

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	32 In Favor	0 Opposed	3 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Battery Park City Security Contract RFP

WHEREAS: Battery Park City contains nearly 36 acres of public parks and spaces including iconic parks such as Rockefeller Park, Teardrop Park and Wagner Park as well as the Esplanade, South Cove, Pier A and Kowsky Plaza, and

WHEREAS: These parks are perpetually deeded as parkland per the Master Lease Agreement and are treated as though they are part of the New York City park system, open to all, patrolled by Parks Enforcement Patrol (PEP) officers and maintained by the BPC Parks Conservancy, and

WHEREAS: The Battery Park City Authority (BPCA) has maintained for many years (since 1992) a contract with the NYC Parks Department for a dedicated force of almost 45 officers and supervisors over three shifts. The cost of this contract is part of the BPCA annual budget, and

WHEREAS: These PEP officers patrol the parks and public spaces in BPC to ensure compliance with the New York City Parks Department [rules and regulations](#), and

WHEREAS: At the BPCA October 27, 2015 Board Meeting, there was an affirmative vote to award a contract to a private security firm to replace the NYC PEP contract for unarmed, uniformed security services, and

WHEREAS: This contract award was based on a BPCA RFP published in May 2015. Prior to the issuance of the RFP, BPCA did not give notice nor explain to Manhattan Community Board #1 the rationale behind this radical change, and

WHEREAS: While reviewing on-going contracts is a prudent business practice and within the powers of the BPCA, the rationale and basis for this decision are unclear and directly affect the safety of residents and visitors. No data or study was presented to establish the need for this change other than increased usage and pedestrian traffic, and

WHEREAS: The awarding of this contract to a private security firm raises many questions about what services they will deliver, their effectiveness and enforcement of all the rules and regulations, and

WHEREAS: CB1 is again greatly disappointed that the BPCA continues to act with complete disregard for the view of and input from other major stakeholders on matters that affect the quality of life for BPC and Lower Manhattan residents and visitors, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: CB 1 emphatically calls upon the BPCA to withdraw the RFP. To properly assess the next steps, we recommend that BPCA take the following actions:

- Present data to CB1 supporting the rationale for changing the current security in BPC which may include
  - Financial information
  - Enforcement issues
  - Increased violations or crimes
- Explain how a private security firm addresses these needs and what experience that firm has in comparable residential neighborhoods
- Explain what performance metrics will be in place and how the private security firm's performance will be monitored and reported, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 calls upon the BPCA to work directly with the community to ensure that maximum benefit is achieved in the delivery of these security services which the BPCA has provided for decades.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT and QUALITY OF LIFE

*Financial*

COMMITTEE VOTE: 13 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

*Quality of Life*

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

PUBLIC MEMBERS VOTE: 1 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 34 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Int. No. 858 - In relation to reducing noise caused by sightseeing helicopters that meet federal noise reduction standards  
Int. No. 859 - In relation to reducing noise caused by sightseeing helicopters

WHEREAS: The New York City Council has proposed Int. No. 858 and Int. No. 859 to amend legislation regarding sightseeing helicopters; and

WHEREAS: The Legislative findings and intent holds that, “The Council finds that there is significant noise pollution caused by the dozens of sightseeing helicopters operating daily from heliports owned by the city. The heliports used by sightseeing helicopters are near water which amplifies and carries the sound of those helicopters a further distance, and significantly disrupts the daily lives of city residents who live and work near the heliports or across the East River”; and

WHEREAS: Further, the document states that, “A previous local law limited sightseeing tour operators to the stage 3 noise levels as determined by the federal aviation administration, however the Council finds that no current noise reduction measures will be acceptable to ensure the quiet repose of the affected communities. Therefore the Council finds that the prohibition on sightseeing helicopters needs to be extended to include helicopters that meet the stage 3 noise levels as well”; and

WHEREAS: In June 2015, CB1 unanimously adopted a resolution (attached) calling for the elimination of helicopter tourism flights originating at the Downtown Heliport at Pier 6. CB1 continues to receive complaints regarding helicopters, which has been a contentious issue, especially since the consolidation of heliports to Pier 6 in 2010; now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 supports legislation proposed by the City Council to further reduce noise caused by sightseeing helicopters that already meet current federal noise reduction standards.

DATE: JUNE 23, 2015

COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	37 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Downtown Manhattan Heliport at Pier 6 and elsewhere in CB1

WHEREAS: The NYC Economic Development Corporation (NYC EDC) owns and leases Pier 6 to the Downtown Manhattan Heliport operator and estimates that there are 50,000 takeoffs and 50,000 landings for a total of 100,000 operations per year. Residents have seen up to 8 helicopters landing and taking off simultaneously in the restricted small area of Pier 6 making it one of the most heavily congested heliports in the country; and

WHEREAS: Community Board 1 (CB1) has long been concerned about the safety and quality of life (environmental) issues from helicopters landing and taking off from the Downtown Manhattan Heliport at Pier 6 in our densely populated district which has some of the tallest buildings in the country; and

WHEREAS: CB1 has repeatedly invited the NYC EDC to present statistics and to present their plans on how they will address safety concerns and minimize noise and air pollution from the Pier 6 heliport located on the East River on the edge of the Financial District and South Street Seaport districts; and

WHEREAS: In the past decade there has been a renaissance in Lower Manhattan and now that the East River Esplanade and Pier 15 have been built and with the positive transformations of both parks at The Battery and Governors Island, the Downtown Manhattan Heliport at Pier 6 negatively impacts the quality of life for residents, workers, visitors and students; and

WHEREAS: As part of a settlement agreement between Friends of Hudson River Park and the Hudson River Park Trust, Air Pegasus and Liberty Helicopters, Inc. to end flights at the 30<sup>th</sup> Street Heliport by April 2010 due to the tour helicopter's operational impact on the environment and quality of life, the tour helicopter industry has repositioned to operate from the Downtown/Wall Street Heliport where it has transferred the same negative environmental, quality of life and safety impact to all of Lower Manhattan  
([http://www.hudsonriverpark.org/assets/content/general/6.20.08-Heliport\\_Final\\_Release\\_June\\_20\\_2008.pdf](http://www.hudsonriverpark.org/assets/content/general/6.20.08-Heliport_Final_Release_June_20_2008.pdf)); and

WHEREAS: CB1 is on the record by the passing of two resolutions: "Downtown Manhattan Heliport tour flights (July 2011) and "Tourist Helicopter Flights from the Downtown Manhattan Heliport" (October 2009) and has had numerous meetings with various agencies and elected officials over the years; and

WHEREAS: CB1 also gave testimony at a City Council hearing about Governors Island (May 20, 2014) which included the following section:

“Air quality and noise issues resulting from helicopters – City, State and Federal involvement must be achieved in order to determine a solution for the negative impacts caused by increased helicopter tourism both in Lower Manhattan and on Governors Island, specifically in regards to the heliport at Pier 6;” and

WHEREAS: The Downtown/Wall Street Heliport has absorbed 100% of the helicopter tour operations from the West Side Heliport as a result of a lawsuit settlement due to noise and other environmental impacts to the community. These same environmental impacts now impact lower Manhattan. Noise has increased exponentially both in lower Manhattan and the Brooklyn shoreline where the tour helicopters operate. This is in violation of 49 U.S.C. § 47101(a)(2) (“It is the policy of the United States... that aviation facilities be constructed and operated to minimize current and projected noise impact on nearby communities;” and

WHEREAS: The Helicopter Sightseeing Plan allows helicopter tour operators to fly over numerous “residential, educational, health and religious structures and sites and parks and recreation areas” in violation of FAA’s own rules. The FAA’s guidance to airports and airmen states that flights near noise sensitive areas must meet certain standards as well. The FAA’s Advisory Circular 91-36D Visual Flight Rules (VFR) Flight Near Noise-Sensitive Areas, states that “[e]xcessive aircraft noise...is particularly undesirable in areas where it interferes with normal activities associated with the area’s use, including residential, educational, health, and religious structures and sites, and parks, recreational areas...;” and

WHEREAS: The FAA’s Advisory Circular 91-36D standard is “[a]voidance of noise-sensitive areas, if practical, is preferable to overflight at relatively low altitudes. Pilots operating noise producing aircraft... over noise-sensitive areas should make every effort to fly not less than 2,000 feet above ground level (AGL), weather permitting.” However, the helicopter sightseeing plan allows helicopter flights as low as 900 feet, in violation of FAA’s own Advisory Circular. The AC also includes a further restriction that “the ground level of noise-sensitive areas is defined to include the highest terrain within 2,000 feet AGL laterally of the route of flight ...” We read that language to include buildings and other structures that the aircraft might be flying over; and

WHEREAS: The helicopter impacts not just CB1 residents. Residents came specifically for the Wednesday, June 3rd Financial District meeting from outside of CB1 including from the Manhattan Upper West Side, Brooklyn, Staten Island and New Jersey. They complained about how the current helicopter routes along the East River and Hudson River negatively impacted them at home and at work; now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 calls on the City Council to hold a hearing on helicopters in New York City, specifically Pier 6; and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 urges that the relevant environmental agencies monitor both the noise levels and air quality during peak usage of the Pier 6 heliport; and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 calls on our elected officials to significantly reduce the tourist and commuting helicopter traffic at Pier 6; and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 urges that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that controls the airspace fill in the regulatory loopholes in the regulation of the helicopters at Pier 6 and elsewhere in our district so that helicopter landings and takeoffs from Pier 6 and their route are minimized.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 13 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 37 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 4 WTC, application for restaurant liquor license for Eataly NY Fidi, LLC, d/b/a Eataly

WHEREAS: The applicant Eataly NY Fidi, LLC, is applying for a restaurant liquor license; and

WHEREAS: The committee and applicant have agreed to the bar service hours of 11:30am to 11pm all week (with 12pm opening on Sunday); and

WHEREAS: The applicant has requested that the bar service hours be extended until 1am for private events, held approximately 10-15 times per year (but potentially more); and

WHEREAS: These private events are typically held in a portion of the store where a restaurant is located, where the area would be roped off for a private party. It is very rare that the whole store is reserved for a private event. The applicant expects this to occur mostly in the Fine Dining restaurant, located in the separated space at the south-west corner; and

WHEREAS: The total area of the restaurant is 41,143 square feet with 9 bars and 2 service bars; and

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

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

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

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB 1 opposes the granting of a liquor license to Eataly NY Fidi, LLC unless the applicant complies with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 13 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 37 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 133 Greenwich, application for restaurant wine & beer license for 133 Greenwich Street Associates LLC & Concord Hospitality Enterprise Company

WHEREAS: The applicant, 133 Greenwich Street Associates LLC & Concord Hospitality Enterprise Company, is applying for a restaurant wine & beer license; and

WHEREAS: The committee and applicant have agreed to the bar service hours of 11:30am – 1am (with 12pm opening on Sunday); and

WHEREAS: The total area of the restaurant is 1,450 square feet with a dining area of 950 square feet with 20 tables and 93 seats; and

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

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

WHEREAS: The applicant has represented that there are three or more establishments with on-premises liquor licenses within 500 feet of this establishment; now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB 1 opposes the granting of a wine & beer license to 133 Greenwich Street Associates LLC & Concord Hospitality Enterprise Company unless the applicant complies with the limitations and conditions set forth above.



COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 13 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

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

RE: Dog off-leash rules at The Battery

WHEREAS: A group of Lower Manhattan dog-owners (Downtown Dog NYC) appeared before the Financial District Committee in October and November 2015 in order to discuss re-instating off-lease activities at The Battery, and having NYC Parks add The Battery to the list of parks in which off-lease activities are permitted; and

WHEREAS: Hope Cohen, Chief Operating Officer of The Battery also attended these meetings, raised a number of issues relevant to off-lease activities, but states that the decision regarding off-lease activities was one to be made by NYC Parks; and

WHEREAS: Manhattan Commissioner Bill Castro of NYC Parks attended the November 2015 meeting and stated that he was willing to consider implementing some level of off-lease privilege at The Battery; and

WHEREAS: In November 2010, a resolution was adopted by Community Board 1 requesting that NYC Parks consider establishment of a trial period of off-leash activities in designated areas of The Battery that would permit off-lease activities to take place for a specified time period, as well as inviting NYC Parks, The Battery and Downtown Dog NYC to participate in a working group to evaluate and establish the trial period; now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 reiterates its request that NYC Parks consider establishment of a trial period of off-leash activities in designated areas of Battery Park that would permit off-leash activities to take place for a specified period; and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 invites NYC Parks, The Battery and Downtown Dog NYC to establish a dialogue and work collaboratively to evaluate and establish off-leash privileges in designated areas of The Battery during designated hours.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 304 Canal Street aka The Pearl Paint Building; an application to alter the existing roof with new elevator and stair bulkheads, new roof top mechanical equipment and new storefronts on Canal and Lispenard Streets

WHEREAS: All the existing wood storefronts on Canal Street will be removed and all existing concrete block and roll-down gates on Lispenard will be removed, and

WHEREAS: The proposed typical storefront is painted extruded aluminum with 4-panel glass windows above a 2'-6" high window bulkhead and narrow stile double doors with metal louvers above, and

WHEREAS: The proposed storefronts will incorporate the existing cast metal grilles (2 on Canal Street and 1 on Lispenard Street, and

WHEREAS: CB 1 the applicant add matching grilles beneath the remaining adjacent storefront windows (1 each on Canal and Lispenard Streets), and

WHEREAS: The proposed signage on Canal and Lispenard Streets is vague, too large and not approvable as presented, and

WHEREAS: All the existing wood double-hung windows will be replaced with single-hung wood windows, and

WHEREAS: The applicant's proposal to remove the existing roof top equipment and elevator hoist room an Lispenard Street is appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The new metal panel stair bulkhead is a maximum height of 8 feet tall the new elevator bulkhead is 2 feet tall above the existing finished roof. The stair bulkhead is highly visible from the East on Canal Street, and

WHEREAS: A total of 5 roof top mechanical units that are approximately 8 feet tall on steel dunnage will be highly visible from the East and minimally visible from the West on Canal Street due to the existing low East and West parapets, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB 1 recommends the LPC disapprove the proposal as presented and work with the applicant to reduce visibility of the roof top mechanical equipment and create a more dynamic and less generic storefront in fill on Canal Street that more resembles the variation seen in the storefront of the 1940's tax photo.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:           8 In Favor   0 Opposed   0 Abstained   0 Recused

BOARD VOTE:             33 In Favor   0 Opposed   0 Abstained   0 Recused

RE:                    39 Lispenard Street, application to alter roof, raise parapets and add mechanical equipment

WHEREAS: This application seeks to raise a V-shaped roof into a level surface, raise parapets and install mechanical equipment, and

WHEREAS: Despite the subject property's irregular shape and numerous exposures, the proposed extension has significant visibility only from the corner of Church and Lispenard Streets, looking east, and

WHEREAS: The presentation included not only photographs of visibility mock-ups, but also a rendering of the proposed finished construction, and

WHEREAS: That construction is of a recessed and neutral beige brick, topped by a garden and simple railings, and

WHEREAS: If anything, the existing white mechanical equipment of the building immediately to the west of the subject building is more prominent and jarring, and the extension under consideration fades away visually, and

WHEREAS: The applicants also plan to replace existing windows with historically accurate ones, and install historically accurate lot-line windows in existing original window penetrations that had been bricked over at some point, and

WHEREAS: Assuming the veracity of this presentation, one would be hard-pressed to deny any aspect of it, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB 1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: PERSONNEL

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused\*

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

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

RE: Change in CB1 Office Operating Procedures

WHEREAS: The Community Board 1 Chair and Co-Chair asked Susan Cole and Roger Byrom to lead a study into how to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Board and Board Members working with the Office and Staff and report back with suggestions for improvements and recommendations, and

WHEREAS: The Staff and Personnel Committee considered a number of wide ranging initiatives to better allow the small staff team to handle the busy office and numerous important issues our Community is facing, and

WHEREAS: The group met as a team over five months to see first-hand how the Office worked and what issues could we better address, with a view to improving efficiency and effectiveness, and

WHEREAS: The draft recommendations of the working team were reviewed with the Chair, Vice-Chair and the Personnel Committee, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Committee work can be handled more efficiently by the Office by Committee Members wherever possible working through the Committee Chair and Co-Chair on all matters that require staff input, with the relevant staff member, District Manager, Committee Chair and Co-Chair and Board Chair being copied on all requests for input, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: Committee meetings must not close before the Chair and Co-Chair summarize the salient points the Committee reached to be included in the draft resolution and the vote on the resolution is clearly recorded and written against the agenda items, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Staff members will generally write resolutions – except for specialist committees such as the Landmarks Committee – or when the Committee Chair and Co-Chair offer to write resolutions, but it is incumbent that the Committee Chair and Co-Chair review all draft resolutions carefully and on a timely basis before circulating to their Committee Members, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Committee Members’ input on resolutions should be made through the Committee Chair and Co-Chair by highlighting the suggested change or by suggesting “tracked changes,” and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Board Members must be prepared and able to serve the Board on the Committees they are appointed to, and it must be noted that the appointments by the Manhattan Borough President, with some based on recommendations by the Council Member, are subject to the rules set forth in the CB1 Bylaws and procedures for removal, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: The Chair will attend the Office on a regular basis - at least 2-3 hours per week - to provide input and direction to the Staff, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: The Chair will attend one regularly scheduled Staff Meeting a month – usually the one that precedes the monthly Board Meeting to provide input and direction and ensure the priorities of the Chair for the Meeting are appropriately addressed, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: The District Manager will complete annual evaluations of the Staff before December 31 of each year, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: The Chair and Co-Chair will complete an annual evaluation of the District Manager before January 31 of each year, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: The Staff and Personnel Committee will meet periodically with the Chair and Co-Chair to monitor the efficient operation of the Office to continue to seek improvements to the efficiency and effectiveness of the Office and Board, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: The entire Board thanks the dedication and hard work of the Staff and Office.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: PLANNING

BOARD VOTE: 38 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Mandatory Inclusionary Housing

WHEREAS: The New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) has proposed a zoning text amendment entitled Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH); and

WHEREAS: MIH is a zoning text amendment that can be applied through a zoning map change for additional density by a ULURP action or through a special permit which creates substantial density, neither of which are likely to occur in Community District 1 (CD1) where few areas are appropriate for rezoning to a higher density; and

WHEREAS: MIH is a new proposal to use zoning to require permanently affordable housing when future City Planning Commission (CPC) actions encourage substantial new housing; and

WHEREAS: For each rezoning, the CPC and City Council can apply:

- Option 1: 25% of units set aside as affordable housing for individuals and families earning at an average of 60% AMI;
- Option 2: 30% of units set aside as affordable housing for individuals and families earning at an average of 80% AMI; or
- Option 3: 30% of units set aside as affordable housing for individuals and families earning at an average of 120% AMI (without direct subsidy), though this option is not available in Manhattan CDs 1-8; and

WHEREAS: Under MIH, required units would be new, permanently affordable units, and the proposed text amendment applies to new developments, enlargements, or conversions with more than 10 units; and

WHEREAS: Affordable units can be located either on-site in the same building as market-rate units, spread on at least half of the buildings' stories with a common street entrance and lobby; on-site, in a separate building, completely independent from the ground to the sky; or off-site on a different zoning lot located within the same community district or within ½ mile; and

WHEREAS: Other considerations are a "payment-in-lieu" option for buildings between 11 and 25 units or those under 25,000 square feet, or a reduction or waiver of requirements through the Board of Standards and Appeals based on a finding that compliance would make development financially infeasible; and

WHEREAS: MIH would be applicable for public and private applications to the CPC that encourage substantial new housing, each with its own full public review, such as City-initiated rezonings, private applications for zoning map changes, or private applications for special permits that create substantial new residential density; and

WHEREAS: CB1 is aware that other community boards and elected officials have expressed various questions and concerns regarding the text amendment, including those raised in a November 17, 2015 letter addressed to CPC Chair Carl Weisbrod from Borough President Gale Brewer and co-signed by several Members of Congress, New York State Senators, New York State Assembly Members and New York City Council Members; now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 supports the objective and goals of MIH and strongly supports enabling the development of permanent city-wide affordable housing; and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1, however, opposes the MIH text amendment as currently proposed; and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 requests the Department of City Planning and City Planning Commission seek to resolve the following concerns of CB1, as well as those reported concerns of other community districts and various elected officials, regarding the current proposal for MIH:

1. CB1 is disappointed by the minimal applicability for this proposal in CD1 and requests that DCP continually evaluate new ways to create affordable housing in CD1 and city-wide;
2. In the case that MIH would be applied in CD1, adequate city services and infrastructure improvements must be matched in order to accommodate the increased residential population;
3. CB1 firmly believes that long-term protection of affordability is as important as new resident's affordability protections;
4. An option for housing for individuals and families at 165% of AMI should be available for neighborhoods such as those within CD1, in order to accommodate for existing middle-income residents who would otherwise exceed the maximum and would not be eligible for new housing under the proposed program's current affordability options;
5. The "workforce option" also should be available in all community districts, including CD1;
6. In the case of "payment-in-lieu" fees, CB1 urges that these funds remain permanently available in the appropriate community district, rather than being relocated for use outside the district after a certain amount of time;



7. CB1 is concerned that there is no requirement for DCP to return to community districts to give an update on the progress of MIH after the program would be implemented;
8. CB1 more generally does not believe a one-size-fits-all approach to inclusionary housing is necessarily a proper approach in a city as large and diverse as New York City;
9. CB1 is concerned this program takes away zoning input and decisions from each of the community districts including CB1;
10. This program does not do enough for middle-income residents (*e.g.*, the spectrum above 80% AMI) or encourage creation of mixed-income neighborhoods;
11. The current draft of MIH effectively allows for a loophole by allowing a waiver to be granted by the Board of Standards and Appeals, again taking away community input on local-level zoning decisions;
12. This program does not fight displacement or secure adequate tenant anti-harassment protections;
13. MIH's on-site, separate building concept would replace "poor doors" with "poor buildings";
14. The trigger for applicability of MIH should be made replaced with clear, objective standards and expanded to a lower threshold for provision of affordable housing, because the "substantial new density" threshold is subjective and unclear; and
15. CB1 is concerned with the process in which this proposal was crafted, having come to the community boards only after significant input from other interests including the real estate industry.

RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: PLANNING

BOARD VOTE: 38 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Zoning for Quality and Affordability

WHEREAS: The New York City Department of City Planning (DCP) has proposed a zoning text amendment entitled Zoning for Quality and Affordability (ZQA); and

WHEREAS: ZQA would allow additional height and unit count, with streetscape and design improvements, with no increase in FAR, and would only be applicable in contextual zoning districts in eastern Tribeca and western Civic Center as well as certain portions of the Lower Manhattan Special District (C6-2A) and Tribeca Special Mixed Use District (Areas 1 and 3); and

WHEREAS: ZQA has three major goals: promote senior housing, reduce parking requirements for affordable housing and support the creation of Inclusionary Housing; and

WHEREAS: To promote senior housing, ZQA would update use regulations to allow a spectrum of affordable senior housing and care facilities, as well as flexibility for mixing of uses and allowing limited additional floor area ratio (FAR) and height (1-2 stories in an estimated 95% of cases); and

WHEREAS: In order to encourage participation in the Inclusionary Housing Program (IHP), ZQA would update height and setback regulations to allow limited additional height (1-2 stories in an estimated 95% of cases); and

WHEREAS: ZQA would also create a transit zone within a half-mile of a subway station that does not require parking for affordable housing; and

WHEREAS: DCP expressly represented that, under the ZQA proposal, there would be:

- No additional market-rate floor area;
- No provisions that encourage tear-downs;
- No elimination of any contextual zoning district, or re-mapping of any zoning district;
- No reduction or alteration of the Landmarks Preservation Commission's oversight and review in historic districts or landmarked buildings;
- No reduction in the amount of green or open spaces required for buildings; and
- No dramatic changes in development in any neighborhood.

WHEREAS: The changes proposed in ZQA would only be applicable in a very small portion of CD1 in Tribeca, the Civic Center and portions of the Lower Manhattan Special District (C6-2A) and Tribeca Special Mixed Use District (Areas 1 and 3); and

WHEREAS: All of the applicable C6-2A areas in the Lower Manhattan Special District are overlaid by the South Street Seaport Historic District, and most of the applicable

areas in the Tribeca Special Mixed Use District are overlaid by the Tribeca Historic Districts; and

WHEREAS: CB1 is aware that other community boards and elected officials have expressed various questions and concerns regarding the text amendment, including those raised in a November 17, 2015 letter addressed to CPC Chair Carl Weisbrod from Borough President Gale Brewer and co-signed by several Members of Congress, New York State Senators, New York State Assembly Members and New York City Council Members; now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 supports the objective and goals of ZQA and strongly supports enabling the development of permanent city-wide affordable housing; and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1, however, opposes the ZQA text amendment as currently proposed; and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 requests the Department of City Planning and City Planning Commission seek to resolve the following concerns of CB1, as well as those reported concerns of other community districts and various elected officials, regarding the current proposal for ZQA:

1. CB1 is disappointed by the minimal applicability for this proposal in CD1 and requests that DCP continually evaluate new ways to create affordable housing in CD1 and city-wide;
2. In the case that ZQA would be applied in CD1, adequate city services and infrastructure improvements must be matched in order to accommodate the increased residential population;
3. CB1 firmly believes that long-term protection of affordability is as important as new resident's affordability protections;
4. CB1 is concerned that there is no requirement for DCP to return to community districts to give an update on the progress of ZQA after the program would be implemented;
5. CB1 more generally does not believe a one-size-fits-all approach to zoning is necessarily a proper approach in a city as large and diverse as New York City;
6. CB1 is concerned this program takes away zoning input and decisions from each of the community districts including CB1;
7. There is concern this program may encourage out-of-context development and result in taller, bulkier and out-of-context buildings;
8. CB1 is concerned with the impact of eliminating the "Sliver Law" under ZQA when affordable housing is part of the project;
9. CB1 is also concerned with the impact ZQA could have if changes in the Voluntary Inclusionary Housing and R10 programs are not considered at the same time, including tightening loose off-site provisions, requiring that a greater percentage of square footage be set aside for affordable units,

- obtaining additional affordable housing where there is “double-dipping” by was of a 421-a benefit, and strengthening community review requirements;
10. The creation of senior housing under ZQA is not permanent, even though height and FAR increases are;
  11. This program does not encourage creation of mixed-income neighborhoods;
  12. CB1 is concerned with the process in which this proposal was crafted, having come to the community boards only after significant input from other interests including the real estate industry; and
  13. This program does not fight displacement or secure adequate tenant anti-harassment protections in the event that ZQA has the effect of encouraging redevelopment of an existing residential building.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: PLANNING

COMMITTEE VOTE: 12 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 2 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 37 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: Water Street Streetscape Project

WHEREAS: The New York City Economic Development Corporation's design consultant presented preliminary plans for the Water Street Streetscape Improvement Project which include the creation of permanent plazas on Water Street from Whitehall Street to Coenties Slip as part of a wider project that will extend to Fulton Street; and

WHEREAS: The Project seeks to enhance the identity of the Water Street commercial corridor by creating a pedestrian-oriented environment through landscaping, improving pedestrian safety, and incorporating design elements into the Corridor that encourage people to walk along its length; and

WHEREAS: The scope of work includes intersection improvements and traditional streetscape elements throughout the Corridor such as curb extensions, bump-outs, benches, street trees, and planters. The work also includes the creation of distinctive public plazas at Whitehall Street and Coenties Slip. As a result of Superstorm Sandy, the scope also includes the reconstruction of Moore Street due to its severe deterioration; and

WHEREAS: Community Board 1 has supported this project as a collaborative effort between the Economic Development Corporation and the Downtown Alliance; and

WHEREAS: The preliminary plans will be presented to the Public Design Commission and then final plans will be brought back to Community Board 1 for final approval; and

WHEREAS: This project is part of a wider reconstruction of Water Street which has major implications for a master plan that will produce a gateway to Lower Manhattan that will connect South Ferry up to the South Street Seaport. It is wide enough to incorporate a bike path and it must do so to make it a complete street design, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 recommends that the Economic Development Corporation and the Public Design Commission consider the following concerns of Community Board 1 in the preparation of a final Water Street Streetscape Improvement project:

1. Provision should be made for bike paths on Water Street as part of the City's public transit system
2. Maximum water mitigation and resiliency measures should be incorporated into the final plan
3. A plan to improve traffic flow should be developed for the surrounding area
4. City, State and Federal agency placard parking should be permanently banned from Water Street.

RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: PLANNING

COMMITTEE VOTE: 14 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 38 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Manhattan Borough Board Resolution In Support of a Right to Counsel for Low-income New Yorkers Who Face Losing their Homes in Legal Proceedings

WHEREAS: A substantial number of people facing eviction and foreclosure proceedings live in poverty, are not able to afford or obtain counsel to represent them, and must appear in court unrepresented; and

WHEREAS: Eviction and foreclosure proceedings are technical legal proceedings in which lawyers generally appear for the petitioners and the rules of evidence and procedural and substantive law all apply; they are consequently very difficult for unrepresented parties to navigate; and

WHEREAS: Representation by counsel in eviction and foreclosure proceedings keeps people in their homes and communities and out of the homeless shelters and provides fundamental fairness and due process for those who face losing their homes; and

WHEREAS: The consequences of eviction and foreclosure are dire for low-income people: there is a deficit of affordable housing, and low-income families and individuals who lose their homes in legal proceedings often end up in homeless shelters or in housing that is less affordable than the housing they must leave; and they suffer from loss of employment, missed schooling and damage to physical and mental health; and

WHEREAS: These dire consequences for those who lose their homes in turn result in huge costs to the City of New York in providing shelter, social services and other services; and

WHEREAS: Intro 214, which would create a right to counsel in eviction and foreclosure proceedings and would establish a city-wide civil justice coordinator to assign tenants legal counsel, is currently pending at the City Council and is co-sponsored by 38 of the 51 Councilmembers; now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 supports the right to counsel for low-income New Yorkers who face losing their homes in legal proceedings and urges the City Council and the Mayor to adopt Intro 214 or any other measure that would guarantee the right to counsel for low-income New Yorkers who face losing their homes in legal proceedings.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
PUBLIC MEMBERS VOTE: 1 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 36 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Subway Station Study by Senator Daniel Squadron

WHEREAS: Senator Squadron’s office released a Subway Station Survey in October 2015, consisting of 53 subway stations with severe issues such as ponding, leaking water, graffiti, broken stairs, deteriorating walls, rodents and trash; and

WHEREAS: The following six of the top nine worst ranked subway stations were located in Community District 1:

STATION	LINE
• Canal Street	1
• Borough Hall	2/3
• Rector Street	R
• Broad Street	J/Z
• Broadway-Lafayette Street	B/D/F/M
• Canal Street	A/C/E; and

WHEREAS: Senator Squadron’s office submitted the survey to the NYC Transit Authority on October 9, 2015 and requested a meeting to discuss the survey findings, but has not heard back from them; and

WHEREAS: With an estimated 14 million tourists a year who visit our community, CB1 is experiencing incredible congestion due to its historic street grid, narrow streets and density, compounded by over 75 construction projects in 1.5 sq miles, and

WHEREAS: CB1 welcomes and encourages our tourists to take mass transit, especially the subway, in order to alleviate this congestion, improve our air quality and allow life-saving emergency vehicles to get to their destinations in a timely manner, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 urges the MTA to fix those worst subway stations to ensure safety and to encourage people to use the subway, and



BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB 1 urges the NYC Transit Authority to act quickly in setting up a meeting with Senator Squadron, and that CB1 be included in the discussion.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC MEMBERS VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Int. No. 0950-2015, New York City Council legislation to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to limiting the number of sightseeing bus licenses

WHEREAS: On November 5, 2015, the Quality of Life Committee reviewed the attached legislation proposed by the New York City Council; and

WHEREAS: The streets of Lower Manhattan are among the narrowest and most congested of any city in the country; and

WHEREAS: Major contributors to the congestion are the many tour and commuter buses which descend on our district every day and frequently park and/or layover on our streets; and

WHEREAS: These buses, which frequently sit on our local streets with their engines idling, significantly contribute to the poor air quality in Lower Manhattan and exacerbate asthma and other respiratory problems; and

WHEREAS: According to the NYS DOT, the number of double decker sightseeing buses in the City more than tripled from 57 to 194 between 2003 and 2013, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 supports Int. 0950-2015 from the New York City Council.

Int. No. 950

By Council Members Chin, Arroyo, Gentile, Johnson, Mealy, Mendez and Van Bramer (by request of the Manhattan Borough President)

A Local Law to amend the administrative code of the city of New York, in relation to limiting the number of sightseeing bus licenses.

Be it enacted by the Council as follows:

Section 1. Section 20-375 of the administrative code of the city of New York is amended to read as follows:

§ 20-375. License plate.

a. Upon the payment of the license fee the commissioner shall issue a license to the owner of the sightseeing bus or horse drawn cab together with a license plate to be securely affixed to a conspicuous and indispensable part of such sightseeing bus or securely and conspicuously affixed to the rear axle of such horse drawn cab, on which shall be clearly set forth the license number of such sightseeing bus or horse drawn cab. The license plate issued to the licensee may, in the discretion of the commissioner, be a plate of a permanent nature with a replaceable date tag attached thereto, indicating the expiration date of the plate during each license year and the issuance of such a plate with such date tag to a person possessing such a plate, shall be deemed issuance of a license plate. Such license plate and the replaceable date tag to be issued from year to year to be attached thereto, shall be of such material, form, design and dimension and set forth such distinguishing number or other identification marks as the commissioner shall prescribe. The commissioner upon renewal of the license hereunder, may continue the use of the license plate for as many additional license years as he or she in his or her discretion may determine, in which event he or she shall issue and deliver to the

licensee a replaceable date tag as evidence of renewal of the license, which shall be attached or affixed in such manner as he or she may prescribe by rule. The failure to affix or display such date tag in a manner prescribed by the commissioner shall constitute a violation of this section. In the event of the loss, mutilation or destruction of any license plate or date tag issued hereunder, the owner may file such statement and proof of facts as the commissioner shall require, with a fee of twenty-five dollars, at the department, and the department shall issue a duplicate or substitute license plate or date tag.

b. The commissioner may issue new sight-seeing bus license plates pursuant to this section provided

that the number of active license plates is less than two hundred and twenty-five. For purposes of this

subdivision an active license plate is a plate that has been issued for purposes of operating a licensed sight-

seeing bus. Nothing in this subdivision shall prevent the commissioner from issuing a replacement license plate

to a licensed sight-seeing bus operator.

§ 2. This local law shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after enactment into law; provided, however, that the commissioner shall take any actions necessary prior to such effective date for the implementation of this local law including, but not limited to, the adoption of any necessary rules.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC MEMBERS:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	1 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 78 Leonard Street, application for restaurant liquor license for TriMasa Restaurant Partners LLC & Takayama Management LLC d/b/a Tetsu

WHEREAS: TriMasa Restaurant Partners LLC & Takayama Management LLC are applying for a restaurant liquor license; and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to closing hours of 12 a.m. on weekdays and 1 a.m. on weekends; and

WHEREAS: The total area of the restaurant is 6,400 square feet with public assembly capacity of less than 280; and

WHEREAS: There will be recorded background music and they will not utilize subwoofers; and

WHEREAS: As per the application plans submitted on 11/16/12, the large unidentified room indicated on the ground floor plan is to be used for storage only, and not for patron use; and

WHEREAS: The State Liquor Authority should not issue a license until issues with the Certificate of Occupancy and the Board of Standards and Appeals are resolved; and

WHEREAS: As per the application plans submitted on 11/16/15, the mezzanine level will be used for the building's mechanical system only and not for patron use; and

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS: The applicant has signed and notarized a stipulations sheet; now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 opposes the grant of a liquor license at 78 Leonard Street for TriMasa

Restaurant Partners LLC & Takayama Management LLC unless the applicant complies with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC MEMBERS:	2 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 156 Chambers Street, application for a restaurant liquor license for Mariachi's Restaurant Corp.

WHEREAS: Mariachi's Restaurant Corp. is applying for a restaurant liquor license; and

WHEREAS: This is a new application for a restaurant that has operated at a prior location at 61 Warren Street for 18 years; and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to a closing hour of 12 a.m. on weekdays and 1 a.m. on weekends; and

WHEREAS: There will be live Mariachi music on weekends, which will reach the level of background music only, so as not to be heard by the neighbors; and

WHEREAS: The total area of the restaurant is 1,000 square feet; and

WHEREAS: The Certificate of Occupancy for the premises is currently for a store (under 50 people); and

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS: The applicant has signed and notarized a stipulations sheet; now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB 1 *opposes* the transfer of a liquor license to 156 Chambers St. for Mariachi's Restaurant Corp. *unless* the applicant complies with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC MEMBERS:	2 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 413 Greenwich Street, application for sidewalk cafe license for Sweetgreen New York LLC, dba Sweetgreen Tribeca

WHEREAS: Sweetgreen New York LLC, dba Sweetgreen Tribeca has applied for an unenclosed sidewalk café license for 9 tables and 18 seats; and

WHEREAS: Although there will be tables and chairs on a side-street, which is inconsistent with Community Board 1 guidelines, there was a prior restaurant with a sidewalk cafe at this location, the applicant will not be applying for a liquor license, and patrons of this establishment are generally a lunchtime crowd. The Tribeca Committee members therefore do not regard this approval of a sidewalk cafe on a side-street as a precedent; now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB 1 does not oppose the grant of a sidewalk cafe license at 413 Greenwich Street for Sweetgreen New York LLC, dba Sweetgreen Tribeca.



COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: YOUTH & EDUCATION and TRIBECA

*Youth and Education*

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

*Tribeca*

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

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Hudson River Park Trust – Pier 26 and “Upland”

WHEREAS: The Hudson River Park Trust (HRPT) plans to complete Pier 26 and the upland portion between N Moore and Hubert streets (the “upland”); and

WHEREAS: The completion of Pier 26 will include an anticipated estuarium of approximately 24,000 square feet; and

WHEREAS: To complete Pier 26 and the “upland,” HRPT has received \$10 million in funding from Citigroup and \$10 million in funding from the New York City capital budget; HRPT has also applied for a \$10 million grant from the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC); and there will possibly be additional funding from Clarkson University to build and operate the estuarium; and

WHEREAS: Completion of Pier 26 and the “upland” is a priority for Community Board 1, as discussed in resolutions passed in March 2007, June 2007, and February 2015; and

WHEREAS: Community Board 1 and HRPT hosted a forum to discuss future design and programming for Pier 26 and the “upland” on October 19, 2015; and

WHEREAS: Members of Community Board 1 and dozens of other community leaders and residents participated in the discussion at the forum; and

WHEREAS: At the forum, there was stakeholder support for passive, quiet space for the enjoyment of nature as well as recreational space for active play; and

WHEREAS: Representatives of the River Project, a water-dependent non-profit organization which has been part of the community for 30 years and which requires direct access to the river, attended the Youth and Education Committee meeting on November 10, 2015 and the Tribeca Committee meeting on November 16, 2015, where they described their longstanding relationship to Pier 26 and their efforts to be part of a rebuilt estuarium on Pier 26; and

WHEREAS: While the estuarium’s mission is to teach about the Hudson River, the river’s health cannot be separated from the important issues of clean energy and sustainability; and

WHEREAS: At the Tribeca Committee meeting on November 16, 2015, several community board members expressed a need for deck space, docking, and landscaping for the estuarium beyond the estuarium’s established footprint; now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 recommends that Pier 26 be programmed for community-based outdoor environmental educational programming, maximizing its location in a natural underwater animal sanctuary and that access be provided to the Hudson River; and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 recommends that Pier 26 and the “upland” include a flexible outdoor recreation and programming area, that it be outfitted with synthetic turf that is carpet-style or which uses sustainable, non-toxic alternative infill materials, rather than crumb rubber infill made from recycled car and truck tires. Any synthetic material used should be reviewed to ensure it doesn’t pose risks with regard to overheating and that it be resilient given concerns regarding climate change, extreme temperatures, and related weather events; and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 recommends that Pier 26 and the “upland” be fitted with solar, wind, hydroelectric energy, and other green building energy standards and materials. Community Board 1 requests that Clarkson University use its well-qualified resources to assist in the planning of alternative energy implementation on Pier 26 and the “upland.” Community Board 1 requests a presentation at the schematic level by the architects on this matter; and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 strongly urges that HRPT follows the Waterfront Alliance's "Waterfront Edge Design Guidelines" (<http://waterfrontalliance.org/what-we-do/waterfront-edge-design-guidelines>) that CB1 supports for waterfront development; and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 recommends that the infrastructure of Pier 26, its electric lines, and its plumbing not be buried under the pier but remain accessible for easy repair. Community Board 1 requests the architects responsible for this part of the planning make a presentation to the community board; and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 recommends that the River Project have a significant working role in the estuarium and on Pier 26; and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 requests that Clarkson University make a presentation to the community board on the estuarium's proposed operation; and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 requests that the HRTP design team, inclusive of the architects, landscape architects, and engineers working on the pier design, make periodic design presentations to the community board on the development of the entire pier and uplands, inclusive of all proposed architecture and landscape architecture designs. Community Board 1 requests that the first of these presentations be given at the completion of the schematic design phase.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 2015

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH & EDUCATION

COMMITTEE VOTE:        7 In Favor    0 Opposed    0 Abstained    0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:            33 In Favor    0 Opposed    0 Abstained    0 Recused

RE:                      School Crossing Guards

WHEREAS: Out of 80 additional school crossing guards funded in the city's FY '16 Expense Budget, only one has been assigned to Community Board 1, yet many of our school crossing guard responsibilities are understaffed while Peck Slip, PS343, and the Spruce Street School, PS397, have none at all, and

WHEREAS: The City Council has allocated funding for four additional school crossing guards in the Community Board 1 area, and

WHEREAS: CB1 has not seen increased school guard presence at three major schools in the district, PS276, PS397 and PS 343, and

WHEREAS: CB1 has experienced absent school crossing guards, vacant positions and inadequate supervision of school crossing guards, and

WHEREAS: CB1 has schools located in areas prone to accidents, due to its congested streets and sidewalks, and there was a recent fatality, and

WHEREAS: All Lower Manhattan Elected Officials support and are actively involved in efforts to provide school crossing guards for all Lower Manhattan Schools, and

WHEREAS: CB1 feels that there are systemic flaws in the current assignment of supervisory responsibility for school crossing guards, and

WHEREAS: The First Precinct has agreed to assign traffic control officers to school crossing duty at the Spruce Street and Peck Slip schools until permanent crossing guards are assigned, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 asks the New York Police Department to assign six additional school crossing guards, two each at the following locations: PS276, PS397 and PS 343, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 recommends that the NYPD lift the cap of working hours of school crossing guards to reasonable hours to cover the needs of the community's schools and afterschool programs, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 recommends that the long term solution to the problem of inadequate supervision of school crossing guards is to annualize the job of school crossing guards, thereby making it a 12 month a year title versus a 10 month title with all possible benefits to make the position more desirable to prospective applicants, and that applications for school crossing guard positions be fully vested for residents of the local community, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 recommends that the city of New York mandate that all schools in CB1 have a minimum of one school crossing guard assigned to each school based upon a comprehensive plan for adequate coverage, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB1 recommends that local candidates are fully vetted for these positions.