 The work consists of changes to the front façade, an extension in the rear, and a rooftop
21 addition.

22
23 The Board found the proposed work on the front façade to be an example of what
24 beautiful restoration planning entails and recommends approval.

25
26 The Board has some hesitation about the extension in the rear as to its height and depth,
27 however, given the existing circumstances of the entire rear of the block and that it can
28 only be seen from the playground we recommend approval but ask the Commission to
29 give it an extra look before a final decision is rendered.

30
31 The Board does not recommend approval of the rooftop as presently proposed. We
32 believe its present height is inappropriate to the district and too apparent from the street
33 level. We recommend that one (1) full story be removed.

34
35 Sincerely,

36
37 Pamela Wolff, Co-Chair
38 Landmarks Committee
39 Manhattan Community Board 4

2

3 Mr. Christopher Crowley
4 Landscape Architect
5 NYC Department of Parks & Recreation
6 Olmstead Center
7 Flushing Meadows Corona Park
8 Flushing, New York 11368

9

10 **Re: Proposed New Design for Ramon Aponte Park**

11

12 Dear Mr. Crowley:

13

14 On July 12, 2012, a proposed design for Ramon Aponte Park was presented to the Manhattan
15 Community Board 4 (MCB4) Waterfront, Parks & Environment Committee (WPE) by NYC
16 Department of Parks & Recreation (DPR). This plan was further discussed on the 13th of
17 September 2012, specifically with regard to the basketball courts. After listening to many
18 comments from community members and users of the park at both meetings, MCB4 has
19 concluded that the plan, as presented, is both esthetically pleasing and contains many desirable
20 features. Further, although there were various differing opinions about the desirability of keeping
21 the basketball courts (currently in place but in need of refurbishment), MCB4 had concluded that
22 the courts should remain as a feature of the park as planned by DPR.

23

24 MCB4 does have a few suggestions. Community members said that the current park has an
25 active rodent population and urges DPR to take all possible mitigation measures to remove this
26 problem. Another request from the community was to plant only male trees of certain varieties
27 (Ginkgo & Crabapple) to reduce or prevent airborne particles.

28

29 However, the general layout of the new park was well received, including moving the fountain
30 feature to a sunnier central location, moving the entry westward, and the pleasing curves that
31 were introduced. The increased seating areas and new plantings are also welcome, and all these
32 features should be retained in the re-design.

33

34 MCB4 greatly appreciates the willingness of DPR to listen to the desires of the neighborhood
35 users of the park, and recognizes the challenge of satisfying many, and perhaps sometimes
36 conflicting desires, in a small place. We thank DPR for this commitment to upgrade this much
37 needed park.

38

39 Sincerely,

40