

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 4 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 25 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 1 Abstained |

RE: Landmarks Preservation Commission Continued Financing and Independence

WHEREAS: In the City of New York Fiscal Plan for 1992-1996, Volume II, the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) does not appear except in an agency detail note citing its merger into the Department of City Planning (DCP), and

WHEREAS: In the Mayor's Management Report, Preliminary, dated February 11, 1992, consolidation of the LPC into the DCP is again stated, and

WHEREAS: In the Mayor's Management Report, Preliminary, dated February 11, 1992, under Agency-wide indicators funding for the LPC is reduced to zero by 1993, and

WHEREAS: Chapter 74 of the New York City Charter created the LPC, and the charter explicitly excludes "any board or commission established pursuant to a provision of this Charter" from the Mayor's authority to reorganize City agencies; thus, the Mayor cannot unilaterally "consolidate" away the LPC's independence, and

WHEREAS: The impetus for the move to "consolidate" the functions of LPC into those of the DCP - until now defended by the Mayor as a cost-saving measure - may, in fact, have its origins in an earlier request by the Real Estate Board of New York to the Charter Revision Commission to subordinate some functions of the LPC to the DCP, and

WHEREAS: The City Administration's attempt to eviscerate the LPC raises larger constitutional issues: it would usurp the powers of the City Council, disregard the will of the citizenry as expressed in the Charter referendum, and violate the Charter itself, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has extensive experience with the protection of the LPC landmarks laws and its important effects, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has previously recommended additional funds for LPC, and

WHEREAS: This Community Board has for many years observed the operation of the LPC in the South Street Seaport Historic District and recently the Tribeca West Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The existing practice and present relationship with the City Planning Commission (CPC) - in which the CPC supplies a report on the implications of each proposed landmarks designation - has worked in a beneficial and proper manner, and

WHEREAS: The function of protecting the City's heritage is one separate and apart from other City functions - based upon knowledge of this past but extending far into the future, beyond the more immediate pressures of planning and development with which the CPC is charged, and

WHEREAS: New York City's historic heritage is one belonging to the whole City, not to any part of it, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 advocates the continued status of the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission as a separate agency, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 calls urges the City Council to strongly oppose the merger of the Landmarks Preservation Commission into the New York City Department of City Planning.

Note: Resolution as adopted from one prepared by CB #2-Manhattan and passed by the Manhattan Borough Board in 2/20/92.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SOCIAL SERVICES

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 3 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 1 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 23 In Favor | 1 Opposed | 1 Abstained |

RE: City Council Intro: 573, The Domestic Partnership Bill

WHEREAS: All forms of discrimination on the basis of marital status and/or sexual orientation are abhorrent, unjust and often gravely harmful, and

WHEREAS: All people, including lesbians, gay men, bisexuals, the disabled and senior citizens deserve and should be accorded the same basic human rights and equal opportunities in all areas of their lives, including their right to openly form and have legally recognized loving and committed relationships with members of the same or opposite sex, and

WHEREAS: The NYC Council "Domestic Partnership Bill" is intended to provide legal recognition and rights for the hundreds of thousands of New York families who do not conform to the definition of a heterosexual married unit and for whom legal marriage is not an option: gay and lesbian couples, senior citizens and disabled people who are unable to marry for fear of losing previous survivor or other benefits, and unmarried heterosexuals in familial relationships, and

WHEREAS: These families are currently being denied basic benefits and privileges such as hospital visitation rights, bereavement leave, health care benefits, accident insurance, and access to housing, and

WHEREAS: The "Domestic Partnership Bill" will require local government to apply the SAME policy and practice to domestic partners as to married couples, and

WHEREAS: The "Domestic Partnership Bill" is being co-sponsored by Council President Andrew Stein and Councilmembers Tom Duane, Carolyn Maloney, Stephen DiBrienza, Ronnie Eldridge, Virginia Fields, Antonio Pagan and District #1 Councilmember Kathryn Freed, among others, and

WHEREAS: Individuals who are committed members of nontraditional family units deserve and are entitled to legal protection against harmful discrimination, and

WHEREAS: The term "domestic partnership" means two unrelated individuals 18 years of age or older, neither or whom is married, who have chosen to share one another's lives in a close and committed relationship of mutual caring, who live together, have agreed to share responsibility for basic living expenses incurred during the domestic partnership, and

WHEREAS: "Domestic partnership" may be established by:

- i. Presenting an original "Domestic Partnership Statement" to the County Clerk, who will file it and give the partners a certificate showing that the Statement was filed with the Clerk; or
- ii. Having a domestic partnership statement notarized; or
- iii. In the event of death, the existence of a domestic partnership may be established by emotional and financial commitment and interdependence. (In no event would evidence of a sexual relationship between such persons be required.), now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1, supports Intro. 573 before the NYC Council and calls upon Councilmembers and the Mayor work towards its immediate passage.

NOTE: Resolution as adapted from a resolution adopted by CB #3-M, and whose Chairperson has requested CB #1 support.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SOCIAL SERVICES

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 3 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 1 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 25 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |

RE: Community-based housing for the mentally ill

WHEREAS: The NYS government passed laws more than 15 years ago to gradually close State mental institutions and replace them with community-based housing, and

WHEREAS: State institutions have reduced their patient occupancy from approximately 85,000 beds to about 14,000 beds, and

WHEREAS: The community-based housing has never kept up with the discharge rate of the state institutions, so there are approximately 20,000 homeless mentally ill people in NYC, as well as many others who are living under borderline conditions. And there are approximately 48,000 mentally ill homeless statewide, and

WHEREAS: It costs \$15,000 a year to house a person in a NYC shelter, compared with \$103,000 for a year's stay in a state hospital. And a community bed for the mentally ill costs between \$14,000 to 28,000 a year to operate, depending on the level of social services provided, and

WHEREAS: Small-scale, community-based housing is recognized as a more appropriate and humane alternative to domiciling the mentally ill and mentally retarded than institutionalization, as the former, in general, enhances the quality of their lives and promotes their overall health and wellbeing, and

WHEREAS: The State has about 3,500 community-based beds for the mentally ill planned, has already spent \$15 million to develop them and has obligated another \$20 million in bonds and loans to finish the project. Some projects are near completion, while others are still without sites. Many of the planned beds will be ready to open in the next 15 months, according to the State Commissioner of Mental Health, Richard C. Surles, and

WHEREAS: The State, without consultation and cooperation of the City currently has programs to open 3,300 community beds for the mentally ill by June 1993. So far the City has delivered 700 beds and the State 284 beds, and

WHEREAS: There are plans to cut state budget allotted funds for the housing of the mentally ill by 1,616 apartments, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 strongly recommends that NYS continue to fund the current plans for creating small-scale, community-based housing, as it is unconscionable to put mentally ill people in the street, or to spend large amounts of money to maintain obsolete, ineffective state institutions.

NOTE: Resolution as adapted from one approved by CB #6-M.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SOCIAL SERVICES

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 3 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 1 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 25 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |

RE: State Budget Cuts to Medicaid Personal Care Services

WHEREAS: The attempt to limit personal care hours to 156 hours per month will result in the re-hospitalization and institutionalization of recipients. Realistically there are insufficient nursing home beds, and as a cost-saving measure, this proposal is penny wise and pound foolish. These catastrophic Medicaid cuts especially in home care hours would inevitably increase the number of admissions to hospitals from the recipient's home. Undoubtedly the result will be an increase in the shortage of nursing home and acute hospital beds, and

WHEREAS: The fact still remains that the cost of inpatient hospitalization and nursing home institutionalization is much higher than personal care. Last year 80,078 Medicaid recipients received personal care in NYS at an average cost of \$14,636 per year, while 110,476 Medicaid recipients were in nursing homes at an average cost of \$25,437 per year. (Dept. of Social Services Memorandum DSS-524E from Peter Gallagher, dated 8/9/91). It is unlikely that individual now receiving eight to twelve hours of care will remain at home with only 156 hours per month, they will turn to hospitals and nursing homes for acute or long term care as their physical condition deteriorates due to inadequate assistance. Thus this proposal is not a cost savings plan but rather a cost shifting plan, and

WHEREAS: The current system of assigning home care hours is based upon professional assessments of individual need for assistance. This new proposal will result in an arbitrary assignment of 5.2 hours to each personal care recipient, thus making this system inequitable, and

WHEREAS: The proposed 156-hour cap will have devastating effects on local economies due to the displacement of personal care workers. The personal care workforce constitutes 59,799 individuals employed in NYS. This workforce requires limited training and a high school diploma or less. (State of NY Governor's Health Care Advisory Board Briefing Book 1991, "Briefing Book" Page 443). In NYC alone, 16,800 persons are employed providing home health care services ("Briefing Book", page 451). Loss of their jobs will mean loss of health insurance for tens of thousands of women and children, forcing them onto the rolls of Medicaid, Home Relief, and Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and

WHEREAS: The proposal is also not equitable because individuals with disabilities and elderly persons will be denied the opportunity to be independent and productive in their homes due to inadequate personal care. Our society's goal of promoting dignity and self sufficiency for our disabled and elderly citizens will be undermined by these draconian proposals. While saving little or no money, this proposal will be devastating for personal care recipients and personal care workers, and

WHEREAS: Home care consumers have already borne the burden of last year's budget cuts due to the new fiscal assessment which could deny personal care services if the cost of such services are 90% or more of institutional costs, and clearly, further cuts in these essential services cannot be tolerated, and

WHEREAS: Proposed cuts in Medicaid will levy extraordinary new costs on the citizens of NY in both financial and human terms, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 expressed its deep concern and strongly opposes the proposed Medicaid cuts, in particular in Personal Care Services.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 3 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 1 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 25 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |

RE: 96 Chambers St., "South Beach Bar", application for a Cabaret License

WHEREAS: The transformation of the above referenced establishment from a clothing store to a bar was accomplished virtually overnight, and CB #1 has no evidence that this work was done with the proper Department of Buildings permits, and

WHEREAS: A Community Board complaint registering concerns about the above, the possible lack of sufficient means of egress and the reported removal of the sprinkler system during the recent construction is awaiting an inspection by the Dept. of Buildings, and

WHEREAS: A representative of the owner of the building has advised CB #1 that the building owner opposes this application by the tenant, and that he has petitioned the court for authority to evict the tenant, arguing that the recent alterations to the commercial space were done without his permission and without the required DOB permits, and

WHEREAS: 96 Chambers St. is a residential building whose residential tenants have vociferously stated their strong opposition to this application, and

WHEREAS: The applicant was invited, but did not attend the March 3rd committee meeting at which the application was reviewed, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 strongly recommends that the Department of Consumer Affairs deny a Cabaret License to "South Beach Bar" at 96 Chambers St.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA/WASHINGTON MARKET

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 4 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 25 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |

RE: 311 Greenwich St., New York Sports Club, Application to the Board of Standards and Appeals In a Special Permit

WHEREAS: In December 1989 the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA) granted a Special Permit to allow a physical culture establishment (health club) on the first floor and cellar at 311 Greenwich St., and

WHEREAS: In May 1990 the BSA granted the club authorization to expand the club on the 1st floor by 15%, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 had recommended that the BSA approve both of these actions, and

WHEREAS: In response to strong neighborhood enrollment, TSI Greenwich Street Inc. (and its parent corporation Town Sports International) is now requesting BSA's permission to expand the club by approximately 20% (1,840 sq. ft.), now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the BSA approve TSI Greenwich Street Inc's application for a Special Permit to allow the expansion of the aerobics exercise studio and the creation of a biometrics center on the first floor.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WATERFRONT & ENVIRONMENT

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 6 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 24 In Favor | 1 Opposed | 0 Abstained |

RE: Amazon Club, application for a cabaret license

WHEREAS: CB #1 has had numerous and serious complaints made during the first season (1991) of this Club's operation, which has prompted this board to seek the cancellation of its seasonal NYS Liquor License and the remainder of its lease with NYS DOT, and

WHEREAS: The applicant has violated the special terms and conditions of his first season's liquor license which included items covered by new rules (1990) of the Department of Consumer Affairs, and

WHEREAS: The applicant has received a noise violation which is pending adjudication and doubtless would have received other violations, if the response of city agencies were not so inadequate due to budget cutbacks, and

WHEREAS: The NYC Department of Consumer Affairs requires a NYC Buildings Department inspection as well as a NYC Fire Department inspection prior to the issuance of a cabaret license. CB #1 has requested copies of these inspection reports, and if no inspections are performed or violations go unsatisfied, no cabaret license will be issued, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 requests this cabaret license application by the Amazon Village/Club be denied in light of the very negative impact this outdoor "club" operation has had on the adjacent and surrounding residential community, as well as to the automotive and pedestrian traffic on West St. and surrounding streets.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WATERFRONT & ENVIRONMENT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained

NOTE: Application was withdrawn by the applicant on 3/10/92.

RE: Pier 32, on the Hudson River, boating and golf facility "concept"

WHEREAS: The NYS/DOT has requested direction and guidance from this Board concerning potential uses of the waterfront and more specifically the use of Pier 32 as a golf and marina facility, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has provided some direction regarding the NYS/DOT's lease of Pier 25 (Resolution of 10/9/90), and

WHEREAS: This Community Board has serious concerns regarding the NYS/DOT's use of month to month permits involving significant (\$300,000) investments on the part of the applicant, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 views the specific example of golf facility (driving and putting) as an inappropriate use of this waterfront resource (Pier 32) and the small marina, though an appropriate use, not acceptable at this time due to its apparent conflict with proposed activities of the River Project (Pier 26) concerning this embayment, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the NYS/DOT follow the direction and definitions set forth in the Westside Waterfront Panel's plan, the draft "Comprehensive Manhattan Waterfront Plan" recently issued by the Manhattan Borough President, as well as the following recommendations:

All future permits or leases for the waterfront, marginal street, and/or piers should:

1. Emphasize public access as well as provide for improvements which begin to allow for the function of an esplanade (walkway) and bikeway.

2. Reduce the use of such space for parking, either associated with a permit of lease or as a permit or lease. As existing leases/permits expire or renew, a re-configuration of parking lot layouts should be done to allow for said walkway and bikeway uses.
3. Sightlines and view corridors towards the Hudson River and NY Harbor must be maintained.
4. Where permits or leases are granted, wording within the lease or permit should commit the lessee or permittee to show proof of compliance with all City, State and Federal rules, regulations and laws, as well as proof of completion of required improvements to the pier(s) and/or bulkhead.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WATERFRONT & ENVIRONMENT

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 6 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 22 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 3 Abstained |

RE: Radioactive waste incineration at Rockefeller University

WHEREAS: A biomedical and medical research institution known as The Rockefeller University located at 1230 York Ave., New York, NY 10021, with a campus extending from East 62nd to 68th St., has filed petitions with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) so as to begin the incineration of radioactive medical, biomedical, and research waste, and

WHEREAS: The Rockefeller University petitions No. PRM 20-17 and PRM 20-18 request the NRC to amend current rules so that the on-site incineration of radioactive animal and bio-medical waste, currently prohibited, would now be mandatory for all jurisdictions, and

WHEREAS: The Rockefeller University requests the NRC to make "this ruling on with which the agreement agencies (NYC and State Health Departments) must comply" since the NYC Health Department does not now permit any incineration of radioactive waste, and

WHEREAS: The Rockefeller University has not conducted an analysis of the environmental impact or prepared a Health Risk Assessment of the proposal for rulemaking change, and

WHEREAS: The Rockefeller University petitions to the NRC calls for deregulation and mandatory incineration of the following radioactive isotopes: Tritium (H-3), Carbon 14 (C-14), Sulfur 35 (S-35), Calcium 45 (Ca-45), Chromium 51 (Cr-51), Iodine 125 (I-125) and Iodine 131 (I-131) which will be released as radioactive gases into the atmosphere surrounding The Rockefeller University in the Borough of Manhattan, and

WHEREAS: No safe level of long term exposure exists for any or all of the radioactive isotopes cited in the petition, and

WHEREAS: Scientific studies have determined that exposure to Tritium and other radioactive isotopes is extremely hazardous to the unborn, to infants, and children, causing extensive neurological damage, reduction in brain size, severe mental retardation, cancer, and genetic damage transmittable across numerous

generations, and

WHEREAS: The Borough of Manhattan contains more than 30 public schools and 56 private and a population of more than 245,000 located within 1,800 yards of Rockefeller University, and

WHEREAS: The Community School Board of School District #2 has called upon Rockefeller University to withdraw both petitions, and the NRC to reject The Rockefeller University petitions for rulemaking changes numbers PRM 20-17 and PRM 20-18, and

WHEREAS: The Chancellor of the Board of Education is on record as opposed to the siting or operation of medical waste incinerators in the proximity of any school, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 demands that The Rockefeller University immediately withdraw both petitions and any other petitions unknown to CB #1 at this time from the U.S. NRC, and immediately terminate all plans for the incineration of medical and radioactive waste, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 calls on the U.S. NRC to enter this resolution in the permanent record on The Rockefeller University petitions under Docket No. PRM 20-17 and PRM 20-18, and to reject forthwith The Rockefeller University petitions requesting the declassification of low-level radioactive waste, and the mandatory incineration of medical and laboratory radioactive waste, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 calls on the US NRC to reject the petitions from any and all petitioners requesting the deregulation and less stringent disposal methods of low-level radioactive waste.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: ARTS & CULTURAL AFFAIRS

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 4 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 21 In Favor | 1 Opposed | 2 Abstained |

RE: Franklin Furnace

WHEREAS: CB #1 regards Franklin Furnace - one of the oldest arts organizations in Tribeca - in high esteem, as it has for many years served as an anchor for the community, particularly for local artists, and contributed significantly to the economic base of this community, and

WHEREAS: Franklin Furnace has always encouraged and supported the creation and exhibition of experimental art, and

WHEREAS: The decision, in January 1992, of the National Council of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) to overturn the recommendation of its own grant review body, the "peer panel": that Franklin Furnace be awarded a grant, represents a severe threat in these difficult economic times to the continued existence of this local, treasured institution for the arts, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 calls upon the NEA to rescind its recent decision, and further that it award Franklin Furnace a grant of \$25,000 to assure its continued work for the benefit of the entire community of Tribeca.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 4 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 24 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |

RE: 90 Maiden La., Application to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a Certificate of Appropriateness

WHEREAS: The applicant is proposing a door identical to the existing door at the west end of the building and awnings at the windows, and

WHEREAS: These installations, in the Board's opinion, will improve the appearance of the building facade, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 90 Maiden Lane.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: ARTS & CULTURAL AFFAIRS

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 4 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 24 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |

RE: Battery Maritime Building, community arts and cultural space

WHEREAS: In October 1988 Dance Theater Workshop and Creative Time were designated to occupy the arts center in the Battery Maritime Building in conjunction with the proposed South Ferry Plaza redevelopment project, and

WHEREAS: This decision marked the culmination of many months of collaborative efforts among the Public Development Corporation, Department of Cultural Affairs and Community Board #1, including the Board's recommending finalists from among arts/cultural organizations who had responded to a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the use of the space, and

WHEREAS: Even after the announced demise of the South Ferry Plaza project in January 1991 it was the Board's clear understanding that the City remained committed to the use of the Battery Maritime Building as a dedicated arts/cultural space, and

WHEREAS: In January 1992, CB #1 was dismayed to learn - not in direct communication from the City, but in accounts from the press -of the Human Resources Administration's plans to consolidate all of its Emergency Services Units for Families (ESUs) from Manhattan and three other boroughs to the Battery Maritime Building, and

WHEREAS: Should the HRA proceed with this plan, CB #1 would consider this move by the City to be duplicitous, not in compliance with the City Charter in that HRA's proposed major "facility expansion" did not appear in the "Citywide Statement of Needs - FYs 93 & 94", not in good faith because it is inconsistent and makes obsolete previous commitments, and runs contrary to the expressed wishes of the community and Community Board that the building be a center for the arts and cultural expression, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1, while recognizing the severe economic constraints under which it is currently operating, nevertheless, calls upon the City of New York to reserve the Battery Maritime Building for the exclusive use as an arts and cultural space

for Lower Manhattan and the entire City and that further, it deem as incompatible all other proposed uses.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: PARKS

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 5 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 1 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 18 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 8 Abstained |

RE: Greening of Greenwich Street

WHEREAS: CB #1 has already gone on record supporting the narrowing of Greenwich St., and

WHEREAS: A 38 foot Greenwich St. roadway would not only dissuade vehicles from racing down this thoroughfare but would allow room to create an attractive series of open spaces along the west side of Greenwich St., and

WHEREAS: Architect Lee Weintraub has brought forth a conceptual design which offers a variety of appealing gardens and a winding walkway which also takes into account budgetary and subsurface constraints, and

WHEREAS: This proposal also allows for the enlargement of the very popular Washington Market Park, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1, supports the overall direction of the conceptual design presented to us for the Greening of Greenwich St. project and asks that the following recommendations be retained or incorporated in this design:

- 1) Retain the existing bus lay-by in front of P.S. 234
- 2) Expand Washington Market Park as far as possible (32 feet)
- 3) Relocate the Greenmarket to the vicinity of Harrison St., and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 wishes to go on record indicating its strong support for the Greenmarket on Greenwich St., and would like to work with the Greenmarket, EDC and Lee Weintraub to insure the continued operation of this important community service, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

EDC and the architect work closely with businesses along Greenwich St., including Pica Packaging, to insure that disruptions to these operations be minimized, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 requests that EDC make Greenwich St. funds immediately available for the installation of a garden, with fencing, in the area in front of PS 234 which has already been narrowed in accordance with this proposal.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: PARKS

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 4 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 23 In Favor | 3 Opposed | 0 Abstained |

RE: Hot Dog Vendor

WHEREAS: The Parks Department has proposed that a hot dog vending concession be authorized at the S/W/C of Centre and Worth Streets (Thomas Paine Park), and

WHEREAS: This vendor would be required to clean the area within 50' of his/her pushcart, and

WHEREAS: Such vendors already proliferate in Lower Manhattan and the fiscally strapped Parks Department will benefit from the revenues raised by this vendor, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 is very concerned about the growing rodent infestation problem in this district, including our parks; and this vending concession as well as others are viewed as, in part, contributing to the problem, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 supports the placement of a hot dog vendor by the Parks Department at the S/W/C of Centre and Worth Streets, however

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: This approval should in no way be constructed to apply to other food vendors at other park locations, particularly when there is only one New York City Health Department exterminator for the entire area south of 96th St.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

MARCH 10, 1992

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: CIVIC CENTER/SEAPORT AND LANDMARKS

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| COMMITTEE VOTE: | 6 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 0 Abstained |
| BOARD VOTE: | 24 In Favor | 0 Opposed | 1 Abstained |

RE: 178-180 John Street

WHEREAS: The owner of the Yankee Clipper Restaurant has proposed the creation of a new one story restaurant structure at 178-180 John Street, and

WHEREAS: The architect has designed a new structure which sensitively respects and enhances the Baker Carver and Morell Building which houses the Yankee Clipper Restaurant at 170 John St. and also captures the architectural style and character of the South Street Seaport Historic District, and

WHEREAS: This new structure, which will house the Clipper Cafe, will replace a closed pizzeria which did not contribute to the historic district, and

WHEREAS: The applicant has withdrawn, for now, his proposal to paint a new mural on the wall of 170 John St., now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 endorses the proposed one story structure at 178-180 John St. and recommends that the LPC grant the requested Certificate of Appropriateness to allow for its construction.