

Carter Booth, *Chair*
Daniel Miller, *First Vice Chair*
Susan Kent, *Second Vice Chair*
Bob Gormley, *District Manager*



Antony Wong, *Treasurer*
Valerie De La Rosa, *Secretary*
Amy Brenna, *Assistant Secretary*

COMMUNITY BOARD NO. 2, MANHATTAN

3 WASHINGTON SQUARE VILLAGE

NEW YORK, NY 10012-1899

www.cb2manhattan.org

P: 212-979-2272 F: 212-254-5102 E: info@cb2manhattan.org

Greenwich Village ✦ Little Italy ✦ SoHo ✦ NoHo ✦ Hudson Square ✦ Chinatown ✦ Gansevoort Market

FULL BOARD MINUTES

DATE: December 17, 2020
TIME: 6:30 P.M.
PLACE: Via Video Conference

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Susanna Aaron, Akeela Azcuy, William Benesh, Keen Berger, Carter Booth (Chair), Katy Bordonaro, Anita Brandt, Amy Brenna, Richard Caccappolo, Rity Chattree, Coral Dawson, Valerie De La Rosa, John Paul DeVerna, Doris Diether, Robert Ely, Mar Fitzgerald, Cormac Flynn, Joseph Gallagher, Susan Gammie, Wayne Kawadler, Susan Kent, Jeanine Kiely, Betty Kubovy-Weiss, Patricia Laraia, Edward Ma, Matthew Metzger, Daniel Miller, Brian Pape, Donna Raftery, Lois Rakoff, Bo Riccobono, Robin Rothstein, Sandy Russo, Rocio Sanz, Scott Sartiano, Shirley Secunda, Kristin Shea, Frederica Sigel, Shirley Smith, Chenault Spence, Eugene Yoo, Susan Wittenberg, Antony Wong, Azam Zeldin

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT WITH NOTIFICATION: None

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Georgia Silvera Seamans

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT/ARRIVED LATE: David Gruber, Michael Levine, Janet Liff, Cathy Sullivan

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT/LEFT EARLY: Cathy Sullivan

BOARD STAFF PRESENT: Bob Gormley, District Manager; and Josh Thompson, Assistant District Manager

GUESTS: Robert Atterbury, Congressman Jerry Nadler's office; Jacob Priley, Senator Brad Hoylman's office; Senator Brian Kavanagh; Assembly Member Deborah Glick; Assembly Member Yuh-Line Niou; Luke Wolf, NYC Comptroller Scott Stringer's office; Manhattan Borough President Gale Brewer; Irak Cehonski, Council Member Carlina Rivera's office; Anthony Drummond, Council Member Margaret Chin's office; Susan Peters, Samir Lavingia, Emily Hellstrom, Jake Schmidt, Robert Nadramia

MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Date – December 17, 2020
Board Members Present – 46
Board Members Absent with Notification – 0
Board Members Absent - 1
Board Members Present/Arrived Late - 2
Board Members Present/Left Early – 1

I. SUMMARY AND INDEX

ATTENDANCE	1
MEETING SUMMARY	1
SUMMARY AND INDEX	2
PUBLIC SESSION	2
ADOPTION OF AGENDA	3
ELECTED OFFICIALS' REPORTS	3
ADOPTION OF MINUTES	3
BUSINESS SESSION	3
STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS	3
LAND USE & BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT	3
LANDMARKS AND PUBLIC AESTHETICS	35
QUALITY OF LIFE	39
SLA LICENSING	45
TRAFFIC & TRANSPORTATION	65

II. PUBLIC SESSION

Non-Agenda Items

5G Antennas

Susan Peters spoke regarding the installation of 11,500 radio frequency 5G antennas into NYC.

Land Use & Business Development Items

Response to SoHo NoHo Neighborhood Plan: Draft Scope of Work for Environmental Impact Statement

Samir Lavingia and Jake Schmidt spoke in favor of the City's draft scope of work as-is.

Emily Hellstrom spoke in favor of the CB2 Land Use resolution.

Quality of Life Items

Newsstand Application: Mohammed F. Uddin, 11 E. Houston St. SEC of E. Houston St. and Broadway

Robert Nadramia spoke against the newsstand application for this location.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

III. ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT AND REPORTING

Robert Atterbury, Congressman Jerry Nadler's office

Jacob Priley, Senator Brad Hoylman's office

Senator Brian Kavanagh

Assembly Member Yuh-Line Niou

Assembly Member Deborah Glick

Luke Wolf, NYC Comptroller Scott Stringer's office

Manhattan Borough President Gale Brewer

Anthony Drummond, Council Member Margaret Chin's office

Irak Cehonski, Council Member Carlina Rivera's office

IV. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Adoption of October and November minutes

V. BUSINESS SESSION

1. **Chair's Report** Carter Booth reported.

2. **District Manager's Report** Bob Gormley reported.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

LAND USE AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Response to SoHo NoHo Neighborhood Plan: Draft Scope of Work for an Environmental Impact Statement (CEQR #21DCP059M) (ULURP Nos. Pending)

We are at an inflection point. Urban retail has been thrown into disarray. Long-standing local businesses are fighting for their survival. We are only just beginning to understand Covid-19's impact on office, retail and residential space, let alone deal with its human toll on our city. The ongoing pandemic is an unprecedented attack on our city, and it is fair to ask: What will our neighborhoods look like after this long winter? Will we come back fairer and stronger?

The "SoHo/NoHo Neighborhood Plan Draft Scope of Work" ignores the majority of the Envision SoHo/NoHo Report and its 27 recommendations, ensures profit-making for a few, offers almost nothing to protect and improve what is so irreplaceable about these districts, and it does little to deliver the vital affordable housing our city needs now.

SoHo and NoHo were landmarked for a reason. The choices we make now, most irreversible, will define and reshape our neighborhoods for the next decades. Do we really want to turn our community into cookie-cutter copies of what can be found all over the city?

CB2, Man. sounds a clear warning on seven key issues:

1. Preserve our uniqueness: Let's do no harm. The beloved, gritty, artistic, human-scale creativity of these streets and their varied storefronts is a national treasure, but it can easily be destroyed.

Response to SoHo NoHo Neighborhood Plan: Draft Scope of Work for an Environmental Impact Statement (CEQR #21DCP059M) (ULURP Nos. Pending)

SoHo and NoHo have already proven to have a highly successful, distinctive, functioning eco- system that perennially attracts retailers, shoppers, artists and tourists from all over the world, generating significant revenue for the City and State.

The success of these neighborhoods is in part the result of a stable regulatory framework that is a combination of the creative amendment of the M1-5A and M1-5B zoning texts, including the Special Permit requirements, the Loft Law, and the creation of the historic districts.

2. Keep it artistic: The presence of galleries, resident artists and cultural spaces has been key to our success for the past 50 years and has transformed our neighborhoods into world-renowned centers of art and creativity.

This requires constant efforts to nurture, sustain and attract cultural institutions, art galleries, artists and the evolving creative and “maker” communities.

Let’s retain and perpetuate the creative arts character of these neighborhoods, whether in new construction or adaptive reuse.

3. Get serious about affordable housing: As our city rebuilds in the aftermath of Covid-19, how do we achieve housing and social justice after an economic free-fall?

Our community supports affordable housing.

We need a better approach than Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH), which has shown to be ineffective as a zoning tool for affordable housing, as demonstrated most recently in the Flushing rezoning that, per citylimits.org (Nov. 11, 2020), that will produce only 75-90 affordable units out of 1725 in only one out of four residential sites.

MIH guarantees lucrative developer payoffs and offers only modest promises of affordable units to reach the equitable housing goals specifically identified as a core reason to rush forward with this plan. It includes loopholes that allow developers to opt-out through “hardship” or simply build all-commercial buildings instead.

Any new residential development should adequately address the displacement of long-term residents and low-income residents.

We reject towering blocks of luxury housing that impact negatively on the character of our neighborhoods. The outlined best-case scenario of 328 to 494 affordable units ignores the socioeconomic impact of up to 1355 ultra-luxury, market-rate apartments.

We reject incentivization of office use over residential uses.

We reject any plans for a blanket up-zoning. Let’s *actually grasp* what the new balance will be between retail, commercial and residential as those markets stabilize and recalibrate.

Community Board 2, Man. calls for the expanded conversation on affordable housing that the City should have undertaken during Envision SoHo NoHo. One-size-fits-all programs are not the solution.

4. Update, but don’t oversize: Everyone agrees that the special permit process needs streamlining. Ground floor spaces should be available to lively, appropriate retail businesses, without requiring special permits.

SoHo and NoHo are mixed-use neighborhoods with sizeable residential populations. Let’s not unleash a land grab of oversized retail and eating and drinking establishments that would crowd out smaller retailers and local neighborhood restaurants, reduce the variety and total number of businesses, and wreak havoc on residential life.

Let's not create an environment that favors big box retail over small businesses. The current restrictions are working and deserve protection: no retail over 10,000sf; a 5,000sf cap on eating and drinking. Those uses should be restricted to below the second floor, as is common throughout the city.

5. Encourage adaptive reuse: The magic of our streets started with the spontaneous transformation by artists of existing industrial space into lofts, imaginative retail and creative office use. SoHo and NoHo exemplify the great transformation and success of New York City in the postindustrial era. This adaptive reuse model inspired a development style now used in readapting industrial areas around the world. Further evolution of this successful transformation should be encouraged through adaptive reuse without new, out-of-scale construction.

6. Protect current occupants: Our neighborhoods need a fair resolution of residential controversies that produces permanent, equitable affordability. That means:

- Record and protect current affordable rental units.
- Identify a mechanism to legalize residential occupancy in manufacturing units without disrupting legal conforming occupants through a public process.
- Protect resident artists and protect the joint live-work manufacturing framework for their lofts, including those still in the transition process from Interim Multiple Dwelling status.
- Identify solutions to help adapt spaces for those aging in place and maintain the unique protections under The Loft Law for our pioneering artist residents.

7. Examine the financial implications: The Draft Scope of work requires an economic analysis across the entire study area. The current focus on only 27 projected sites (out of approximately 850 lots) fails to address the array of other development possibilities. Transparency was promised; we expect it. Now is not the time for business as usual. The pressure of your timeline is self-imposed and the consequences of moving forward with the wrong plan are stark. Making the wrong choices will without doubt kill what is unique, world-renowned and profitable about SoHo and NoHo without achieving our shared goal.

No Scope or Environmental Impact Study compiled now, during an ongoing global upheaval, could possibly be an accurate assessment of any neighborhood or provide the basis for changes we will live with for decades. While everything is in monumental flux, we call for caution and innovative thinking—the creation of a comprehensive, long-range vision implemented in carefully-designed, incremental stages.

That process should begin with an examination of the shortcomings of the current draft scope of work and the presentation (for public review before any ULURP begins) of a new draft scope that reflects those shortcomings, plus the impact of the pandemic on the residential, commercial and retail sectors of our economy.

Herewith the resolution that documents the basis for our concerns. It is based on input from two Land Use Committee meetings and a public hearing with 175+ attendees and 40+ speakers. The resolution follows the outline of the draft scope of work for the proposed plan:

WHEREAS:

A. INTRODUCTION

1. This proposal is the first-ever upzoning of an historic district since the creation of the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) in 1965.

2. This Draft Scope is only 61 pages long and explores the impact of 27 projected development sites and 57 potential development sites. In comparison, the Bushwick Draft Scope is 201 pages long and analyzes 167 projected sites. The Draft Scope for the Gowanus Rezoning, led by not only Department of City Planning (DCP) but also by NYC HPD and NYC Parks, is 237 pages long and analyzes 60 projected sites. Clearly, the Gowanus and Bushwick proposals have benefitted from having been started prior to the pandemic.

3. On p. 1, the Draft Scope states that this proposal was “informed by local and citywide stakeholders during the Envision SoHo/NoHo process, a public engagement initiative undertaken in 2019” by Manhattan Borough President Gale Brewer, City Council Member for City Council District 1 Margaret Chin, and DCP.

4. The report, “Envision SoHo/NoHo: Summary and Recommendations,” created by the plan sponsors at the end of the Envision process concluded with 25+ “Suggested Areas for Further Analysis/Study,” p. 85). There is no evidence in the Draft Scope that any additional work on those areas has been done (see Task 1).

5. On p. 1, the Draft Scope’s Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario expects a net increase of approximately 1,683 dwelling units, only 20%-29% of which would be “affordable” units. CB2 is looking for a greater percentage of affordable units in any new development.

6. Long before the pandemic, many retail spaces remained empty. Adding 57,473gsf of projected destination retail space (p.1) without any mention of how small local retail would be protected is of grave concern.

The goal of expanding housing opportunities by “requiring permanently affordable housing” is mentioned on p. 2, but there are no details or mechanism described in the Draft Scope for either the preservation of current affordable housing or the legalization of existing residents in SoHo and NoHo. Nor did the Draft Scope study the number of affordable units and how many of these units are occupied by residents over 60, who are aging in place and comprise a Naturally Occurring Retirement Community (NORC). This was a topic of extreme concern and importance during the Envision process.

7. To achieve the goal on p. 2 of preserving historic resources, adaptive reuse of existing buildings could yield a significant number of affordable units more quickly than an upzoning, without greatly increasing the stock of luxury market-rate units.

8. The Draft Scope seeks to promote economic recovery, resiliency, and growth by allowing a wider range of uses (p.2), but many property owners have kept rents high to satisfy mortgage requirements, hold out for “credit tenants,” and/or use high rent potential as a way to finance other locations, causing long-term retail vacancies.

9. Many of the introduction’s stated objectives are contradicted by the Proposed Action. For example: Requiring permanently affordable housing to “support income diversity” is an objective, one with which CB2 agrees. However, CB2 questions how adding 70-80% market-rate housing based on incentives that may never be realized will ever ensure affordable housing.

10. Another objective is to “establish appropriate densities and building forms that ensure new development harmonizes with neighborhood context and scale (p.2).” Historic districts do this by their very nature, and 85% of the proposed upzoning area is in such districts. The proposed increase in as-of-right FAR would significantly redefine neighborhood context and scale rather than harmonizing with the existing historic building forms.

B. REQUIRED APPROVALS AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

C. BACKGROUND TO THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

PROJECT AREA HISTORY

A DIVERSIFYING ECONOMY AND A GROWING RESIDENTIAL PRESENCE

1. Artist Certification: p. 5 of the Draft Scope, states that “many residents did not qualify for artist certification.” The absence of certification is a problem with the certification process and the agency overseeing it. It does not indicate a lack of artists.

Discussions with many working artists in SoHo and NoHo during the Envision SoHo/NoHo meetings clarified that the Department of Cultural Affairs (DCLA) certification was haphazard, complicated and, since it had not been enforced for so long, unnecessary for artists residing in Joint Live-Work Quarters for Artists (JLWQA) housing in SoHo and NoHo.

2. Special permits and variances: p. 5 of the Draft Scope states that “the area sees an extraordinarily high volume of applications for special permits and variances to locate or legalize retail uses.” CB2’s opportunity to weigh in is vital for community representation in the application process. With removal of these reviews, only speculation and profit govern retail uses, rather than their desirability in a mixed-use neighborhood.

3. P. 5 of the Draft Scope acknowledges that the Covid-19 pandemic has impacted SoHo and NoHo, and then makes an unsubstantiated assumption that office, retail, accommodation and food services will remain core economic assets in the long term. Pandemic-related questions include:

- a. Who will come back to work in offices and will the offices have the appropriate infrastructure to ensure safety?
- b. Would office, hotel and other properties currently under distress become available for city acquisition, perhaps in partnership with a not-for-profit to create 100% affordable housing in existing structures?
- c. Will in-person retail ever exceed the levels it had before the pandemic despite vacancies prior?
- d. How much retail will return, now that consumers have shifted largely to shopping from home?
- e. How much tourism will return and when?
- f. Rents have been dropping since 2016 and the pandemic has furthered this correction.
- g. How long will that remain? Will rents come down low enough to provide affordable housing without requiring the immense increases in FAR contemplated in the proposal outlined in the Draft Scope?
- h. Would adaptive reuse rebalance the neighborhoods without resorting to what amounts to developer giveaways and increased building envelopes?

4. Without data based on post-pandemic experience, the answers can only be guesses.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND INTERAGENCY PARTICIPATION

ENVISION SOHO/NOHO

1. This section of the Draft Scope describes the Envision process and its goals in detail but completely disregards the expectation that “these Neighborhood Priority recommendations and corresponding potential Implementation Strategies...have been developed with an understanding that many areas warrant further research and community input. (Envision SoHo/NoHo, p.11)”

2. It is a disservice to the entire Envision process to describe its findings as conclusive, when the Report itself states, “It is emphasized that the provided Potential Implementation Strategies are not definitive.”
3. It is hard to understand how CPC is willing to turn its back on the Report’s findings (p.46) that continued conversation and aspirational thinking “...is encouraged to further evolve ideas to achieve effective implementation.”
4. The Plan fails to “maintain, enforce and strengthen existing protections for residents including renters and those in rent-regulated units (p.7),” one of seven goals in the November 2019 Envision SoHo/NoHo report. Instead, the conversion from existing M zoning to new R or C zoning will remove protections directly related to work created and practiced within the unique JLWQA units that were established specifically for the M1-5A and M1-5B districts. Further, real estate speculation, brought on by upzonings, is known to increase the instances of harassment aimed at rent-regulated tenants. This is of particular concern for the numerous senior residents who were part of the pioneering movement that transformed these neighborhoods and are now aging in place.
5. The Scope should include outreach to the following areas/groups as recommended in Envision SoHo NoHo (p.84): The Southeast Study Area; younger populations of SoHo/NoHo; workers of SoHo/NoHo; and other important voices inside and outside the SoHo/NoHo boundaries.
6. The survey of land uses that DCP conducted, which is mentioned on p.5 of the Draft Scope, is not included.

PROJECT AREA

HISTORIC DISTRICTS

1. This proposal is the first-ever upzoning of an historic district since the creation of the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) in 1965. If a precedent is set now, the Proposed Actions not only will have a negative impact on the immediate study area, the proposed actions, but also will have a profound negative impact on historic districts throughout the city.
2. An action that would potentially damage the character and attraction of all our historic districts and the tax-base city-wide must not be passed.
3. The assorted FAR increases proposed for within various areas of the historic districts run the risk of fundamentally altering the neighborhoods, and such proposals are in contradiction to NYC Landmark law (§ 25301[b]) which notes that the protection and perpetuation of protected districts are “for the education, pleasure and welfare of the people of the city.”
4. In the historic districts, where upzoning is proposed to be a minimum of 20% (6 FAR), and up to 94% (9.7 FAR)—and in a few cases 140% (12 FAR)—changes in neighborhood character will be subject mostly to LPC review. But those big FAR increases will create tremendous incentives for owners to seek rooftop additions and demolitions, some of which no doubt the LPC will grant. And new development at that scale will also often be out of scale for the historic districts, where the overall average FAR in both SoHo and NoHo is below 5.

NEIGHBORHOOD CONTEXT

1. Lifting the 5,000sf limit on restaurants would not achieve the desired goal to “contribute to the charm and vibrancy of SoHo and NoHo (p.9) or “foster the small business community of SoHo/NoHo...” (p.2).
2. The variety of eating and drinking establishments already in existence in the district is part of the unique character of SoHo/NoHo and is a differentiator to other parts of the city. The regulations

restricting their size to 5,000sf were the product of years of consultation and consensus-building by the community and public officials; that restriction has been critical to protecting the vibrancy, tourism economy and commercial and residential desirability of the SoHo/NoHo area.

3. Prior to Covid-19, the SoHo/NoHo area was already vibrant, bustling and congested and among the most popular areas of NYC with tourists, already providing plenty of food and drink options to the community of residents, workers and visitors all over the area.

4. The outsize scale of eating & drinking establishments of more than 5,000sf would require a level of commercial delivery, garbage handling and other services that would overwhelm and destroy the residential life that exists throughout the district.

5. Even the wider street corridors are already very congested and establishments of this size will create significant adverse effects on noise and congestion levels as well as public safety. (As recently as July 29, 2020 the NY State Liquor Authority voted against an on-premise liquor license application for a food hall on Broadway for these reasons).

SoHo and NoHo Historic Cores

1. Notwithstanding the Draft Scope's acknowledgement of NoHo's and SoHo's "pervasive mixed-use character" which "contributes to the charm and vibrancy of SoHo and NoHo and presents unique conditions related to zoning, land use, and quality of life" (p. 9), the Draft Scope fails to address and correct the serious quality-of-life problems that mixed-use engenders, and which Envision SoHo/NoHo strongly recommended be addressed.

2. It is not by chance that "bars and restaurants are interspersed across the project area, but are more prevalent along Lafayette St., Great Jones St., Bond St., and W Broadway." For decades, the SoHo/NoHo community fought successfully to restrict use on the narrower and much more residential streets. The ill-effects of oversize bars and restaurants is detrimental to the character, the local environment, and the residential life of these neighborhoods. For the Draft Scope to casually suggest that these uses be legalized—apparently without restriction as to size—ignores the wishes of thousands of families, Community Board 2, the NY State Liquor Authority, and local elected officials who feel otherwise. It will drastically alter the neighborhood character.

3. It is ill-advised to draw a line down the center of any street so that one side is populated with huge developments facing another side's "intact historic zone." As the Draft Scope is currently configured, that happens in 5+ instances.

Commercial Corridors

Broadway Corridor

1. The Draft Scope states, "The Broadway corridor contains...a high concentration of commercial uses, particularly offices and destination retail (p.9)." What the document fails to state is that many, if not most, of these establishments have been operating without proper Certificates of Occupancy for decades, in clear violation of the law. Indeed, it is these countless violations and lack of enforcement that propelled the creation of the Envision SoHo/NoHo process in the first place.

2. The Broadway corridor appears to be regarded as a development opportunity without reference to the current overcrowded sidewalks and congestion in the street, not to mention hazardous crossings and dangerous turns at intersections.

3. The Draft Scope should take into account the mixed-use character of this corridor and its sizeable population. According to the Broadway Residents Coalition, the population along Broadway in both

NoHo and SoHo is comprised of over 750 residential units. Broadway between Canal and Houston Streets has approximately 57 second-floor JLWQA residential units with many more above.

4. Any proposed actions to address recovery from the Covid-19 pandemic in the Broadway corridor or anywhere else are premature and must be only tentative at this time.

Bowery Corridor

1. While the Draft Scope describes the SoHo and NoHo historic districts in some detail, it blithely ignores the historic, architectural, cultural, and commercial significance of the Bowery.

2. Despite the plethora of historic structures that the Bowery is famed for, the Draft Scope's chief comment on this subject is, "There are a number of under-built sites, including vacant land, low-rise tenements, and single-story semi-industrial or formerly industrial buildings." In fact, in 2013 the Bowery was placed in the Department of the Interior's National Register of Historic Places, defined as "the official list of the Nation's historic places worthy of preservation."

3. The Draft Scope ignores the monumental structures, the historic buildings, and the cultural history of this boulevard—the second oldest thoroughfare in the city after Broadway.

4. It seeks to perpetuate the legend of the Bowery as a home to derelicts, both human and buildings, while ignoring its rich contribution to the city's streetscape and past.

5. The Bowery historic district extends from Chatham Square in Chinatown to Cooper Square in NoHo. It contains multiple building styles, including several NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) Individual Landmarks, two of which are in NoHo. One, the Bond Street Savings Bank/Bouwerie Lane Theatre at 330 Bowery, a French Second Empire gem, was among the first Individual Landmarks, designated in 1967. It was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1980.

6. The other Individual Landmark, the Cooper Union, just north of the study area, an Italianate brownstone and mere feet outside the study area, was deemed a National Landmark in 1961 and an LPC Individual Landmark in 1965, the same year the LPC was formed.

Canal St. Corridor

1. The Draft Scope states "341 Canal and 419 Broadway, at six and eight stories respectively, are establishing Canal Street as a gateway to the neighborhood and serve as a transition between SoHo and the taller commercial buildings south of Canal."

2. Both these new buildings are planned in accordance with the current 5 FAR, with no request from the developer for a variance or a special permit, so we question the need now for the added FAR that the Draft Scope is proposing for the corridor.

SoHo East and SoHo West

1. The Draft Scope states that SoHo East and SoHo West "are generally less residential and less built up than the other areas described above." This ignores the scores of East SoHo residents residing at 129 Lafayette St. by Howard St., as well as the countless residents in the crowded tenements abutting Chinatown, Little Italy and Nolita and the residents in the West SoHo and South Village tenement buildings.

2. Introducing new housing that is only 20-30% affordable will gentrify these “low-intensity semi-industrial” areas, increase the cost-of-living for many of these low-income residents trying to eke out a living, and accelerate their displacement.

E. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

1. This section references the importance of addressing the needs of the City’s artists and creative workforce with no supporting plan details.
2. This section takes suggestions for further study from 12 areas for the Envision SoHo NoHo Summary (see Task 1) and re-purposes them as “community-driven recommendations.”
3. CPC’s specifically excludes from the proposed zoning actions the improvement and support of “public realm management” (e.g., infrastructure issues). This is contrary to the prominence of that topic during the professed goals of the 2019 Envision SoHo/NoHo process.
4. “The public realm” (i.e., “quality of life”) is only mentioned once in the entire Draft Scope whereas Envision SoHo NoHo mentions it 37 times. The Scope must address concern for the resident population in more detail and propose zoning solutions to address these concerns—not increase them.

REPLACE OUTDATED MANUFACTURING DISTRICTS WITH MIXED USE REGULATIONS

1. The Draft Scope states that the obsolete and onerous current zoning will be replaced with appropriate and flexible regulations to address the need for expanded as-of-right commercial development balanced with the need to maintain appropriate residential use, but it does not explain how residential uses would be protected from commercial expansion or what that balance should be.
2. This section discusses the 74-781 Special Permit process but does not offer any plan to improve and update it.
3. The Draft Scope makes little mention of 74-711 Special Permits. DCP assumes that all special permits are onerous and makes no mention of the public benefit of the 74-711, which assures that historic buildings are maintained in perpetuity.
4. Overreliance on special permits is largely related to UG6 ground floor retail, but the Draft Scope lumps all UG6 together. Nor does it address the existing 5,000sf maximum, failing to give UG6 eating and drinking the particular consideration it requires.
5. Of the six key findings of the DCP July 2020 Study, none of them concluded that “outdated regulatory barriers will only serve to exacerbate the recovery for two of New York City’s most significant commercial areas.” Nor is there any evidence that these “outdated regulatory barriers” will restrict recovery post-Covid-19.
6. This DCP study showed 50% vacancies in SoHo NoHo, and data reports by SoHo Business Initiative on July 30, 2020 reported a 31% vacancy. DCP is now using the uncertainties of Covid-19 recovery to move quickly ahead with an upzoning. Moreover, it significantly reduced the size of five of the 24 corridors studied in the 2019 storefront vacancy report and excluded the following previously surveyed streets:
 - a. Houston Street between MacDougal and Mulberry Streets

- b. Prince Street between Sixth Avenue and Mulberry Streets
- c. Broome Street between Sixth Avenue and Mulberry Streets
- d. Lafayette Street between Prince Street and Astor Place
- e. Centre Street between Canal and Spring Streets
- f. Mulberry Street between Canal and Bleecker Streets

7. Canal St. (which, according to the study had a higher vacancy rate on the south side than on the north) had very high vacancies well before Covid-19 and has been a wasteland ever since Thor, Vornado and others cleared out all the longtime local businesses that offered all sorts of useful materials and products as part of a failed effort to turn the Canal corridor into a new retail strip mall.

INTRODUCE RESIDENTIAL USE AND PROMOTE EQUITY IN HOUSING

1. The word “equity” appears only four times in the Draft Scope and no further details to advance the goal are provided.
2. As our city rebuilds in the aftermath of the Covid-19 pandemic over the coming years, there is the exciting possibility that New York City will come back stronger, and fairer. How can we ensure true and lasting equality for everyone? How do we achieve economic justice for all after an economic freefall?
3. The southwestern corner of the project area is slated to be the site of significant residential development, but it is also one of the most polluted corners of the city. Study how siting affordable housing at the entrance to the Holland Tunnel contributes to the goal of equity in housing.

SUPPORT ARTS AND CULTURE

1. The Draft Scope describes no detailed plan to maintain the existing JMWQA and rent-stabilized and rent-controlled apartments, and there is no official count, nor even an estimate, of the number of such units.
2. The Draft Scope provides no occupation-based restrictions to accomplish the goal of supporting the artists and makers population.
3. The Draft Scope mentions voluntary transition from JMWQA to residential use but it does not detail how it would work or how arts and creative uses would benefit.
4. The Draft Scope refers to certified-artist-occupied JMWQA as “the sole as-of-right quasi- residential use” when in fact, Use Group 17D is very much a real residential option.
5. The Draft Scope states that “only 30% of all SoHo/NoHo homes are still listed as JMWQA use on Certificates of Occupancy,” but that low percentage is unreliable data, since DOB has increasingly been dropping the JMWQA annotation. Even the Loft Board is aware of this and intends to address it.
6. The “voluntary option to transition JMWQA to regular residential use with conditions that more broadly benefit the arts and creative industries” is not only vague and unspecified, but it opens the door to losing a lot of units that might best be transferred to rent stabilization. Verbiage like this—with no mention of permanent affordability—leaves the role of the Loft Board in limbo.
7. Instead of converting M districts to UG2, the Scope should study maintaining the M district with protections and broader allowances for residentially-occupied units. UG2 puts at risk things that the Draft Scope claims to want to protect.

8. Not-for-profit museums (UG3) should be made as of right.

FACILITATE SUPERIOR URBAN DESIGN AND APPROPRIATE BUILDING FORM

1. The Draft Scope proposes to “facilitate superior urban design,” but it is necessary to precisely distinguish between the historic effectiveness of the existing urban design (which needs to be protected) and any necessary updating of the variance and special permit processes (which allow for the engagement of the community).

2. The Draft Scope discusses deploying “appropriate buildings forms” that “relate harmoniously to the loft building context.” It is important to explore the dangers of big box retail and new residential projects with uncharacteristic, out-of-scale FAR.

3. The Draft Scope points out that “existing bulk regulations in M1-5A and M1-5B districts” haven’t always served the “loft building context.” The fact remains that ill-considered modifications to those regulations might easily produce far more drastic, if unintentional threats to this national treasure, especially if explicit limits and cautions are not clearly identified before deciding future changes.

4. The Proposed Actions would establish new bulk and height regulations, and where it is claimed that these regulations would “minimize the effects of new developments and enlargements on neighboring buildings,” the DCP must rigorously substantiate this claim so that resulting impacts truly correspond to promises made.

5. This Draft Scope states the changes would “allow the LPC to shape the building form without the need for separate land use actions.” This process would bypass community input on land use issues, which should remain as an important check and balance.

6. There is no analysis regarding the number of LPC applications that will be generated by DCP’s proposed new maximum FAR.

F. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTIONS

1. The Action’s goal is purportedly to “strengthen SoHo/NoHo as a vibrant mixed-use district and more inclusive community,” but the challenge remains to ensure that the specific, concrete changes implemented actually serve that objective.

2. The Proposed Actions correctly support nurturing a “healthy retail ecosystem,” but these districts already have a successful and unique ecosystem (characterized by small scale diversity and artistic vibe) whose continuation is valuable in its own right.

3. Retail is in the middle of massive restructuring and national crisis. It seems prudent to proceed cautiously and not blindly apply once-familiar approaches in a context where they might have major adverse impacts. This may be the time and special place for truly visionary innovation to be the key to survival.

4. The last proposed action, “Support arts and culture and creative industries that serve the community and the public with use allowances and other appropriate provisions,” is yet another example of a bone that is thrown to the community without a single supporting detail.

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

1. The proposed Zoning Map Amendment that establishes the Special SoHo NoHo Mixed Use District proposes eight new zoning sub-districts with proposed as-of-right use and bulk regulations that allow for major increases in floor area ratios far in excess of current building bulk and form.

The proposed Zoning Map Amendment increases in FAR are without regard to the unique historical development pattern of SoHo and NoHo and would create massive, out-of-scale developments throughout the districts. One example is the projected development at 558 Broadway, where DCP identifies for the future the construction of a 200' tall tower due to the granting of over 50,000 SF of new allowable bulk. Data indicates over a dozen other locations along Broadway with similar additions of new bulk, which could result in a succession of towers all along Broadway from Canal Street north, despite the DCP's November 9, 2020 FAQ that erroneously states the "new rules will not allow tall towers and skyscrapers."

PROPOSED ZONING DISTRICTS

1. Instead of simplifying regulations and procedures, DCP proposes five new zones, eight new subdistricts and, in several cases, boundaries for the subdistricts that bisect streets.
2. In the data in Appendix A, there are two lots with M1-6/R10A zoning—a district that is not discussed or mapped in the Draft Scope.
3. To "achieve the right balance among uses," the EIS study should investigate/document impact commercial overlays to limit the possibility of expanded new office construction and to ensure that local retail uses are incorporated in the plan.

PROPOSED SPECIAL SOHO/NOHO MIXED USE DISTRICT (SNMD)

ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS

1. CB2, Man. is vehemently opposed to any proposed Zoning Text Amendment that allows--with no public review process-- retail uses over 10,000sf (including cellar space) and eating & drinking establishments over 5,000sf.
2. Calculation of FAR in retail establishments should include basement/cellar space.
3. An upzoning of residential FAR need not be a requirement of Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (p. 17). The Scope should include the study of the potential of adaptive reuse as an alternative to increasing FAR.

SPECIAL SOHO/NOHO MIXED USE DISTRICT AND SUBDISTRICTS (SNMD)

General Use Regulations

1. The Draft Scope states (p. 17): "Within the SNMD, the proposed M1-5/R7X, M1-5/R9X, and M1-6/R10 districts' use regulations would apply, with modifications." The subsequent table, as well as the proposed zoning map, show these three proposed zonings as well.
2. The two lots in Appendix A with M1-6/R10A zoning are 358 Bowery (DSOW ID 13 and already in development as an office building) and 350-352 Bowery (DSOW ID 1).

3. The R10A offers bonuses for contextual development and community facilities. Would this be in conflict with the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing provisions of the proposal or would it be additional floor area bonus uses to create even larger buildings? Are these two lots on a corner of Bowery or within 100 feet of a corner, in which case they can be even taller? This should be clarified.

4. Allowing “UG 10 retail uses such as department stores over 10,000zsf” as-of-right flies in the face of Envision SoHo NoHo, which specifically recommended maintaining the 10,000zsf cap (Envision SoHo NoHo, 3.1).

As-of-right Use Group 10 is also inconsistent with the second goal of the report, to “foster the small business community” as noted on p. 6 of the Draft Scope. Existing and new small businesses will need additional protections.

5. If Use Group 10 retail uses are to be permitted as-of-right, where are the provisions for the protection of residents, such as enforcement of the loading berths requirement and restriction of delivery hours?

6. SNMD should provide protection for arts-related and creative-industry ground floor spaces, such as showrooms and galleries, which would face increased financial pressures caused by loosening the zoning regulations to retail uses and would have a negative effect on neighborhood context.

Joint Live-Work Quarters for Artists

1. JLWQA is inadequately addressed in the Draft Scope. Despite accounting for 30+% of residential units in SoHo and NoHo (per p.31, Envision SoHo/NoHo Report), there are no details regarding either the preservation or the legalization of these residents. This was a topic of extreme importance during the Envision SoHo/NoHo process.

2. The Draft Scope allows for voluntary transition from Use Group 17D JLWQA to Use Group 2, but does not define the details of the “mechanism” and related costs for doing so. Such conversions must result in no loss of tenant rights protections.

3. There are no guidelines or timeline for transitioning UG 17D JLWQA with permanent affordability to Use Group 2 nor are there any provisions for protecting JLWQA units in IMD buildings in limbo.

4. The Scope needs to study alternatives to JLWQA and do research into expanding the definition of “artist.”

5. The Draft Scope’s modifications of FAR prioritize big box retail over small businesses and office use over housing.

6. What provisions will the SNMD include to govern “JLWQA, arts and cultural uses, and conversions of existing buildings (p.17).”

7. The Draft Scope does not explain what would become of the Loft Law process nor does it offer a single detail regarding how “the mechanism would be paired with conditions that support arts and culture and establishments that broadly benefit the community and the public.”

8. “The voluntary transition from UG 17D JLWQA to UG2 residential with expanded home occupation provisions” sounds like an update of live/work but would result in the loss of many affordable units that would otherwise be transitioned into rent stabilization.

9. It is not clear if the City would propose amnesty to non-certified artists living in JLWQA units as it did in 1987 (“Non artist Tenants Grandfathered in SoHo and NoHo, *NY Times*, Aug. 30, 1987) and noted on p. 5 (2nd para) of the Draft Scope or if the current permitted uses under M-zoning will continue to be permitted.

Non-Residential Floor Area Retention

1. Why will the proposal will require a developer to replace any commercial space lost to residential conversion with an equal amount of new commercial space? And will this cause displacement of the existing commercial tenants?
2. Despite the current glut of office space, the Non-Residential Floor Area Retention modification incentivizes office use, not adaptive reuse, and is inconsistent with the Draft Scope's objectives.
3. Retention Modification may also disincentivize residential development and conversions, which contradicts the Draft Scope's objectives to "expand housing opportunities" and "promote adaptive reuse of existing buildings by allowing for the conversion of existing buildings (p. 2)."
4. DCP (RWCDs Table 3) shows 75 Spring St. (DSOW 31(CV)), 154 Grand St. (DSOW 32(CV)) and 324 Lafayette (DSOW 28 (CV)) as projected development sites with conversion from office to residential, and no office retention. For those in the historic core, DCP grants a FAR allowance that does not line up with the historic core subdistrict allowances.
5. The Retention Modification also requires the Chair of the CPC to certify that the amount of non-residential floor area in a building will be replaced at a one-to-one ratio with future non-residential uses on the zoning lot, but this certification is not subject to public review and adds a new city approval for each project even though the Draft Scope seeks to reduce the number of applications and approvals.
6. Existing office buildings offer an opportunity for adaptive re-use. This proposal discourages this possibility, but should be more open to investigating its utilization, as REBNY is proposing for Midtown.
7. Conversions to residential within existing buildings, many of which are grossly overbuilt, will complicate as-of-right conversion to residential without special rules.

Floor Area and Bulk Regulations

1. Two subdistricts—the Broadway-Houston Corridor and NoHo North—would permit full lot coverage up to two stories, instead of the 70% and 80% permitted for interior/through and corner lots respectively under R9X zoning. This will negatively impact light and air for buildings that share a rear lot line.
2. Many buildings in the area have 2nd floor residential occupancy, and there is no indication that DCP has taken this into consideration.

MANDATORY INCLUSIONARY HOUSING (MIH) PROGRAM

1. If the maximum additional MIH FAR is built across SoHo and NoHo, it will add nearly 11 million new square feet of new housing: the equivalent of four Empire State Buildings, 12 Woolworth Buildings or 90 NOMO SOHO Hotels.
2. Nothing in the MIH program guarantees that any housing will be built. It would be helpful to see a report on successful MIH programs.
3. There are strong incentives for office and dormitory use.
4. The pre-Covid-19 luxury condo glut will temper any business decisions to build new housing—both luxury and affordable.

5. The special permit process for developers with “hardship” cases will undermine the creation of affordable units.
6. New, as-of-right residential development, with mandatory inclusion of affordable housing could be accomplished with less disruption and no upzoning at the same FAR as is currently allowed for commercial/manufacturing development in SoHo.
7. This would be particularly feasible if, as is suggested on p. 19, the text amendment were to “provide for some adjustments to make the existing MIH program work for conversions in SoHo and NoHo.” It also does not describe these adjustments nor explain how they would apply to office buildings undergoing a conversion or redevelopment, given the proposed requirement to maintain non-residential floor area.
8. Chief among these adjustments would be requiring lower income levels and a higher percentage of residences reserved for the required affordable housing.
9. Subsidies should be provided to ensure the development of affordable housing, with greater subsidies for those developments with a higher percentage of affordable housing.
10. A set-aside for some percentage of the required affordable units in new residential developments should be considered for those in the maker and creative arts and industries.
11. Developments should consider dedicated arts-production space in new developments, especially in those where the unit size is 850sf.
12. If commercial FAR is raised to 10 and residential FAR is only 12 for MIH, the meager difference will disincentivize residential development. The Scope should examine the effect of no upzonings for commercial use.
13. DCP’s proposed zoning text amendment would allow for off-site, low-income housing when less than 25,000sf of housing is developed. This creates an opening for developers to do enlargements of existing historic buildings, creating a windfall for developers who can add luxury penthouse units, and not have to provide any onsite affordable housing.
14. The proposed Affordable Housing Fund allows developers to apply to BSA for a “special permit” to reduce their payment into the Fund where requirement would make development “financially infeasible.” Isn’t one of the goals to reduce the number of special permits? Would this be a public process?
15. What are the criteria for which the BSA would grant this exception?
16. How will the DEIS define and calculate “financially feasible”?
17. The Scope needs to include a description of how the Affordable Housing Fund will work. Since 2016, how much money has been paid into this fund and where and how has the money been spent?
18. A loophole allows payments into an Affordable Housing Fund in lieu of building the housing in the proposed area, defeating the stated goal. This loophole must be closed.
19. It is unclear who determines the amount a developer pays to the Affordable Housing Fund? The developer? The DCP? The City Council? Is this amount based on the project’s “financial feasibility”?

20. Exempting “developments, enlargements, or conversions that do not exceed either 10 units or 12,500sf or residential floor area from the requirements of the program” may be shortsighted, given the scale of many of the smaller buildings in SoHo/NoHo.

21. As a market-driven program, MIH program is unlikely to produce neither the number of AH units required to make a difference nor provide housing at the AMIs most needed by our city’s vulnerable populations.

22. In addition to the three zoning districts described, in the data in Appendix A, there are two lots with M1-6/R10A zoning: 358 Bowery (DSOW #13 and already in development as an office building) and 350-352 Bowery (DSOW #1). The R10A offers bonuses for contextual development and senior facilities. Would this be in conflict with the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing provisions of the proposal or would it be additional floor area bonuses to create even larger buildings? This should be clarified.

23. The Scope needs to explain how Covid-19 and a recovery whose details are impossible to predict would affect the number/percentage of projected development sites legitimately be able to apply for this exception?

WRP REVIEW PROCESS AND DETERMINATION

1. According to New York City’s Zoning & Land Use Map, the entire southern boundary of the SNMD going as far east as Greene St. and as far north as Dominick St. is in the floodplain.

2. Building to the specifications of the City Planning’s Zoning for Coastal Flood Resiliency program in the M1-6/R10, M1-5/R9X, and M1-5/R7X areas is going to be an added cost to developers.

G. ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

REASONABLE WORST-CASE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO

1. What and whose assumptions about the future “financial feasibility” will the DEIS model use to forecast the “No Action condition” and the “With Action condition” analysis in the 10-year time-frame (2021-2031)?

2. What happens if Covid-19 continues and/or worsens the current economic downturn? Will the RWCDs model’s financial and economic assumptions be changed “mid-stream” to reflect the reality of a significant delay in the financial feasibility to absorb the “build-out” commercial and residential square footage assumed in the model?

3. What assumptions are reasonable for a 10-year period in light of Covid-19 and the yet- undetermined economic recovery, given the office space glut; the historical reliance on tourism spending and the fact that 2019 tourism levels might not return for many years; the pre-Covid-19 luxury condo glut, only worsened by Covid-19; and overleveraged retail landlords hurt by pre- Covid-19 retail rent drops and post-Covid-19 empty offices and lack of tourists, particularly foreign tourists who tend to spend more?

THE FUTURE WITHOUT THE PROPOSED ACTION (NO ACTION CONDITION)

1. The Draft Scope assumes that in a No Action condition, residential conversions and conversion of former industrial space to commercial uses would not occur and CPC discretionary actions and BSA variances would not be obtained. Even with a conservative environmental analysis, given the heavy calendar of the CB2 Land Use committee, it is hard to imagine that these actions would cease to be applied for and (and usually granted).

THE FUTURE WITH THE PROPOSED ACTION (WITH ACTION CONDITION)

1. There are no projected development sites located within the Canal Corridor (Subdistrict 4), making evaluation of the effects of the proposed action on the Canal Corridor impossible, according to the methodology set forth by the Draft Scope. Similarly, there are no potential development sites located within the NoHo–Bowery Corridor (Subdistrict 1), SoHo East (Subdistrict 3), or SoHo West (Subdistrict 8). Only a single projected development site is located within the NoHo Core (Subdistrict 6): DSOW 14: 53 Bond St. This is not a sufficient number of sites for the analysis framework.
2. Two of the six Proposed Development Sites that are within the SoHo Core (Subdistrict 7) incorrectly identify M1-5/R9X as the proposed zoning: DSOW 31(CV) – 75 Spring St.; and DSOW 32(CV) – 154 Grand St. They should be M1-5/R7X.
3. Potential Development Site W – 92 Prince St., which is within the boundary of the Broadway–Houston Corridor (Subdistrict 5), is incorrectly identified as M1-5/R7X. It should be: M1-5/R9X with modifications.
4. The following projected sites have distinctions not reflected in the Draft Scope that should be studied:
 - a. Site 1 (350, 352 Bowery) is listed on the National Registry of Historic Places in the Bowery Historic District. It has transferred air rights for 2.0 FAR to 358 Bowery.]
 - b. Site 2 (30 Great Jones St – block 531, lots 17, 52, 56) is located wholly within the NoHo Historic District.
 - c. One of the tax lots in Site 3 is in fact only 1000sf, so it does not meet the criteria for a development site, but Site 3 consists of two lots joined together so as a whole site 3 is above the 1700sf limit. The two are also directly above the Lafayette/Broadway subway station.
 - d. Site 12 (410 Lafayette St) is located wholly within the NoHo Historic District.
 - e. Site 13 (358 Bowery) is currently undergoing active construction and does not meet the criteria for a Projected Development site. It is listed on the National Registry of History Places within the Bowery Historic District.
 - f. Site 15 (281 Lafayette St) is listed on the National Registry of Historic Places within the Chinatown/Little Italy Historic District.
 - g. Site 16 (81 Mercer St) is located wholly within the SoHo-Cast Iron Historic District and is occupied by an existing building, so does not meet the criteria for a Projected Development site.
 - h. Site 23 (72 Grand St) is located wholly within the Soho-Cast Iron Historic District. It has additionally undergone multiple discretionary reviews by the LPC and most recently came before CB2 in Sept., 2020, seeking an application to construct a four-story commercial building.
 - i. Site 24 (217 Hester St) is listed on the National Registry of Historic Places within the Chinatown/Little Italy Historic District.
 - j. Site 27 (114 Baxter St) is listed on the National Registry of Historic Places within the Chinatown/Little Italy Historic District.
 - k. Site 30 (324 Lafayette St) is located wholly within the NoHo Historic District.
 - l. Site 31 (75 Spring St), a purported conversion site, is located wholly within the SoHo- Cast Iron Historic District Extension. It is already overbuilt to a FAR of 9.85, exceeding the maximum allowable FAR in an R7X zone.
 - m. Site 32 (154 Grand St) is located wholly within the SoHo-Cast Iron Historic District Extension.
5. The following Potential Development Sites have distinctions not reflected in the Draft Scope that should be studied:
 - a. Site BB (686 Broadway) has transferred air rights for 10 FAR to 684 Broadway and should not be considered a development site.

- b. Site BBB (146 Spring St) is among the oldest buildings in SoHo, built in 1819; was reviewed by CB2M in April 2004 (LPC Item 9); and should not be considered a development site.
- c. Site EEE (403 Lafayette St) is adjacent to an individual LPC Landmark, the Merchant’s House.
- d. Site HH (102 Greene St) was involved in a discretionary review by the LPC and granted a CPC Special Permit in Feb 2010 (ULURP 080260ZSM), and thus should have been excluded from the development scenario.
- e. Site J (27 East 4 St) is adjacent to an individual LPC Landmark, the Merchant’s House. It underwent discretionary review by the LPC in 2018, and most recently came before the CB2 Landmarks Committee on Dec. 10, 2020, seeking an application to demolish an existing one-story garage and construct a new building. Accordingly, it should not be considered a development site.

6. The proposed R10 zoning drives the RWCDs, but may not produce the projected housing. The city’s assumption that the vast majority of development will be for residential use, 84% of projected GFA, may be unrealistic given that R10 zoning allows 10 FAR for commercial uses without any MIH subsidy.

7. There is already current glut of luxury condos.

8. There is a trend for property owners to build office space in lieu of housing in nearby Hudson Square and 550 Washington, including new headquarters for Disney and Google.

9. “One entirely non-residential building is projected in the western portion of the project area near Hudson Square, another strong office market”: That site is at the northeast corner of Grand St. at Sixth Avenue and is owned by Trinity Church Real Estate and is shown as #22 on the Projected Map/List. The Scope should explain why new FAR will be allowed on that site but housing is not required.

10. What is the basis of the conclusion that “a substantial portion” of the 1,683 DUs are “expected to be affordable”?

GENERAL CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING DEVELOPMENT SITES

- 1. The Scope needs to explain why the lot area threshold was set at 1700sf or larger to guide where development can reasonably be expected to occur.
- 2. Much of the area has been landmarked going back to 1973, but the Landmark Districts were only cursorily mentioned.
- 3. There is only a very brief mention of rent-stabilized tenants in buildings of six or more residential units. The proposal claims that these sites should be excluded from the development scenario because of the expense of relocating the residents. This category requires deeper analysis, due to the number of buildings in SoHo/NoHo of this size. Has CPC determined the impact of any residential displacement from the development of projected and potential sites?

According to the Loft Board, there are currently 475 units in 331 buildings under their control. The DEIS must study stabilized IMD tenants covered under Loft Laws and rent- stabilized affordable housing programs including as JLWQA.

PROJECTED AND POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

- 1. More than half of the GFA of the 27 projected development sites (or 1,942,995sf) will benefit five property owners:

- a. Edison Properties' two parking lots account for 397,836 sf, or 20% of the GFA, and the Appendix shows that these sites would contain medical office space and a grocery store;
- b. Alexander Chu/Centre Plaza LLC and Stellar Management and City Urban Realty buildings account for 279,798sf or 14% of the GFA;
- c. Diehl Realty's SoHo parking garage accounts for 138,794 sf or 7% of the GFA, which per the Appendix shows would contain a grocery store under the city's plan;
- d. Lots owned by Yee Tai and The Kaufman Organization are expected to account for 133,184sf or 7% of the GFA; and, Park-It's garage accounts for 93,383 sf or 5% of the GFA and community facility space, plus Park-It owns two parking garages on the potential development site list, accounting for another 172,542 sf.

2. In light of a more favorable federal administration, has CPC reevaluated the redevelopment potential of 2 Howard Street, a federally-owned parking garage with a lot area of 12,716sf, which at 12 FAR could be redeveloped for more than 144,000sf and 100% affordable housing, while maintaining parking for government vehicles?

3. In light of the near-term prospects for substantially built office buildings and hotels, has CPC explored the purchase of distressed assets to be redeveloped as 100% affordable and/or supportive housing?

Projected Development Sites

1. The DEIS needs to analyze sites that might be developed after 10 years, including 57 Potential Development Sites that are assumed to be "less likely to be developed" within 10 years, and all other sites in the study area impacted by the proposed zoning changes. (Under CEQR Technical Manual guidelines, potential sites are only analyzed in the DEIS for "site-specific effects such as potential noise impacts, effects on historic resources and the possible presence of hazardous materials," (Draft Scope, p. 24). As a result, the Draft Scope vastly underestimates the impact of the proposed upzoning on historic districts because it excludes all site located within historic districts, other than vacant lots, solely because these sites are "subject to LPC review and approval."

2. Per the Draft Scope, lots of highly irregular shape would be excluded because of the difficulty of future as-of-right development; because such lots are more costly and more difficult to build on; and because they do not produce marketable floor space. The CB2 Land Use committee sees applications for development on such types of lots on a regular basis and for this reason, DCP must study irregular lots in the DEIS/Scope.

3. In fact, several of these sites already have plans for development. Owners of two underutilized sites, 61 Spring St. and 134 Wooster St., listed by DCP as "Potential," have already applied to the City to construct commercial structures on their lots. Nearby, on just one block of Prince St. between Greene and Mercer Sts., 105 Prince Street, a two-story building housing the Apple store with a 6,000sf footprint; 110 Prince St., a recently constructed one-story retailer; and 92 Prince St., another recent one-story mercantile structure yearning to increase in height and bulk, will surely attract developers seeking to enlarge them along this busy thoroughfare.

4. Why is a garage at 349 Canal St. (DSOW ID DDD) and an abutting building excluded from projected development when many similar sites are included for study?

5. Although DSOW ID 23 is indicated as being Vacant Land (land use 11), 72 Grand St. was, in fact, until recently a standing one-story cast-iron building in the Soho-Cast Iron Historic District that had had the upper four floors destroyed by fire.

DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO PARAMETERS

1. In these sections, the parameters for development (small units, low floor- to-ceiling heights, small floor plates) all but eliminate the possibility of any future affordable housing for any artist or live-work situations, further eroding the identity of SoHo and NoHo.
2. These parameters are also a complete repudiation of any attempt to “accommodate and expand live-work” (last bullet, p.2), or “create housing and live-work opportunities” (third bullet, p.7) or “support and promote and create more spaces and uses for arts, maker uses and cultural uses.” (last bullet, p7)
3. The lots for development include lots now dedicated to commercial uses with very few residents. The DEIS/Scope must study the projected increase in residential population of almost 50%, which will create the need for new infrastructure for a significantly expanded population. The area does not have the infrastructure to support this change in residential population, and if history is any guide, the City will not provide that infrastructure in a timely, systematic, or thorough manner. We have clear instances of such failure in our own community board.
4. Why does the Draft Scope assume that development sites will exclude “government facilities, utilities, large institutions, homeless shelters, and houses of worship” even though the study says that since these facilities are often under-built? In light of all the efforts to redevelop these types of sites around the City, it seems naïve to exclude them.

Dwelling Unit Factor

1. Does establishing a size of 850sf per unit support the stated goal of the Neighborhood Plan to “accommodate and expand live-work uses and supporting creative, arts and cultural uses”? (p.2)

Floor-to-Floor Height Conversion Prototypes

1. According to the DCP map, Conversion Prototype 75 Spring St. is in the Historic Core with the lowest FAR change (M1-5/R7X), but in Appendix 1, it is part of the calculation for the Broadway Commercial Corridor (M1-5/R9X), which has highly increased FAR. At its existing 9.85 FAR, 75 Spring is either overbuilt by 4 FAR (M1-5/R7X) or by 1.85 FAR (M1-5/R9X). Any claim of affordable housing at that location will have to be subtracted from DCP's affordable housing total.

Development within Historic Districts on Projected and Potential Sites

1. Because all three proposed “representative examples” of prototype conversion are all within a stone’s throw of each other (154 Grand, 75 Spring, 324 Lafayette), they are hardly “distributed across the project area.”
2. All three are landmarked.

APPENDIX 1

1. These three tables are unreadable, and need to be reformatted (offered in some downloadable format) in larger type to be accessible to the general public for whom they are intended.
2. There is data/information in the Appendix that is not referenced in the text of the Draft Scope, which increases the lack of transparency of the spreadsheets—and clouds the intent of the Draft Scope itself.
3. Projected Development Sites: The following discrepancies in Appendix 1 should be studied:
 - a. Site 1 (350, 352 Bowery): FAR of 2; PLUTO data reports FAR of 3.00.

- b. Site 3 (315 Lafayette, 301 Mulberry): FAR of 1; PLUTO data reports FAR of 1.56.
- c. Site 4 (155, 159 Grand St): FAR of 2; PLUTO data reports FAR of 5.53.
- d. Site 7 (381, 383 Canal St): FAR of 3; PLUTO data reports FAR of 3.82.
- e. Site 8 (126 Lafayette, 257 Canal St): FAR of 2; PLUTO data reports FAR of 2.55.
- f. Site 9 (239, 243 Canal St, 3 Howard St): FAR of 3; PLUTO data reports FAR of 3.48.
- g. Site 13 (358 Bowery): FAR of 0; PLUTO data reports FAR of 0.58.
- h. Site 20 (356 West Broadway): FAR of 3; PLUTO data reports FAR of 3.97.
- i. Site 25 (123 Lafayette): FAR of 4; PLUTO data reports FAR of 5.35.
- j. Site 27 (114 Baxter): FAR of 5; PLUTO data reports FAR of 5.98.
- k. Site 30 (324 Lafayette): FAR of 5; PLUTO data reports FAR of 6.17.
- l. Site 31 (75 Spring St): FAR of 8; PLUTO data reports FAR of 9.85. It is in the historic core, so its actual FAR is 5.
- m. Site 32 (154 Grand St): FAR of 5; PLUTO data reports FAR of 5.94

4. Potential Development Sites: The following discrepancies in Appendix 1 should be studied.

- a. Site AA (382 West Broadway): FAR of 2; PLUTO data reports FAR of 2.90.
- b. Site BB (686 Broadway): FAR of 2; PLUTO data reports FAR of 2.94.
- c. Site EEE (403 Lafayette): FAR of 2; PLUTO data reports FAR of 2.84.
- d. Site FFF (90 Grand St): FAR of 4 PLUTO data reports FAR of 6.04.
- e. Site GGG (96 Spring St): FAR of 7; PLUTO data reports FAR of 8.02.
- f. Site MM (53 Mercer St): FAR of 2; PLUTO data reports FAR of 3.44.
- g. Site W (92 Prince St): FAR of 1; PLUTO data reports FAR of 2.36.
- h. Site WW (518 Broadway): FAR of 1; PLUTO data reports FAR of 4.48.
- i. Site Y (424 West Broadway): FAR of 2; PLUTO data reports FAR of 2.78.
- j. Site YY (118, 120 Prince St): FAR of 1; PLUTO data reports FAR of 1.89.
- k. Site Z (396 W Broadway): FAR of 2; PLUTO data reports FAR of 2.85.

5. Include in the DEIS/Scope an accurate building-by-building analysis that corrects the many errors in the DSOW list with regard to building typologies, heights and size, so that an accurate analysis of the proposed actions’ potential adverse impacts on the existing built conditions within the SNMD can be completed and alternates can be considered that will provide a range of building height caps more appropriate to their immediate surroundings.

6. Include in the DEIS/Scope an accurate building-by-building analysis that correctly quantifies the amounts of existing retail, commercial, manufacturing (including JLWQA) and residential uses so that the CEQR analysis will truly reflect the proposed actions’ potential adverse impacts on the existing character of SoHo and NoHo.

PROPOSED DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE EIS

Task 1: Project Description:

This task should describe “the background and/or history of the project” and detail “key planning considerations that have shaped the current proposal.” The tasks for study in the DEIS should include the recommended study items from “Envision SoHo/NoHo: A Summary of Findings & Recommendations.” They are taken from the Report below verbatim:

IMPROVE QUALITY OF LIFE

1.1A: **Further research** the specificity of SoHo/NoHo’s mixed-use nature and schedule needs for curb access with the objective to make deliveries more efficient

ENCOURAGE NEIGHBORHOOD DIVERSITY

2.1B:

- **Study** the implications of the Housing Stability and Tenant Protections Act of 2019 and if/how it interacts with rent regulations within Loft Law provisions.
- Work with State elected officials to **explore** measures to implement and enforce anti- harassment procedures based on the newly passed rent law.

2.1C: It is recommended that Process Sponsors **study** the feasibility of implementing such rental assistance for low-income artists and other renters.

2.2A: Consider a potential expansion of live-work definition that reflects current and future trends, which should be **further studied** and identified.

2.2B: Exact mechanisms and use classifications of the framework presented remains unclear and would require further **study**.

2.2C: **Study** new affordable housing that is targeted to artists and is conducive to arts production in the context of fair housing laws and broader concerns over housing equity.

2.2D: **Additional research** to create a new entity outside DCLA to review the eligibility and connect individuals with benefits/resources to detail further how such an entity might be established, how it would function, and how it would improve the ability to administer eligibility standards without being overly exclusionary.

2.2E:

- **Explore** how legislative efforts could be made to implement property tax breaks and
- other mechanisms to support existing artists and to encourage arts and making in new
- “live-work” units that accommodate a broader range of cultural workers.
- **Explore** mechanisms to incentivize shared work and/or exhibition space for artists and
- makers as provisions in new developments or residential conversions.
- **Explore** ways to establish productive relationships between local non-profits and the
- business community to encourage and formalize support the local arts and cultural
- programming.
- **Explore** opportunities to connect property owners with efforts seeking to create
- temporary programming/ studios in empty commercial spaces.
- **Explore** opportunities to create a “Made in SoHo/NoHo” branding campaign and encourage
- retailers to commission designs from SoHo/NoHo artists and makers, with possibly a portion of
- sales of such goods used to support local arts and culture in the neighborhood.

2.3B: **Study** local non-profits in efforts to help artists and others find affordable housing, live-work space, or general work space.

2.3C: **Explore** opportunities to create design guidelines, with assistance and input from LPC based on the study area’s character, to ensure future development will be physically and architecturally contextual with existing built environment.

PROMOTING ECONOMIC VITALITY

3.1A: **Study** how to allow a wider range of compatible ground floor uses that balance mixed-use neighborhood blocks and examine a wider range of compatible uses, traffic patterns, sanitation efforts, and a retail study. Efforts would include the involvement of the business and residential communities.

3.1B: It is recommended that further research **study** the following:

- The appropriate parameters for allowing hybrid/complementary uses, including consideration of the type, size, operations, and land use compatibility.
- How hybrid uses might be viable in a continually evolving local economy, as they become established and potentially seek opportunities to grow.

3.1C: **Further research** and a coordinated effort with the community is recommended to create general guidelines and potential subareas for the expansion of such uses.

3.2A: It is recommended that community groups and the City **further research** advantages that a cultural arts district designation might provide for SoHo/NoHo. Such a designation may more broadly enhance community identity and affirm local heritage.

3.2B: The planning process also revealed that there are opportunities to update use regulations in ways that consider the expansion of arts and maker uses. The City should consider this as an area requiring **further analyses**.

3.2C: Private landlords should be encouraged to “activate” vacant properties during interim occupancy periods for artistic, micro-manufacturing and cultural uses. Currently, artistic and cultural uses are not permitted as-of-right and an allowance for such uses would remove zoning violations and fines that are in place. It is recommended that the City further **explore** the feasibility of such an initiative by further contemplating two provisions: the involvement of well- suited local partners and non-profits to help with monitoring, and the potential role of philanthropy and incentives to help fund such an endeavor.

3.2D: Additional consultation with relevant agencies and organizations is recommended, in light of their expertise of artists’ workspace needs, to **study** new live-work typologies and configurations that are responsive to today’s generation of artists and makers.

3.2E: **Study** the feasibility of implementing such tax incentives for these causes and further investigate other financial support mechanisms that could be utilized.

3.3B: **Investigate** the feasibility of encouraging affordable rent options specific to such uses.

3.3C: Work with Small Business Services (SBS), Chambers of Commerce, BIDs and merchants’ associations to better **understand** small business’ challenges in SoHo/NoHo, and connect them to resources.

Task 2: Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

1. A thorough understanding via a detailed economic analysis should be conducted on all areas and properties that may be afforded additional development rights through increased FAR to properly calculate the value of the economic development conferred and the impacts of transferable development rights.

2. Study the potential impacts of the Proposed Actions on land use, zoning, and public policy, but beware the methodologies presented in the CEQR Technical Manual. The Municipal Art Society of New York’s recently released the report, *A Tale of Two Rezoning: Taking a Harder Look at CEQR*, exposes the shortcomings of the existing environmental review process through the lens of two recent rezonings in Long Island City (2001) and Downtown Brooklyn (2004).
3. The report demonstrates CEQR’s failure to predict the type and scale of new development that its zoning changes will stimulate and studies the resulting impacts on open space, transit congestion, school seats, and other measures of livability.
4. Chief among the findings of the MAS Report is CEQR’s to take into account the cumulative effect of many small, individual acts. “From school capacity, to open space, to traffic congestion, to affordable housing, the CEQR process has produced mitigation plans that have no bearing on the ultimate needs of these neighborhoods. Residents have been left to shoulder the burden of these miscalculations,” said Elizabeth Goldstein, President of MAS. MAS points out that decisionmakers need, and New Yorkers deserve, an environmental review process that does more than disclose limited and illusory outcomes from the City’s zoning changes.
5. MAS proposes a series of improvements across eight categories of reform, including consideration of potential zoning lot mergers, increasing the range and scope of alternatives, making use of General Environmental Impact Statements to assess a wider range of potential outcomes, and requiring the implementation of mitigation measures before receiving Certificates of Occupancy.
6. “These neighborhoods [in Queens and Brooklyn] were transformed by an explosion of high- end, high-rise residential development, fueled—unintentionally—by the City’s zoning changes. Demographically, they are now whiter, wealthier, and more crowded than ever.” (MAS, *A Tale of Two Rezoning: Taking a Harder Look at CEQR*)
7. Study the feasibility of the purchase of distressed buildings by the City (by eminent domain, etc.)
8. Include the survey of land uses that DCP conducted, which is mentioned on p.5 of the Draft Scope but is not included.

Task 3: Socioeconomic Condition

1. During the City’s October 26, 2020 Zoom presentation, it admitted that it has not performed the necessary studies to investigate potential for displacement within the study area. Direct Residential Displacement is a chief concern. The Plan will increase vulnerabilities of approximately 1,500 rent stabilized units, including more than 500 in the R10 “housing opportunity” subdistricts, and more than 400 IMD Loft Law units that have not yet been converted to rent stabilized status under current law. This brings into question the City’s assumption that there will not be direct displacement of more than 500 residents, and its claim that the SoHo/NoHo rezoning “would not typically be expected to alter the socioeconomic characteristics of a neighborhood (p.27).”
2. Study the following items across the entire Study Area:
 - a. Value of FAR by square foot, for each individual property.
 - b. Costs of LPC applications, due to enlargements etc., rising from the increased FAR. C
 - c. Transferable Development Rights, all possible scenarios.
 - d. Costs applicable to residentially occupied units due to the proposed conversion from manufacturing use to residential use (now described, without specifics, as a “mechanism”).
 - e. Costs of newly-allowed SLA applications, per removal of existing zoning boundaries.

- f. Costs related to the Affordable Housing Fund and how that could apply for existing residentially occupied buildings, as well as for new developments.
3. The analysis projected for the levels of displacement of owner and renter occupied residential units and existing manufacturing and retail establishments does not include current housing costs for units that would be displaced and salaries for jobs that would be lost. Alternatives should be developed for replacement of displaced units and jobs, which are essential to protect the existing socio-economic character of SoHo NoHo.
4. Investigate the character and size of the various “employment hubs” in the project area before positing any assumptions about displacement.
5. Recalculate the resident and worker assumptions Table 2 was based on, in light of Covid-19.
6. Reach out to the following areas/groups as recommended in Envision SoHo NoHo (p.84): the Southeast study area; younger populations of SoHo/NoHo; workers of SoHo/NoHo; and other important voices inside and outside the SoHo/NoHo boundaries.
7. Study the effect on JLWQA residents who might be displaced during the transition from UG17D JLWQA to UG2.
8. Data gathered by the Broadway Residents Coalition indicates approximately 750 rent- stabilized units in and around the three Housing Opportunity Areas will be affected, and greater than 1500 units within the study area. Quantify and analyze the direct effect of that across the Neighborhood Plan.
9. Study the effect of upzoning on the southeastern and southwestern corners of SoHo with respect to displacement and the economy.
10. Indirect Business Displacement: The DEIS study should investigate/document effects of potential commercial displacement to be caused by elimination of existing commercial spaces caused by conversion in the light of pandemic and post pandemic office market.
11. Include additional data on the breakdowns, locations and rental/ownership of floor area within the study area occupied by the artistic/creative/“maker” communities so that the CEQR analysis discloses any potential adverse impacts on these SoHo/NoHo communities and appropriate and equitable provisions can be developed to provide for their retention in the SNMD.
12. So that equitable provision can be made to provide for their retention in the SNMD, analyze the available zoning and governmental support programs used in conjunction with other City programs to support the retention or availability of both residential and work space for New York’s cultural, artistic and “maker” communities (e.g., Westbeth, Manhattan Plaza, Special Midtown District, Special 125th Street District, Governor’s Island) as potential mitigation for displacement of these communities created by the proposed actions.
13. Identify and analyze potential adverse impacts on the current built environment within the SNMD, with particular attention to the necessity for specialized SNMD text governing conversions to MIH floor area, especially in existing overbuilt noncomplying buildings.

Task 4: Community Facilities and Services

1. Public Schools:

- a. As a result of Covid-19, public schools were closed after March 13, 2020 through the end of the 2019-20 school year; opened nearly a month late in Fall 2020 and then closed after just seven weeks, creating a crisis in providing education to all students, but particularly students with disabilities, English Language Learners and students living in temporary housing.
- b. Consequently, how could you accurately quantify current utilization; assess the need for more school facilities for social distancing; or forecast demand for public school seats until schools fully and safely reopen, not to mention the need to address the increase in population?

2. Libraries and Childcare Centers

- a. If the population increases by 41% (Table 2, p. 22), study the impact of the increase on libraries and childcare centers.

Task 5: Open Space

1. The upzoning is expected to increase the SoHo and NoHo population from 7800 to 11,011 (an increase of 3,211 residents per Table 2). Demand and use of open green space have increased during Covid-19 and “proven that parks are essential infrastructure.” Under the *CEQR Technical Manual*, the broader “NoHo Neighborhood” is the only downtown neighborhood that the NYC Department of Parks and Recreation defines as underserved by open space.

2. Meanwhile, SoHo and NoHo remain significantly underserved by open space, with an open space ratio of only 0.08 acres per 1,000 residents, as compared with the City’s planning goal of 2.5 acres per 1,000 residents.

3. The addition of open space at the E. Fourth St. and Grand St. water tunnel sites would only increase the open space ratio in SoHo and NoHo to 0.09 acres per 1,000 residents, still well below the City planning goal.

4. Study accompanying any increase in FAR with an increase in open space, either in the form of additional physical open space or contributions to an Open Space Fund that would be used within CB2. Such a fund would be formed to provide the active and passive forms of recreation to the level of the City’s planning goals. It would be formed and administered by the City and used to add either one or more recreation centers (like the Tony Dapolito Recreation Center) designed and sized to serve the increased population of SoHo and NoHo as a result of the proposed actions.

Task 6: Shadows

1. Study the effect of shadows on typical loft buildings with large windows and artists’ studios.
2. Study the potential for all new or redesigned buildings (not just buildings over 50 ft.) to cast shadows.
3. Study the loss of sky if FAR is increased.
4. Study the effect of shadows from new or redesigned buildings on the current open spaces.

5. Study the effect of shadows on historic buildings with ornamentation that will be obscured and compromise the look and feel of the historic districts.

Task 7: Historic and Cultural Resources

1. Standards should be established for new construction that maintain the integrity of the street walls that constitute the urban form of the historic districts. The projected analysis includes an examination of historic and cultural resources within the study area, but it does not address all the impact of new construction in the historic districts. The Landmarks Preservation Commission does not usually rule on the height and bulk and setbacks and open space of new buildings. This could result in development that is out of scale with existing historic buildings.

2. The DEIS Scoping document should investigate/analyze the impacts and additional impacts of the zoning recommendations on the SoHo-NoHo plan, and in particular the area between Bleecker and Spring and Mercer to Crosby St. Fifty-two and a half percent of all buildings were built prior to 1939. As a result, the majority of existing buildings were built to full lot dimensions, and a significant number with through-lot configurations. This building-to-building density has, and will continue to be, an impediment in configuring and regulating the crucial infrastructure adaptations necessary for increased density within the built environment.

3. Study the archaeological history of this area and the importance of preserving any remaining artifacts. In the 1640s, a New Netherland community known as the “Land of the Blacks” encompassed what today are SoHo, NoHo, Chinatown, Little Italy, and Greenwich Village. Black land ownership continued into the time of New York City. From 1643-1716, 130 acres+ were owned by free Black men and women in what is now the neighborhoods of Soho and NoHo, including Bond Street, Bowery and Lafayette.

4. Study the danger of demolition of old buildings and the approaches for protecting them.

5. Study the danger of demolition and construction on sites that are immediately adjacent to individual landmarks, as is the case for Site EEE (403 Lafayette St.) and Site J (27 E 4 S.t).

6. Study the impact of the proposed actions on tourism and real estate values as the connection to the past is weakened by the proposed actions.

7. Study the short- and long-term impact on the Landmarks Law if it is modified to suit political demands and not cultural, educational or history needs.

8. Study the effects of a surge of new **construction** within historical structures.

9. Investigate/document the impact of maker economy give-backs within the scope of this zoning proposal as in similar subsidized artist housing and performance spaces (Governor’s Island, Westbeth).

10. The DEIS study should investigate/document effects and costs of development of older, historic buildings in their feasibility analysis. SoHo and NoHo M1-5B District is largely a historic district: 5,619 units were built prior to 1939 [source 2014-2018 American Community Survey]. For this reason, the feasibility of adding MIH units or even new development under this zoning will be severally affected by the age and historic underpinnings. Added to this is a building stock that has virtually no separation – even rear yards in most places, especially the commercial corridors. These factors will impact costs of

new buildings and the ability to include MIH in the mix. In fact, it could encourage non-residential development or produce another wave of BSA applications based on hardship not dissimilar to those experienced over the last 15 years.

Task 8: Urban Design and Visual Resources

1. The description of this task states that “an assessment of urban design and visual resources is appropriate when there is the potential for a pedestrian to observe, from the street level, a physical alteration beyond that allowed by existing zoning.”
2. DCP should study the well-established precedents demonstrating that additional FAR has harmful impacts on an altered streetscape and that the City has rightfully acted in the past to prevent such damage.
3. DCP avoids the fact that, besides building on underutilized sites, property owners will surely take advantage of increased FAR to add bulk on top of existing landmarked buildings, forever changing the streetscape, view corridors and character of the historic districts, along both Broadway and Lafayette Sts. as well as the side streets. This rooftop scenario actually occurred in 1998 when property owners uncovered a zoning loophole that saw at least seven rooftop additions constructed contrary to the zoning intent. When New Yorkers complained about the harmful impact, the City Council quickly amended the Zoning Resolution to remove this loophole.
4. This task states that “for the projected and potential development sites, the analysis will focus on general building types,” but in this case, most of the affected and adjacent study area is landmarked. The LPC does not normally approve “general” building types. Instead, it demands buildings of a higher quality, often with expensive details and materials not found in cookie-cutter “general” structures. The pressure will be formidable on LPC to approve generalized building plans submitted by developers to counter their financial deficits that building below-market housing generates. This would result in undistinguished edifices detracting from neighborhood masterpieces.
5. Study the difference in terms of landmarking between With Action and No Action, which will see the historic districts’ skyline utterly altered from the historic built-context that has long been in place—a context that draws countless visitors to marvel at the special character of the area.
6. If the zoning is changed to these three districts, the pedestrian experience will gradually become as follows (from the NYC Zoning Handbook): RX9 is described as producing “the taller, bulkier 16- to 18-story apartment buildings characteristic of Chelsea and Murray Hill in Manhattan.” “Much of Midtown, Lower Manhattan and major avenues in Manhattan, as well as parts of Downtown Brooklyn and Long Island City, are mapped at R10 density.” “R7X districts are mapped along major thoroughfares in Harlem in Manhattan and Jackson Avenue in Long Island City in Queens.”
7. Study how increases in height and density will increase wind.
8. Study if bulk, form and scale will comply with residential standards.
9. Study how the proposed actions might adversely impact opportunities for expansion and/or conversion of already overbuilt, noncomplying buildings to residential use.
10. Analyze the proposed actions’ potential adverse impacts on the current and future supply and affordability of the existing stock of JLWQA and residential space within the study area.

Task 9: Natural Resources

1. Study how the streams in the Canal St. area will affect new construction.
2. Study how new construction in the Canal St. area will affect the stability of adjacent old buildings, given the network of underground waterways.
3. Study the issue of the subsoil, particularly in the M1-5B district, which is wet. A new building on the corner of Greene and Canal was forced to build out of steel, as opposed to poured concrete, and took more than 3 years to complete at the current FAR.

Task 10: Hazardous Materials

1. Study the environmental effect of the old gas works in the area of the Edison parking lot in southeast SoHo.

Task 11: Water and Sewer

1. According to New York City's Zoning & Land Use Map, the entire southern boundary of the SNMD going as far east as Greene St. and as far north as Dominick St. is in the floodplain.
2. Study the effect of flooding and the effect of climate change on wastewater and stormwater infrastructure.
3. Identify and analyze the proposed actions' potential adverse impacts on the currently well-established unstable ground, subgrade water and storm and sewer drainage conditions within SoHo and NoHo, with particular emphasis on the potential adverse impacts on existing historic properties of excavations and foundations for new construction within the SNMD.

Task 12: Solid Waste and Sanitation

1. Study how deliveries and pickups will be affected by the lack of loading berths and storage if, as predicted by the report, increased residential creates 50 additional tons of waste per week.

Task 13: Energy

Task 14: Transportation

TRAVEL DEMAND AND SCREENING ASSESSMENT

1. Study traffic at more times of day than just peak hours. A great variety of different activities occur in the neighborhood at many times of day.
2. Study more transportation modes than just automotive, transit and pedestrian. Need to include bicycles, e-bikes and other micro-mobility modes.

TRAFFIC

1. Selection of study locations needs to be based on not only "the assignment of project generated traffic and the CEQR Technical Manual, but also in consultation with the community (CB2, block associations, BIDs, businesses, etc.) based on frequent observations.
2. The generation of 50 or more additional vehicle trips in any peak hour needs to be considered in the context of how traffic can be reduced from its current state. In addition, there are side streets in the area that are frequently inundated by automotive traffic and need to be studied along with the key corridors.

3. Nine days of continuous ATR counts will help supplement data collection at peak hours, but will not adequately reflect conditions that occur frequently at non-peak hours, which should be included, because of the varied activities occurring in these neighborhoods at different times of day. What is needed are accounts of routine users and inhabitants who regularly observe and experience conditions, which can be achieved by incorporating questionnaires/surveys and interviews.

4. A truck trip generation forecast alone doesn't address the already highly negative truck impacts. Create a management plan.

5. The influence of the Covid-19 pandemic must be taken into account, i.e., the atypical conditions that exist because of the pandemic don't reflect what traffic conditions will be once there is a return to normal, i.e., to a stabilized situation. The study should be based on pre- Covid-19 figures (applied as existing conditions, rather than what currently exists) which reflect "No Action" more accurately.

6. Regarding mitigation, Vision Zero has introduced a new outlook on how traffic functions with alternative modes, new street geometries and varied curb uses that need to be considered, rather than just the traditional approaches.

TRANSIT

1. Study Transit using pre-Covid-19 figures, which present a more realistic picture of what can be viewed as base conditions.

2. Study problems posed by nearby subway lines for 20+ projected and potential sites.

3. Although there is attention to conditions at subway stations, there is no consideration of the impact on subway cars (e.g., crowding estimates) i.e., the proposed actions will have an impact on the system, not just stations.

4. There have been gaps created in bus service in the SoHo area with the restructuring of bus routes such as the M1 which eliminates a central route for SoHo, a dearth that calls for remediation. Spacing of bus stops, trip frequency and seating opportunities also need improvement. These types of already existing problems need to be part of the analysis.

5. Problems exist concerning access for the bus going down Broadway, which is often blocked by stationery tourist buses and slowed down by traffic congestion. This needs to be considered.

PEDESTRIANS

1. Little attention is paid to examination of the latest alternative transportation approaches to creating more space for pedestrians and making the pedestrian environment safer, more comfortable and accessible. The formulaic approach of the CEQR Technical Manual is no longer enough to ascertain impacts which should be assessed based on actual pedestrian needs in action and an already existing lack of needed pedestrian facilities.

PARKING

1. Study how using parking lots/facilities for development of residential buildings could lead to increased demand for on-street parking, which isn't even currently available. This needs to be assessed, as does the impact on the environment and traffic movement of increased cruising for parking spaces.

2. Of the 27 proposed development sites seven are parking lots or garages [DSOW 2, 10, 12, 16, 20, 22: marked as land use 10; DSOW 21: marked as bldg. class "Fireproof" but in fact a parking garage].

However, the No Action condition shows only 39,000 gsf of parking area, which upon inspection is solely attributable to the site at 356 West Broadway.

3. An additional five Proposed sites contain parking for at least 228 cars, according to their certificates of occupancy.
4. Using the DCP's assumption of 300 sq ft of parking per vehicle, 228 cars accounts for 68,400 gsf of parking. As some of the certificates of occupancy state "at least" x number of vehicles, this is a lower limit.
5. Additionally, DSOW 22 represents 4,484 gsf of parking area, according to the tax lot's land use classification as a parking facility.
6. Taking into account the additional gsf of parking lot area, Table 2, the No Action Condition, undercounts the Other Commercial (Parking) category by at least 72,884 gsf, as well as the Total Commercial subtotal by that same amount.
7. The Population figures Table 2, according to the standard industry rates of 1 employee per 1,000 sf of other commercial, also undercounts the number of Workers by 73 employees.
8. Accordingly, the net change, or Incremental condition, in Table 2 should state a loss of - 111,884 gsf of Other Commercial (Parking) and -124,392 gsf of Total Commercial space. Additionally, the net change of Workers should be -182 workers.

Task 15: Air Quality

1. Study how proximity of the Holland Tunnel affects air quality.
2. Study how the poor air quality will affect the equity position of this location.

Task 16: Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

1. Study the New York City Zoning & Land Use Map to see how the entire southern boundary of the SNMD going as far east as Greene St. and as far north as Dominick St. is in the floodplain.
2. Study how building to the specifications of the City Planning's Zoning for Coastal Flood Resiliency program in the M1-6/R10, M1-5/R9X, and M1-5/R7X areas will affect construction costs.

Task 17: Noise

1. Study how the noise from retail deliveries to Big Box stores will affect life for residents if the population of SoHo/NoHo increases by almost 50%.

Task 18: Public Health

Task 19: Neighborhood Character

1. Study the effect on neighborhood character of building the equivalent of four Empire State Buildings, 12 Woolworth Buildings or 90 NOMO SOHO Hotels (Crosby St. size), if the maximum additional MIH FAR is built across SoHo and NoHo.

2. Study the effect on neighborhood character of the impact of increased FAR inside the historic districts and outside the historic districts, which is different because of the mitigating effect of LPC oversight.
3. Study the impact of proposed actions on the defining features and human scale of the project area.
4. Study the adaptive reuse of existing buildings that preserved neighborhood character and was responsible for the area's renaissance in the 1970's.
5. Coordinate with City and State agencies to do a comprehensive inventory—by both quantity and type—of all types of affordable housing in the project area.
6. Study how the limits of the three proposed zoning districts will change neighborhood character. NYC Zoning Handbook: RX9 is described as producing “the taller, bulkier 16- to 18- story apartment buildings characteristic of Chelsea and Murray Hill in Manhattan.” “Much of Midtown, Lower Manhattan and major avenues in Manhattan, as well as parts of Downtown Brooklyn and Long Island City, are mapped at R10 density.” “R7X districts are mapped along major thoroughfares in Harlem in Manhattan and Jackson Avenue in Long Island City in Queens.”
7. A detailed analysis must be conducted to show how the Proposed Actions will impact and negatively affect the defining features of the neighborhoods' character. The Draft Scope notes that projects that make substantial alterations to the scale of the streetscape may require a detailed analysis.
8. For example, in NoHo, a 20,000 square-foot parking lot on Lafayette and Jones Streets is located within the proposed M1-5/R9X area. According to DCP's own website, the Proposed Actions could produce a tall, bulky, twenty-story high-rise apartment building characteristic of Chelsea and Murray Hill—although it sits in the median-rise NoHo Historic District Extension. Such an edifice will result in a dramatic and harmful impact on the historic district.

Task 20: Construction

1. Identify and analyze the proposed actions' potential adverse impacts on the currently well-established unstable ground, subgrade water and storm and sewer drainage conditions within SoHo and NoHo, with particular emphasis on the potential adverse impacts on existing historic properties of excavations and foundations for new construction within the SNMD.

Task 21: Mitigation

Task 22: Alternatives

1. Analyze alternates to the Proposed Actions that will not increase the existing FAR within the historic districts and alternates that satisfy MIH requirements through development of off-site affordable units and/or affordable units located outside the SNMD.
2. Include in the DEIS an accurate building-by-building analysis that corrects the many errors in the DSOW list with regard to building typologies, heights and size, so that an accurate analysis of the proposed actions' potential adverse impacts on the existing built conditions within the SNMD can be completed and alternates can be considered that will provide a range of building height caps more appropriate to their immediate surroundings.

Task 23: Summary Chapters Task 24: Executive Summary

Therefore, be it resolved that no Scope or DEIS compiled during the global upheaval of a pandemic could possibly be an accurate assessment of any neighborhood.

Be it further resolved that CB2 urgently recommends that DCP examine the shortcomings of the draft scope of work as outlined above and present to CB2 for further review a new draft scope of work that rectifies those shortcomings plus reflects the impact of the pandemic on the residential, commercial and retail sectors of our economy.

Be it further resolved that this new draft scope be presented to CB2 for public review before any ULURP is begun.

Be it finally resolved that CB2 recommends that DCP study and offer affordable housing alternatives to Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (such as new, more targeted, zoning tools and an expanded review of adaptive reuse) and study and offer the minimal modifications to the existing M1-5A/B zoning that would be required to achieve the primary goal of affordable housing and small business survival without increased FAR.

Vote: Passed with 45 Board members in favor and one abstention (B. Kubovy-Weiss).

LANDMARKS AND PUBLIC AESTHETICS

FIRST LANDMARKS MEETING

1. **61 Seventh Ave. So.** - The application is to install an ADA required ramp.

(laid over)

2. **14 Gay St.** - Application is to restore the facade and roof and reconstruct stoop, and iron work in historic design.

(laid over)

3. **27 E. 4th St.** - Application is to demolish an existing one-story garage and construct a new building.

Whereas:

A. The Merchant's House Museum (Tredwell House), adjacent to the property at the east, is a significant and fragile individual landmark with both the exterior and the intact original interior designated; and

B. Existing garage is non-historical and undistinguished and CB2 Manhattan previously recommended approval for demolition to the Commission; and

C. The site was originally occupied by a row house of a similar design to the Merchant's House Museum adjoining the property; and

D. The proposed building is six stories with a seventh-floor setback and the front facade has substantial steel columns with modern black metal and glass infill with transoms; and

- E. The height, 94'-5" to the roof and 112'-5" to the top of the mechanical equipment, overwhelms the Merchant's House and does not provide a suitable intermediate transition in height from the house to the building at the west of 27 East 4th Street; and
- F. The building is 90'-1" deep with a two-story extension at the rear extending to the north property line and an approximately three-story high wall overlooking the Merchant House garden; and
- G. The facade is in brick with a terra cotta "screen" design dividing the four windows and covering the bottom of the windows on the second through sixth floors and repeated in an obtrusive horizontal cornice at the sixth floor with no historical context; and
- H. The facade brick is a historical design, turning to utilitarian brick with punched lot-line windows on the east facade which overlooks and dominates the Merchant's House; and
- I. The required extension of chimney flues from the Merchant House are enclosed within the proposed building; and
- J. The applicant provided drawings and testimony concerning steps that are proposed with the construction intended to provide safeguards against structural movement up against the Merchant's House, however they did not make any provision for the securing of the interior of house itself and its contents during the construction and no proof was provided that the house would not suffer damage, especially to the irreplaceable decorative plaster under the proposed plan; and
- K. The Merchant's House Museum is a well-preserved building from 1832 and is the only nineteenth-century family home in New York City preserved intact — both inside (including intricate original decorative plaster) and out; and
- L. The building is a New York City individual landmark for both its exterior and interior and is listed on the New York State Register of Historic Places and National Register of Historic Places; and
- M. The exterior masonry walls, lathing, decorative plaster and woodwork are organically interconnected and any disturbance to one part would adversely affect the whole and especially the fragile plasterwork; and
- N. Monitoring would be ineffective by providing limited protection - once sufficient disturbance activates the monitors, damage to both the structure and the interior finishes would potentially have already occurred; and
- O. There was no corroborated persuasive testimony from the applicant that the demolition of the existing building and the construction of the proposed building would not do irreparable harm to the exterior and interior of a fragile individually landmarked building; and
- P. There was no assurance or provision that the garden and garden wall, an integral to the historic design of the property, would not be undermined and the high wall to the west is higher than the existing wall of the garden and would harm its open feeling; and
- Q. The director of the museum has estimated that the cost to secure the building, store its contents, compensate for lost revenue, and carry on the administrative functions of the organization is approximately \$5,000,000; and

R. A prior application for a similar smaller building on this site was recommended for denial by CB2, Man. and was denied by the City Council; and

S. There was no testimony from the public in support of the application; and

T. There was extensive testimony, oral and written, from the Director of the Merchant's House Museum, its counsel, and others associated with the museum in opposition to the application, both from an aesthetic perspective and due to the inevitable harm that would come to the exterior, interior and to the garden; and

U. Approximately 60 members of the public, including a member of the Tredwell family, spoke or sent correspondence to the Board opposing the application; now

Therefore be it resolved that CB2, Man. recommends **denial** of the application that, with its excavation, construction, appearance, and bulk would cause irreparable aesthetic and structural harm to the Merchant's House Museum, an individual exterior and interior landmark.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

4. **49 Grove St.** – Application is to restore the façade.

Whereas:

A. An extensive analysis of the existing condition has been carried out; and

B. There is considerable deterioration of brick and bluestone and a moderate amount of deterioration of cast stone throughout the facades; and

D. Where possible, original materials, especially decorative cast stone elements, will be used; and

E. Care will be taken that replacement for original materials is closely matched to the original materials; now

Therefore be it resolved that CB2, Man. recommends **approval** of this restoration using salvaged original and matching replacement material.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

5. **Consideration of a [letter of support](#) for the designation of 50 West 13th St. as an individual landmark.**

Whereas:

A. A request has been made from Village Preservation to support their initiative concerning the designation of 50 West 13th Street, which has housed the 13th Street Repertory Theatre since 1958, for designation as an individual landmark; and

B. The theater is among the few original Off-Off Broadway theaters which still survives, and over the years has been a great incubator for cultural innovation, and

C. The theater has been an important cultural asset to Greenwich Village which has nurtured actors, playwrights, designers, and technicians who make important contributions to the American theatre; and

D. The designation of the building as an individual landmark would honor the critical cultural history of Greenwich Village and New York, as well as ensure the preservation of a more than 173-year old structure which is already an unofficial local landmark, now

Therefore be it resolved that CB2, Man. supports the proposed landmark designation of 50 West 13th Street, home of the 13th Street Repertory Company theatre, and will send a letter of support for this designation to the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

SECOND LANDMARKS MEETING

1. 310 Spring St. and parcels to the north and south – The application is to restore 310 Spring St. and to connect two new buildings on either side of the property with a 10 story corridor and construct a lobby and private outdoor space on the 310 Spring St. lot.

Whereas:

A. 310 Spring Street (Dennison and Lydia Wood House), is an individual landmark built 1819 and modified with the early addition of a third-floor story, the conversion of the ground floor to a storefront, and an extension; and

B. The house retains a large amount of original material in the front façade and is among the few remaining houses of the era in the Hudson Square neighborhood; and

C. The front façade is to be restored, including new material of the same kind to replace the existing material where necessary, installation of a historic design door and restoration of the display shelf, and installation of shutters shown in a historic photograph in the storefront; and

D. The ground floor will be used as a part of the residential unit occupying the entire building; and

E. The undistinguished rear extension, represented by the applicant as being modified and of poor construction, is to be demolished; and

F. No assurance, supported with an engineering report, was given that the structure of the house would be protected with the extensive excavation beneath it in connection with the adjoining buildings and proposed construction of the new buildings and construction in the garden of the house; and

G. The ground floor rear façade is solid brick with no windows and the upper two floors have historic windows and shutters and are blocked with masonry; and

H. The rear “garden” is to be occupied by a lobby on the ground floor level, common space in the cellar, a 10-story glass structure enclosing a corridor connecting buildings from the non-landmarked property on the north and south sides of the lot and an outdoor space for use by the new building’s tenants; and

I. The use of the storefront as residential space will necessarily afford an artificial appearance and together with blocking of windows on the rear facade and the absence of windows at the ground floor reduces the house to a token Potemkin Village structure and greatly harms its historical character; and

J. The two new buildings “squeeze” the landmarked house visually and the glass corridor building on the landmark lot overwhelms the house with a glass wall to be illuminated day and night; and

The proposal, in effect, cuts the lot in two portions at the rear of the house and gives over the “garden” to the corridor structure, lobby, and outdoor space for the new construction flanking the lot; and

K. The taking of landmark property for use by the applicant to enhance two properties separated by the landmark property is a burden that the landmarked property does not need to bear, does harm to the concept of landmarks preservation, is without precedent and is unacceptable; now

Therefore be it resolved that CB2, Man. recommends:

- Approval of the restoration of the front facade; and
- Approval of the demolition of the rear extension; and
- Denial of the blocking of rear windows, the rear ground floor design without historic windows and doors, and
- Any intrusion above, at or below grade by any construction that is not a part of the house or a historic extension.

Vote: Passed, with 45 Board members in favor, and 1 in opposition (D. Diether).

QUALITY OF LIFE

1. Newsstand Application: Mohammed F. Uddin, d/b/a N/A, 11 E. Houston St. SEC of E. Houston St. and Broadway, 10012 (5090-2020-ANWS)

Whereas, the applicant wishes to operate a 12 foot by 5-foot newsstand licensed from the City’s street furniture vendor, JCDecaux; and

Whereas, the newsstand is to be located in front of the newly constructed building at 11 E. Houston St., between Broadway and Crosby St., which currently houses a small HSBC location on the ground floor; and

Whereas, the applicant has operated a newsstand at a busy location in midtown, Manhattan, and plans to operate this location himself and will offer a selection of newspapers, gum, and refreshments; and

Whereas, the applicant hopes to capitalize on pedestrian traffic entering and leaving the Lafayette Street subway station which is down the block from this location; and

Whereas, the sidewalk on this block of Houston Street is 15 feet wide and there will be 8 feet and 4 inches of unobstructed sidewalk space for pedestrian use in front of the newsstand; and

Whereas, no member of the public appeared in support or opposition of this application; now

Therefore, Be It Resolved that CB2, Man. recommends **approval** of the **application** for a Newsstand to be located at 11 E. Houston St. SEC of E. Houston St. and Broadway (5090-2020-ANWS), provided that the application conforms with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations and clearance requirements.

Vote: Passed, with 24 Board Members in favor, and 22 in opposition (A. Azcuy, C. Booth, A. Brandt, C. Dawson, V. De La Rosa, J. DeVern, M. Fitzgerald, C. Flynn, S. Gammie, D. Raftery, L. Rakoff, B. Riccobono, R. Rothstein, S. Russo, S. Sartiano, S. Secunda, F. Sigel, S. Smith, E. Yoo, S. Wittenberg, A. Wong, A. Zeldin).

2. Resolution in response to the Department of City Planning (“DCP”) proposed Zoning Text Amendment, Zoning for Coastal Flood Resiliency (“ZCFR”), which would amend and update Article VI, Chapter 4 of the NYC Zoning Resolution, “Special Regulations Applying in Flood Hazard Areas,” and Article VI, Chapter 2 of the NYC Zoning Resolution, “Special Regulations Applying in the Waterfront Area.”

Whereas:

Background & History

1. Manhattan Community District 2 (“CD2”) is a coastal district, with over a mile of waterfront along the Hudson River, stretching from Canal Street to West 14th Street;
2. A significant percentage of CD2’s residents and built environment are located within NYC’s 1% chance and 0.2% chance floodplains, as defined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (“FEMA”) 2015 Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps (“PFIRM”) and FEMA’s 2007 Flood Insurance Rate Maps, including:
 - a. as of the 2010 census, a population of 5,000 residents in the 1% chance floodplain and a population of 10.2k residents in the 0.2% chance floodplain;
 - b. 346 buildings (7% of all buildings in CD2) and 4,490 dwelling units (8% of all units in CD2) located in the 1% chance floodplain;
 - c. 777 buildings (15% of all buildings in CD2) and 7,620 dwelling units (13% of all units in CD2) located in the 0.2% chance floodplain.
3. There is a scientific consensus that sea levels will continue to rise globally due to climate change, with the latest report by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change projecting a rise in sea levels of between 30cm – 110cm (11.8in – 43.3in) by 2100, depending on greenhouse gas emissions;
4. A continued rise in sea levels as projected by the scientific community is likely to cause the size of the 1% and 0.2% chance floodplains within CD2 to increase in the coming decades;
5. CD2 was impacted by Superstorm Sandy in 2012, with a portion of the district being flooded, resulting in extensive property damage to buildings including the West Village Houses and the landmarked Westbeth Artists Housing, as well as the flooding of the Holland Tunnel;
<https://communityprofiles.planning.nyc.gov/manhattan/2#floodplain>
6. Following Superstorm Sandy, DCP implemented two Zoning Text Amendments, the 2013 Flood Text and the 2015 Recovery Text, which were intended to eliminate conflicts between the Zoning Resolution and regulations governing flood-resistant construction in NYC Department of Buildings’

(“DOB”) Appendix G of the NYC Building Code, thereby helping to remove regulatory barriers to reconstruction of storm-damaged properties as well as to the retrofitting of existing buildings, and to help ensure that new buildings could be constructed to be more resilient;

7. The 2013 Flood Text and the 2015 Recovery Text were both adopted on an emergency, temporary basis, were not subject to environmental review, and are set to expire in the next few years, with the 2013 Flood Text expiring within 1 year of the adoption of new FEMA PFIRMs, and the 2015 Recovery Text having already expired in July 2020, thus creating the need for a more permanent Zoning Text Amendment;

Overview of Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

8. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would apply to both buildings and lots within the 1% chance and 0.2% chance floodplains, as opposed to buildings in the 1% chance floodplain only in the 2013 Flood Text, thereby anticipating the expansion of the NYC floodplain in the future due to climate change;

9. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would continue to provide additional building height where building owners are required or are opting to meet DOB Appendix G floodproofing standards, to allow building owners to physically elevate habitable spaces and other building support features above expected flood elevations, with the continuation and amendment of various provisions in the 2013 Flood Text and 2015 Recovery Text, including:

- a. continuing to allow building height to be measured from the Flood-Resistant Construction Elevation (“FRCE”), which is defined as equivalent to the Design Flood Elevation (“DFE”) in the 1% chance floodplain (same as in 2013 Flood Text) and 2’ above the lowest adjacent grade in the 0.2% chance floodplain (new addition);
- b. continuing to allow building height to be measured from a “Reference Plane” as an alternative to measuring from FRCE, but redefining the Reference Plane to a maximum of 10’ above grade for the 1% chance floodplain or 5’ above grade in the 0.2% chance floodplain;
- c. allowing building height to be measured from a Reference Plane above FRCE only if the first finished floor above the level to which the building complies with flood-resistant construction standards (defined as the “First Story above Flood Elevation”) is placed at or above such Reference Plane height, which was not required under the 2013 Flood Text;
- d. continuing to allow minimum base height to be measured from either the curb level or reference plane, as measuring from the curb would allow setbacks to be made closer to the ground and keep base heights lower;
- e. modifying underlying dormer allowances, which permit 60 percent of building width as a permitted obstruction in the building setback above maximum base height, but diminishing in width as the building rises, to provide an alternative allowance for a dormer that extends up to 40 percent of the building with no diminishing, which could result in breaking up bulk in the upper portion of the building.

<https://www.ipcc.ch/2019/09/25/srocc-press-release/>

<https://www.villagepreservation.org/2018/10/29/remembering-hurricane-sandy/>

<https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/planning/download/pdf/plans-studies/flood-resiliency-update/project-description.pdf>

10. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would continue to incentivize ground-floor floodproofing while allowing for accessibility, promoting active street level use, and maintaining streetscape design, with the continuation and amendment of various provisions in the 2013 Flood Text and 2015 Recovery Text, including:

- a. allowing both new and existing buildings to exempt wet-floodproofed spaces from floor area, as compared to the 2013 Flood Text which only applied to new buildings;
- b. modifying floor area incentives to better encourage dry-floodproofing in Commercial Districts and
- c. M1 Districts paired with Residence Districts, while setting design requirements for those using the dry-floodproofing floor area exemption, with the goal of maintaining retail continuity along commercial streets;
- d. continuing to allow access to be exempted from floor area when located below FRCE, though modifying the cap from the 2013 Flood Text;
- e. providing greater street wall flexibility to accommodate access, flood panels and streetscape regulations for buildings in zoning districts that require street walls to be located within 8' of the street line;
- f. requiring blank walls created along retail corridors to be subject to streetscape rules, to be addressed by adding elements such as planting, street furniture or artwork;
- g. expanding the range of design options available to comply with streetscape rules.

11. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment expands the range of zoning rules which can be modified by the Board of Standards and Appeals (“BSA”) to facilitate resiliency improvements in special situations;

12. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment continues provisions from the 2013 Flood Text allowing for new and existing buildings to increase bulkhead dimensions in order to facilitate the movement of mechanical equipment to the roof;

13. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would allow for the second story of buildings to be used for non-residential uses across all commercial districts, when located in a floodplain;

14. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment expands upon the 2013 Flood Text which allowed for the deployment of temporary flood panels, by continuing to allow flood panel deployment and additionally providing for a minor floor exemption for flood panel storage, while also allowing landscaped berms and floodgates in the same open areas;

15. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment provides greater flexibility for the grading of waterfront yards and visual corridors to enable the design of soft shorelines and bi-level esplanades, in order to allow public waterfront access while also providing for flood resiliency;

16. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment attempts to remove regulatory obstacles to recovery from future flood events and other disaster types, through provisions including:

- a. allowing all buildings to place power systems, including emergency generators, as permitted obstructions in open areas, provided size limitations are met;
- b. clarifying the floor area exemption for mechanical equipment;
- c. permitting ramps and lifts for all building types in any required open areas.

17. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment prohibits new nursing homes and restricts the enlargement of existing nursing home facilities within the 1% floodplain and within other designated areas where vehicular access would likely become limited during a disaster;
18. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment provides for a series of Recovery Provisions, including rules that could facilitate the recovery process from physical disasters (e.g. hurricanes) as well as a wider range of non-physical disasters (e.g. pandemics), and could be implemented in the event of a future disaster via a text amendment;
19. In the event that Recovery Provisions are activated during or following a disaster, such provisions are intended to be based on the specific types of impacts caused by such disaster and to apply only to “Designated Recovery Areas”, which would be selected based on the breadth and severity of the impacts as well as recovery plans, and are intended to be in effect on a temporary basis, determined at the time of the activation of such provisions, and subject to Community Board review at that time;
20. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment seeks to immediately put into effect two of these Recovery Provisions in the context of the current Covid-19 pandemic, with the entire city being set as a Designated Recovery Area, and which would relate to CPC Special Permits / Authorization Timeframes and Discontinuance of Non-Conforming Uses, and would remain in effect for a period of two years beyond the expiration of the Mayor’s Executive Order 98 (March 12, 2020);
21. A range of other provisions are included within the proposed Zoning Text Amendment which are applicable to lower-density residential communities, or other special situations, with less relevance to CD2;

Analysis and Specific Applicability to CD2

22. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment is not intended to account for funding for the retrofitting of existing buildings to be more resilient or the inclusion of resilient features in new construction, though building owners could potentially realize monetary incentives for such construction in the form of lower flood insurance rates;
23. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment, while attempting to incentivize the retrofitting of existing buildings, describes changes that are optional and does not require mandatory changes to be made to existing buildings, notwithstanding the fact that DOB Appendix G requires existing buildings with “substantial damage” or making “substantial improvements” to elevate all habitable spaces above DFE;
24. A portion of the FEMA 1% chance and 0.2% chance floodplains overlaps with landmarked historic districts within CD2, including landmarked blocks in the Greenwich Village Historic District north of West 11th Street and west of Greenwich Street; the Weehawken Street Historic District; portions of the Sullivan-Thompson Historic District between Prince and Watts Streets; portions of the Gansevoort Market Historic District below 14th Street; and portions of the Soho Cast Iron Historic District between Broome and Canal Streets; as well as individual landmarked buildings outside of these historic districts;
25. Retrofitting of existing buildings within a historic district would still be subject to review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, which could impose additional requirements in contrast to what would be permitted under the proposed Zoning Text Amendment, with the potential to result in more difficulty in retrofitting landmarked buildings, notwithstanding the option to pursue a variance with the BSA as outlined in whereas #11 above;

26. Per DOB records, around 20 new building permits and 40 alternation permits have been issued within CD2's floodplain since the implementation of the 2013 Flood Text;
27. The implementation of floodproofing measures in certain buildings is not expected to have any measurable impact on the behavior of floodwaters during a coast storm inundation scenario;
28. DCP has performed extensive outreach to the NYC community on the topic of Zoning for Coastal Flood Resiliency in the years following Superstorm Sandy, including 110+ outreach events with approximately 2500 NYC residents and stakeholders engaged;
29. The proposed ZCFR is only one component of the city's broader strategy around NYC's resiliency to coastal flooding, which includes other measures such as building up coastal defenses and protecting critical infrastructure.

Therefore, be it resolved that:

1. Community Board 2 ("CB2, Man.") generally supports the implementation of the proposed Zoning Text Amendment, though with certain proposed changes as outlined below, as a positive step to allow businesses and residents more flexibility in preparation for future storm surge and flooding events, as well as in the ability to recover from such events, especially as such events may become more likely in the future due to climate change.

Be it further resolved that:

2. In order for building owners to fully take advantage of the proposed Zoning Text Amendment and retrofit their buildings for resiliency, CB2, Man believes a robust funding program would be needed;
3. To this end, CB2, Man. encourages the City to explore the viability of various options to provide funding for resiliency-focused retrofitting / building improvements, which could include, among other things, continuing to advocate to the state and federal government for direct grants and/or subsidies to home and business owners making such improvements;
4. Though direct funding to building owners should be the first consideration, CB2 also encourages the City to study additional indirect means to support retrofitting, including tax incentives or the implementation of Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resilience ("PACER") programs which could potentially allow for property owners to borrow against anticipated future savings on flood insurance;
5. CB2, Man. encourages the City to further study the magnitude and nature of insurance savings that could be realized by building owners who retrofit their buildings to be more resilient, and to publicize the results to increase public awareness thereof;
6. CB2, Man. continues to advocate for City funding for resiliency related projects within CB2, as outlined in our annual register of funding requests,

<https://nycclpc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=93a88691cace4067828b1eede432022b>

<https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/planning/download/pdf/plans-studies/climate-resiliency/outreach-summary.pdf>

7. Given the unique overlap of FEMA floodplains and historic landmarked districts that occurs within Community District 2, CB2, Man. encourages further study to determine best practices for improving the resiliency of buildings within these overlapping districts while still maintaining their historic and aesthetic character,

8. Though CB2, Man. understands the need to establish a process through which variances can be granted by the BSA in special situations, CB2 requests that the language in the Zoning Text Amendment be modified to place a specific, measurable cap on such variances, and in general believes that to the extent possible, any foreseen special situations should be addressed in the Zoning Resolution itself rather than left to a future BSA variance,

9. CB,2, Man. requests that the City consider whether or not additional types of vulnerable populations beyond nursing homes should be considered when limiting development within the floodplain,

10. In the event of Recovery Provisions being activated in the context of a future disaster, with a proposed Designated Recovery Area that overlaps with Community District 2's boundaries, CB2, Man. requests to be promptly consulted on the proposed geographic scope and timeframe of such provisions, as is required when proposing a text amendment to implement such provisions.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board Members in favor.

SLA LICENSING

1. Coco Shack LLC d/b/a Coco Shack, 184 Prince Street 10012 (New RW – Restaurant)

i. Whereas, the Applicant and the Applicant's Attorney appeared before CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee to present an application to the NYS Liquor Authority for a new Restaurant Wine Liquor License; the Applicant will operate a full-service restaurant featuring moderately priced Mediterranean seafood along with Pacific-Atlantic seafood delicacies in the ground floor of a R7-2 zoned, five-story, residential brick building constructed in the early 1900's on Prince Street between Sullivan Street and West Broadway (Block #503/Lot#18), the building falling within the designated NYC South Village Historic District; and

ii. Whereas, the storefront is approximately 1,000 sq. ft. (500 sq. ft on the ground floor and 500 sq. ft. in the basement, with no patron use of the basement), there will be eight (8) tables with sixteen seats and one (1) bar with 5 seats, for a total patron occupancy of 21 persons; there is no patron seating in the basement, the basement being for storage purposes only; and

iii. Whereas, the licensed premises had been operated for years as a restaurant known as Piccola Cucina Enoteca, there being many complaints from people living in the surrounding neighborhood regarding unwanted behavior and loud music coming from the establishment, the instant application being made by an applicant that has another restaurant in the neighborhood (Coco Pazzo at 160 Prince Street, License #1304802), that restaurant being operated in accordance with its stated method of operation ; and

iv. Whereas, the Applicant's agreed to hours of operation are 11AM to 11PM Sunday through Wednesday and 11AM to 12AM Thursday through Saturday, music will be quiet background only consisting of music from iPod/CDs (i.e. no active manipulation of music – only passive prearranged music), there will be no dancing, no DJs, no live music, no scheduled performances, no cover fees or promoted events, no televisions, no velvet ropes or metal barricades, no security personnel/door staff; and

v. **Whereas**, there is no licensed sidewalk café permitted at this location and no other areas for the service of alcohol to any exterior areas in connection with the license, the existing premises does have a set of French doors running along the front façade facing the sidewalk, the Applicant agreeing to close the operable doors and any operable windows by 10 PM every night and any time there is sound from the television; and,

vi. **Whereas**, the Applicant has executed and has had notarized a Stipulations Agreement with CB2, Man. which will be incorporated into the “Method of Operation” of the Restaurant Wine License, with those stipulations as follows:

1. Premises will be advertised and operated as a full-service Mediterranean seafood restaurant with Pacific-Atlantic seafood delicacies with the kitchen open and full menu items available until closing every night.
2. The hours of operation will be Sunday through Wednesday 11AM to 11PM and Thursday through Saturday from 11AM to 12AM. No patrons will remain after stated closing time.
3. It will not operate a backyard garden or any outdoor area for commercial purposes.
4. There will be no licensed sidewalk café seating.
5. Will not operate as a Lounge, Tavern or Sports Bar or allow any portion of the premises to be operated in that manner.
6. Will have one (1) television no larger than 46".
7. Will play quiet ambient recorded background music only from iPod/CD's (i.e. no active manipulation of music – only passive prearranged music). No music will be audible in any adjacent residences at any time.
8. Will close all doors and windows at 10PM every night and any time that there is sound on the television.
9. Will not make changes to the existing façade except to change signage or awning.
10. Will comply with NYC Department of Buildings Regulations and keep current at all times required Permits and Certificates.
11. Will not have unlimited drink or unlimited food and drink specials. Will not have “boozy brunches.” No pitchers of beer.
12. There will be no “bottle service” or the sale of bottles of alcohol except for the sale of bottles of wine products.
13. Will not have: dancing, DJs, live music, promoted events, any event where a cover fee is charged, scheduled performances, velvet ropes or metal barricades, security personnel/door staff.
14. Any future sidewalk or roadbed seating will end no later than 11 PM every night (all patrons will be cleared by this hour and area closed); no speakers or music played outdoors and no speakers positioned to face outside.
15. Will appear before CB2, Manhattan prior to submitting any changes to any stipulation agreed to herein.

v. **Whereas**, this application being for the service of Beer and Wine only and thus not subject to the 500 Foot Rule.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man recommends **denial** of the application for a new Restaurant Wine License in the name **Coco Shack LLC d/b/a Coco Shack 10012**, **unless** the statements presented by the Applicant are accurate and complete and that the conditions and stipulations agreed to by the Applicant remain incorporated into the “Method of Operation” of the SLA Restaurant Wine License.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

2. Beyond Pho Corp. 2 d/b/a N/A, 227 Mulberry Street, Store B 10012 (New–Restaurant Wine)

i. Whereas, the Applicant’s Attorney appeared before Community Board 2, Manhattan’s SLA Licensing Committee to present an application to the NYS Liquor Authority for a new Restaurant Wine Liquor License; the Applicant will operate a full-service traditional Vietnamese restaurant in the ground floor of a C6-2-zoned, seven (7)-story mixed-use building constructed in 1991 on Mulberry Street between Spring and Prince Streets (Block #495/Lot#33); and

ii. Whereas, the storefront is approximately 1,900 sq. ft. and consists of 10 tables with 44 seats and one (1) bar with seven (7) seats for a total occupancy of 51 persons; there are two doors and one (1) bathroom; there is no DCA sidewalk café at this time or other outdoor space for the service of alcohol; and

iii. Whereas, the Applicant’s agreed to hours of operation are 11:30AM to 11:00PM seven days a week, music will be quiet background only consisting of music from iPod/CDs (i.e. no active manipulation of music – only passive prearranged music), there are no televisions, there will be no dancing, no DJs, no live music, no scheduled performances, no private parties, no cover fees or promoted events, no velvet ropes or metal barricades, no security personnel/door staff; and

iv. Whereas, there is no licensed sidewalk café with this application and no service of alcohol to any other exterior areas in connection with the license, the existing premises does have a set of French doors running along the front façade facing the sidewalk, the Applicant agreeing to close the operable doors and any operable windows by 8:00PM every night; and,

v. Whereas, the Applicant has executed and has had notarized a Stipulations Agreement with CB2, Man which will be incorporated into the “Method of Operation” of the Restaurant Wine License, with those stipulations as follows:

1. Premises will be advertised and operated as a full-service restaurant serving traditional Vietnamese cuisine with the kitchen open and full menu items available until closing every night.
2. The hours of operation will be Sunday through Saturday from 11:30AM to 11:00PM. No patrons will remain after stated closing time.
3. It will not operate a backyard garden or any outdoor area for commercial purposes.
4. Sidewalk café is not included with this application.
5. Will not operate as a Lounge, Tavern or Sports Bar or allow any portion of the premises to be operated in that manner.
6. Will not have televisions.
7. Will play quiet ambient recorded background music only from iPod/CDs (i.e. no active manipulation of music – only passive prearranged music). No music will be audible in any adjacent residences at any time.
8. Will close all doors and windows at 8:00PM every night.
9. Will not make changes to the existing façade except to change signage or awning.
10. Will comply with NYC Department of Buildings Regulations and keep current at all times required Permits and Certificates.
11. Will not have unlimited drink or unlimited food and drink specials. Will not have “boozy brunches.” No pitchers of beer.
12. There will be no “bottle service” or the sale of bottles of alcohol except for the sale of bottles of wine products.
13. Will not have: dancing, DJs, live music, promoted events, any event where a cover fee is charged, scheduled performances, velvet ropes or metal barricades, security personnel/door staff.

14. Any future sidewalk or roadbed seating will end no later than 11 PM every night (all patrons will be cleared by this hour and area closed); no speakers or music played outdoors and no speakers positioned to face outside.
15. Will appear before CB2, Manhattan prior to submitting any changes to any stipulation agreed to herein.

vi. Whereas, this application being for the service of Beer and Wine only and thus not subject to the 500 Foot Rule.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. recommends **denial** of the application for a new Restaurant Wine License in the name of **Beyond Pho Corp 2, 227 Mulberry Street, Store B 10012**, **unless** the statements presented by the Applicant are accurate and complete and that the conditions and stipulations agreed to by the Applicant remain incorporated into the “Method of Operation” of the SLA Restaurant Wine License.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

3. Dolce Vita Hospitality Group LLC d/b/a TBD, 137 Sullivan Street 10012 (New–Restaurant Wine)

i. Whereas, the Applicant and the Applicant’s Attorney appeared before Community Board 2, Manhattan’s SLA Committee to present an application to the NYS Liquor Authority for a new Restaurant Wine License; the Applicant will operate a restaurant serving Italian cuisine in a R7-2 zoned, one-story mixed-use building constructed in 1910 on Bleecker St. between MacDougal and Sullivan Sts. (Block #526/Lot #56) and which is located in the SoHo Cast Iron Historic District; and

ii. Whereas, the Applicant will operate a full-service Italian restaurant in a premises of approximately 765 sq. ft. and with a maximum proposed occupancy of 74 persons; the space will have six (6) tables with 22 seats, and one (1) stand-up bar (which will also serve as a food counter) with eight (8) seats, for a total of 30 seats in the premises, which has one (1) entrance/exit and one (1) bathroom; and

iii. Whereas, the Applicant’s agreed-to hours of operation will be 10:00AM to 12:00AM Sundays through Thursdays, and 10:00AM to 1:00AM Fridays and Saturdays; music will be quiet recorded background only consisting of music from iPod/CDs (i.e. no active manipulation of music – only passive prearranged music); there will be no DJ’s, no promoted events, no live music or scheduled performances, no cover fees, and no televisions; and

iv. Whereas, there is no licensed sidewalk café permitted at this location and no other areas for the service of alcohol to any exterior areas in connection with the license, the Applicant plans to have windows that open and is agreeing to close any operable windows by 10 PM every night; and,

v. Whereas, the Applicant has executed and has had notarized a Stipulations Agreement with CB2, Man. which will be incorporated into the “Method of Operation” of the Restaurant On-Premise License, with those stipulations as follows:

1. The premises will be advertised and will operate as a full-service Italian restaurant with the kitchen open and full menu items available until closing every night..
2. The hours of operation will be from 10:00AM to 12:00AM Sundays through Thursdays, and 10:00AM to 1:00AM on Fridays and Saturdays.

3. The premise will not operate as a Lounge, Tavern or Sports Bar or allow any portion of premises to be operated in that manner.
4. Will not have televisions.
5. Will not operate a backyard garden or any outdoor area for commercial purposes.
6. A sidewalk café is not included in this application.
7. Will play quiet ambient recorded background music only. No music will be audible in any adjacent residences at any time.
8. Will close all doors and windows by 10:00PM every night.
9. Will comply with NYC Department of Buildings Regulations & keep current at all times required Permits & Certificates.
10. Will not have unlimited drink or unlimited food and drink specials. It will not have “boozy brunches” and will not sell pitchers of beer.
11. There will be no “bottle service” or the sale of alcohol by the bottle, except for beer and wine products.
12. Will not have any of the following: dancing, DJs, live music, promoted events, any event for which a cover fee is charged, scheduled performances, velvet ropes or barricades, or doormen/security personnel.
13. Any future sidewalk or roadbed seating will end no later than 11:00 PM every night (all patrons will be gone by this hour and the area closed); there will be no speakers installed or music played outdoors, and no speakers will be positioned to face outside.
14. The Applicant will appear before CB2, Manhattan prior to submitting any changes to any stipulation agreed to herein.

vi. Whereas, this application being for the service of Beer and Wine only and thus not subject to the 500 Foot Rule.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. recommends denial of the application for a new Restaurant Wine License in the name of **Dolce Vita Hospitality Group LLC, 137 Sullivan Street 10012**, unless the statements presented by the Applicant are accurate and complete and that the conditions and stipulations agreed to by the Applicant remain incorporated into the “Method of Operation” of the SLA Restaurant Wine License.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

4. Jeremy Schaller or Entity to be Formed d/b/a TBD, 23 Cleveland Pl. 10012 (New OP)

i. Whereas, the Applicant appeared before Community Board 2, Manhattan’s SLA Licensing Committee to present an application to the Liquor Authority for a new on-premise liquor license to operate a bar specializing in sausage and other meat products within a ground floor storefront located in a 4-story mixed use building (Circa 1900) located on Cleveland Place between Spring and Kenmare Streets directly across from Petrosino Square in Nolita; and,

ii. Whereas, the storefront premise was previously operated in the past as Le Jardin Bistro (2009–2011) and The Cleveland Restaurant (2012–2015), the premises having a significant history generating significant complaints as it relates to a 1,300 SF exterior backyard at the rear of the premises, which the prior operators used for eating, drinking and live music but which was never permitted, and instead was repeatedly disapproved by the NYC Dept. of Buildings, the existing certificate of occupancy presented for the storefront premise permitting an occupancy limited to 50 for eating and drinking on the interior first floor only but does not extend such use and occupancy to the rear yard or the basement; and,

iii. Whereas, more recently and subsequent to the unpermitted use of the rear yard between 2009 and 2015, the storefront premises has operated with a restaurant wine license, by The Pokespot (2017–2019), a fast casual Restaurant specializing in Hawaiian poke bowls, and Arrepas (2019), a fast casual Greek restaurant, both of which stipulated and operated at the instant storefront without the use of the rear yard; and

iv. Whereas, the instant application is to operate with refrigerated and dry meat products being showcased in the front of the storefront and sold at retail, with the operations in the premise’s rear being for eating and drinking purposes, selling deli sandwiches, with a stand up bar and additional table seating on the interior, in addition to extending the eating and drinking from the interior premise to the rear yard, the diagram presented for the premises not demonstrating or including a full-service kitchen; and,

v. Whereas, the interior storefront premises is approximately 1,858 sq. ft., with a roughly 1,000 sq. ft. first floor and 858 sq. ft. basement (to which there cannot be patron access), there is one patron bathroom, no TVs, a first floor plan being presented demonstrating 1 stand up bar with 12 patron seats, 5 counter-level tables with 20 high top seats and 5 banquetts with 20 additional patron seats in the rear and 9 addition countertop level seats running along one side of the front façade for a total interior patron seating capacity of 61, in excess of the occupancy limits imposed on the certificate of occupancy, a licensed sidewalk café is also planned for additional exterior seating in the front; and

vi. Whereas, the applicant proposed interior hours of operation were until 2AM Sunday through Wednesday and until 4AM Thursday through Saturday, but upon presenting the application later reduced those proposed hours to 12AM Sunday through Tuesday and 1AM Wednesday through Saturday, the application also including live, amplified music, which was subsequently removed from the application, there will be no DJs., no promoted events, no scheduled performances or cover fees, no velvet ropes and no movable barriers; and,

vii. Whereas, despite being notified of the illegal nature of the backyard use in the past, the Applicant was not willing to stipulate that there would be no commercial use, no patrons and no service of alcohol to the rear yard, further indicating that the use of the rear yard was an integral component of his method of operation despite his lack of due diligence with the NYC DOB; and

viii. Whereas, there was significant opposition to this application from residents living in the neighborhood and immediately impacted by the use of the rear yard, photos demonstrating a significant number of apartments facing the back yard space, creating a residential donut surrounding the year yard, those neighbors appearing in opposition to the application describing the significant history of illegal uses of the rear yard at these premises, the lack of a viable emergency exit from the rear yard, along with the myriad of negative impacts of noise and drinking on those with living quarters adjacent to and overlooking the rear yard; and,

ix. Whereas, this application being subject to the 500 foot rule, requiring the Applicant to satisfy the public interest standard for the addition of this liquor license at this location, this storefront location being in front of Petrosino Square, the particular area around this Square having seen a significant increase in the number of liquor licenses over the last 10–15 years, eating and drinking with liquor licensing being in almost every storefront surrounding the Square, there being no permit to lawfully operate in the rear yard space as proposed, there likewise being a history of transgressions and unpermitted use with inappropriate activities, noise and past disturbances to those living in the above-referenced rear yard, that the unmitigated impacts of noise and intrusion from the use of the year yard for eating and drinking not meeting the public interest standard, the Applicant not willing, as prior operators have in the past, to forgo use of the rear yard; and,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. recommends denial for **Jeremy Schaller or Entity to be Formed d/b/a TBD, 23 Cleveland Pl. 10012** on its application seeking a new OP license; and

THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that should this application be considered by the SLA, CB2, Man. respectfully requests that this item be calendared to appear before the Full Board of the SLA; and,

THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if this application is considered by the SLA, despite CB2, Manhattan’s recommendation to deny this application, CB2 requests that the SLA conduct a 500-foot hearing because the premises and rear yard extension thereat has never been licensed for the service of alcohol at any point in the past.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

5. Becca 161 Lafayette Inc, d/b/a Baby Grand Jr., 161 Lafayette Street 10013 (New–OP Tavern, Karaoke Bar)

- i. Whereas,** the Applicant appeared before Community Board 2, Manhattan’s SLA Committee to present an application to the NYS Liquor Authority for a new Tavern On-Premise Liquor License; the Applicant will operate a tavern and karaoke bar in a M1-5B zoned, five (5)-story commercial building constructed in 1909 on Lafayette Street between Grand and Howard Streets. (Block #234/Lot #9); and
- ii. Whereas,** the Applicant will operate a tavern and karaoke bar in a premises of approximately 492 sq. ft. (252 sq. ft on the ground floor and 240 sq. ft. in the basement with no patron use of the basement); the premises will have two (2) tables with four (4) seats, and one (1) bar with eight (8) seats, for a total of 12 seats in the premises, there is one (1) entrance/exit and one (1) bathroom; and
- iii. Whereas,** the Applicant is also the long-term landlord of the building, the premises having previously been licensed with an on-premise liquor license (SN1218388) as a karaoke bar, that license was abandoned by the previous tenant; and
- iv. Whereas,** the Applicant’s agreed-to hours of operation will be 10:00AM to 12:00AM Sundays, 8:00AM to 12:00AM Monday, 8:00AM to 2:00AM Tuesday through Thursday and 8:00AM to 4:00AM Friday and Saturday; music will be quiet recorded background only consisting of music from iPod/CD’s and entertainment level but restricted to karaoke only; all doors and windows will be closed at all times; there will be one (1) television no larger than 46"; there will be no DJs, no promoted events, no live music or scheduled performances, no cover fees; and
- v. Whereas,** the Applicant has agreed that there will be no licensed sidewalk café or roadbed seating at this location now or in the future, the interior of the premises being quite small and lacking a full kitchen but only having a small prep area in the basement, this being insufficient to support a food operation outside; there already exists a large, full-service restaurant adjacent to the premises, occupying the corner location in the same building; the small scale and nature of the instant application and the Applicant’s agreement to not add any seating outdoors will minimize the impact to the surrounding community of having two licensed premises in the same building; and,
- vi. Whereas,** the Applicant has executed and has had notarized a Stipulations Agreement with CB2, Man. which will be incorporated into the “Method of Operation” of the Restaurant On-Premise License, with those stipulations as follows:

1. The premises will be advertised and will operate as a tavern / karaoke bar with less than a full-service kitchen but will serve food during all hours of operation.
2. The hours of operation will be from 10:00AM to 12:00AM, 8:00AM to 12:00AM Monday, 8:00AM to 2:00AM Tuesday through Thursday, and 8:00AM to 4:00AM on Fridays and Saturdays.
3. The premises will have one (1) television no larger than 46".
4. Will not operate a backyard garden or any outdoor area for commercial purposes.
5. A sidewalk café is not included in this application and there will be no sidewalk café now or in the future.
6. Will close all doors and windows at **all** times.
7. Will comply with NYC Department of Buildings Regulations and keep current at all times required Permits & Certificates.
8. Will not have unlimited drink or unlimited food and drink specials. It will not have “boozy brunches” and will not sell pitchers of beer.
9. There will be no “bottle service” or the sale of alcohol by the bottle, except for beer and wine products.
10. Will not have any of the following: dancing, DJs, live music, promoted events, any event for which a cover fee is charged, scheduled performances, velvet ropes or barricades, or doormen/security personnel.
11. Will not participate in any current or future sidewalk or roadbed seating dining programs, both temporary or permanent
12. The Applicant will appear before CB2, Manhattan prior to submitting any changes to any stipulation agreed to herein.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. recommends denial of the application for a new Restaurant Wine License in the name of **Becca 161 Lafayette Inc d/b/a Baby Grand Jr., 161 Lafayette Street 10013**, unless the statements presented by the Applicant are accurate and complete and that the conditions and stipulations agreed to by the Applicant remain incorporated into the “Method of Operation” of the SLA On-Premise License.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

6. Mulberry Hospitality LLC d/b/a October, 244 Mulberry Street (South Storefront) 10012
(New OP – Restaurant)

i. Whereas, the Applicant and the Applicant’s Attorney appeared before Community Board 2, Manhattan’s SLA Licensing Committee to present an application to the NYS Liquor Authority for a new On-Premise Liquor License; the Applicant will operate a full-service vegetarian restaurant serving breakfast, lunch and dinner with food focusing on hydroponically grown produce and cocktails (both with and without alcohol) utilizing fresh greens, herbs and spices in the ground floor of a C6-2 zoned, two-story, mixed use building constructed in the early 1900’s on Mulberry Street between Prince and Spring Streets (Block #494/Lot#15); and

ii. Whereas, the Applicant opened a restaurant of the same name in another neighborhood in Manhattan, albeit without a liquor license, and is planning to leave that location for the larger premises of this instant application; and

iii. **Whereas**, the storefront is approximately 1,400 sq. ft., there will be 18 tables with 52 seats and one (1) bar with eight (8) seats, for a total patron occupancy of 60 persons; there is one (1) door for patron ingress and egress, the Applicant intends to install operable French windows along the sidewalk on Mulberry Street and there are two (2) patron bathrooms; and

iv. **Whereas**, the Applicant's agreed-to hours of operation will be 9:00AM to 11:00PM Sunday and 9:00AM to 1:00AM Monday through Saturday; all doors and windows will close at 9:00PM every night; there will be no televisions, music will be quiet recorded background only consisting of music from iPod/CDs (i.e. no active manipulation of music – only passive prearranged music); there will be no DJs, no promoted events, no live music or scheduled performances, no cover fees, and no televisions; and

v. **Whereas**, the Applicant has executed and has had notarized a Stipulations Agreement with CB2, Man. which will be incorporated into the "Method of Operation" of the Restaurant Wine License, with those stipulations as follows:

1. Premises will be advertised and operated as a full-service vegetarian restaurant serving breakfast, lunch and dinner with food focusing on hydroponically grown produce and cocktails (both with and without alcohol) utilizing fresh greens, herbs and spices with the kitchen open and full menu items available until closing every night.
2. The hours of operation will be Sunday from 9:00AM to 11:00PM and Monday through Saturday from 9:00AM to 1:00AM. No patrons will remain after stated closing time.
3. It will not operate a backyard garden or any outdoor area for commercial purposes.
4. Sidewalk café is not included with this application.
5. Will not operate as a Lounge, Tavern or Sports Bar or allow any portion of the premises to be operated in that manner.
6. Will not have televisions.
7. Will play quiet ambient recorded background music only from iPod/CD's (i.e. no active manipulation of music – only passive prearranged music). No music will be audible in any adjacent residences at any time.
8. Will close all doors and windows at 9:00PM every night.
9. Will comply with NYC Department of Buildings Regulations and keep current at all times required Permits and Certificates.
10. Will not have unlimited drink or unlimited food and drink specials. Will not have "boozy brunches." No pitchers of beer.
11. There will be no "bottle service" or the sale of alcohol by the bottle, except for beer and wine products.
12. Will not have: dancing, DJs, live music, promoted events, any event where a cover fee is charged, scheduled performances, velvet ropes or metal barricades, security personnel/door staff.
13. Any future sidewalk or roadbed seating will end no later than 11 PM every night (all patrons will be cleared by this hour and area closed); no speakers or music played outdoors and no speakers positioned to face outside.
14. Will appear before CB2, Manhattan prior to submitting any changes to any stipulation agreed to herein.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. recommends **denial** of the application for a new On-Premise License in the name of **Mulberry Hospitality LLC d/b/a October, 244 Mulberry Street, (south storefront) 10012, unless** the statements presented by the Applicant are accurate and complete and that the conditions and stipulations agreed to by the Applicant remain incorporated into the "Method of Operation" of the SLA On-Premise License.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

7. Rezdora USA LLC d/b/a Maestro Pasta, 102 MacDougal Street aka 185 Beecker Street 10012 (New OP – Restaurant)

i. Whereas, the Applicant and the Applicant’s Attorney appeared before CB2, Manhattan’s SLA Licensing Committee to present an application to the NYS Liquor Authority for a new On-Premise Liquor License; the Applicant will operate a full-service Italian restaurant with a focus on homemade fresh pasta made on the premises in the ground floor of a mixed use, six-story building constructed in the early 1900’s on MacDougal Street at the corner of Bleecker Street; and

ii. Whereas, the storefront is approximately 1,850 sq. ft. (1450 sq. ft on the ground floor and 400 sq. ft. in the basement, with no patron use of the basement), there will be 10 tables with 40 seats for a total patron occupancy of 40 persons; there is one (1) door for patron ingress and egress and one (1) patron bathroom; there is no sidewalk café included with this application; and

iii. Whereas, the Applicant’s agreed-to hours of operation will be 11:00AM to 11:00PM Sunday through Thursday and 11:00AM to 12:00AM Friday and Saturday; all doors and windows will close at 9:00PM every night; there will be no televisions, music will be quiet recorded background only consisting of music from iPod/CDs (i.e. no active manipulation of music – only passive prearranged music) and any speakers that are near the operable French doors or windows will be placed so they face into the interior of the restaurant; there will be no DJs, no promoted events, no live music or scheduled performances, no cover fees, and no televisions; and

iv. Whereas, the Applicant has executed and has had notarized a Stipulations Agreement with CB2, Man. which will be incorporated into the “Method of Operation” of the Restaurant Wine License, with those stipulations as follows:

1. Premises will be advertised and operated as a full-service restaurant serving Florentine-style Italian Pizza, Tuscan fare and pasta dishes from homemade pasta made on the premises with the kitchen open and full menu items available until closing every night.
2. The hours of operation will be Sunday through Thursday from 11:00AM to 11:00PM and Friday and Saturday from 11:00AM to 12:00AM. No patrons will remain after stated closing time.
3. It will not operate a backyard garden or any outdoor area for commercial purposes.
4. Sidewalk café is not included with this application.
5. Will not operate as a Lounge, Tavern or Sports Bar or allow any portion of the premises to be operated in that manner.
6. Will not have televisions.
7. Will play quiet ambient recorded background music only from iPod/CDs (i.e. no active manipulation of music – only passive prearranged music). No music will be audible in any adjacent residences at any time.
8. Will close all doors and windows at 9:00PM every night
9. Will not make changes to the existing façade except to change signage or awning.
10. Will comply with NYC Department of Buildings Regulations and keep current at all times required Permits and Certificates.
11. Will not have unlimited drink or unlimited food and drink specials. Will not have “boozy brunches.” No pitchers of beer.
12. There will be no “bottle service” or the sale of alcohol by the bottle, except for beer and wine products.

13. Will not have: dancing, DJs, live music, promoted events, any event where a cover fee is charged, scheduled performances, velvet ropes or metal barricades, security personnel/door staff.
14. Any future sidewalk or roadbed seating will end no later than 11:00PM every night (all patrons will be cleared by this hour and area closed); no speakers or music played outdoors and no speakers positioned to face outside.
15. Will appear before CB2, Manhattan prior to submitting any changes to any stipulation agreed to herein.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. recommends **denial** of the application for a new On-Premise License in the name of **Rezdora USA LLC d/b/a Maestro Pasta, 102 MacDougal Street aka 185 Bleecker Street 10012**, **unless** the statements presented by the Applicant are accurate and complete and that the conditions and stipulations agreed to by the Applicant remain incorporated into the “Method of Operation” of the SLA On-Premise License.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 in favor

THE FOLLOWING ARE RESOLUTIONS FOR ALL APPLICANTS THAT WERE LAID OVER, WITHDRAWN, OR DID NOT APPEAR BEFORE THEIR REQUESTED HEARING:

8. Astrea Management, Inc., 163 Bleecker Street 10012 (Alteration)

Whereas, prior to this month’s CB2, Manhattan’s SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 1, 2020 the Applicant requested **to withdraw** this application from further consideration at this time, affirming that they will not submit this application to the NYSLA for consideration without returning to CB2 Manhattan should they decide to proceed at some time in the future.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premise liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license for **Astrea Management, Inc., 163 Bleecker St. 10012** **until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2’s SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor

9. Little Guilty Pleasure d/b/a Crispy Heaven, 38 Grand Street 10013 (RW)

Whereas, prior to this month’s CB2, Manhattan’s SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 1, 2020 the Applicant requested **to layover** this application to January/2021 and will resubmit the application for consideration at a future CB2 SLA Licensing Committee meeting prior to any filings with the SLA should they proceed

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premise liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license for **Little Guilty Pleasure d/b/a Crispy Heaven, 38 Grand St. 10013** **until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2’s SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

10. CCFC 62 Spring, LLC d/b/a Chef's Cub Counter, 62 Spring Street 10012 (OP-Restaurant) (Class Change –Upgrade from RW)

Whereas, prior to this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 1, 2020 the Applicant requested **to layover** this application to January/2021 and will resubmit the application for consideration at a future CB2 SLA Licensing Committee meeting prior to any filings with the SLA should they proceed.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premise liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license for **CCFC 62 Spring, LLC d/b/a Chef's Cub Counter, 62 Spring Street 10012** **until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2's SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

11. Li & Gao Entertainment LLC, 163 Bleecker Street 2nd Floor (10012) (OP-Karaoke Bar) (Previously Unlicensed location)

Whereas, prior to this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 1, 2020 the Applicant requested **to layover** this application to January/2021 and will resubmit the application for consideration at a future CB2 SLA Licensing Committee meeting prior to any filings with the SLA should they proceed.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premise liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license for **Li & Gao Entertainment LLC, 163 Bleecker Street 2nd Floor (10012)** **until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2's SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

12. CrowdSync Technology, LLC d/b/a New Trade Name to be Formed, 191 Lafayette Street 10013 (OP-Restaurant) (DJ) (Sidewalk Café)

Whereas, prior to this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 1, 2020 the Applicant requested **to withdraw** this application from further consideration at this time, affirming that they will not submit this application to the NYSLA for consideration without returning to CB2 Manhattan should they decide to proceed at some time in the future.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premise liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license for **CrowdSync Technology, LLC d/b/a New Trade Name to be Formed, 191 Lafayette Street 10013** **until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2's SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

13. Gigi's of Mulberry, Inc. d/b/a Mulberry, 149 Mulberry Street 10013 (OP-Restaurant) (Back Yard)

Whereas, prior to this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 1, 2020 the Applicant requested **to layover** this application to January/2021 and will resubmit the application for consideration at a future CB2 SLA Licensing Committee meeting prior to any filings with the SLA should they proceed.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premise liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license **for Gigi's of Mulberry, Inc. d/b/a Mulberry, 149 Mulberry Street 10013** **until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2's SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor

14. CP Spring St., LLC d/b/a TBD, 307 Spring St. 10013 (New OP-Restaurant)

i. Whereas. the Applicant and the Applicant's Attorney appeared before CB2, Manhattan's SLA Committee to present an application to the NYS Liquor Authority for a new on premises license to operate as an Italian pizzeria and pasta restaurant focused on Florentine style pizza and Tuscan fare within a ground floor storefront located in a 5 story, 1900 residential apartment building on Spring Street between Hudson and Greenwich Streets in Hudson Square; and,

ii. Whereas, the licensed premise has been operated for years as a restaurant known at Giorgione with a similar method of operation as proposed in the instant application as a full service restaurant, the ground-floor storefront being approximately 3,500 sq. ft. (2,500 sq. ft. on the ground floor and 1,000 sq. ft. in the basement), there will be 25 tables with 55 seats and 1 stand up bar with 10 additional seats on the ground floor, for a total interior seating capacity of 65; there is no patron seating in the basement, the basement being for storage purposes only; and

iii. Whereas, there is no licensed sidewalk café permitted at this location and no other areas for the service of alcohol to any exterior areas in connection with the license, the existing premises does have a set of French doors running along the front façade facing the sidewalk in front, the Applicant agreeing to close those operable doors by 10 pm every night; and,

iv. **Whereas**, the Applicant's hours of operation will be 11 AM to 12 AM, Sunday through Wednesday and 11 AM to 1 AM Thursday through Saturday, music will be quiet background only, not audible in surrounding residences, there will be no DJs, no dancing, no promoted events, no live music, no private parties, no scheduled performances or cover fees, and there will be only one TV located behind the bar; and

v. **Whereas**, the Applicant has executed and has had notarized a Stipulations Agreement with CB2, Man. which will be incorporated into the Method of Operation of the On-Premise License, with those stipulations as follows:

1. Premise will be advertised and operated as an Italian pizzeria and pasta restaurant with a kitchen open at all hours.
2. The hours of operation will be 11 AM to 12 AM, Sunday through Wednesday and 11 AM to 1 AM Thursday through Saturday.
3. Will not operate as a Lounge, Tavern or Sports Bar or allow any portion of premises to be operated in that manner.
4. Will have one television.
5. There will be no licensed sidewalk Café.
6. All doors and windows will be closed by 10 PM every night.
7. Will play quiet, ambient, recorded background music only. No music will be audible in any adjacent residences anytime.
8. Will not make changes to the existing façade except to change signage or awning.
9. Will comply with NYC Department of Buildings Regulations & keep current at all times required Permits & Certificates.
10. Will not have unlimited drink or unlimited food & drink specials. Will not have "boozy brunches." No pitchers of beer.
11. There will be no "bottle service" or the sale of bottles of alcohol except for the sale of bottles of wine and beer products.
12. Will appear before CB2, Manhattan prior to submitting any changes to any stipulation agreed to herein.
13. Will not have: dancing, DJs, live music, promoted events, any event where cover fee is charged, scheduled performances, velvet ropes or metal barricades, security personnel or a doorman.
14. Any future sidewalk or roadbed seating will end no later than 11 PM every night (all patrons will be cleared by this hour and area closed); no speakers or music played outdoors and no speakers positioned to face outside.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. recommends **denial** of the new restaurant wine license for **CP Spring St., LLC d/b/a TBD, 307 Spring St. 10013** **unless** the statements presented by the Applicant are accurate and complete, and that the above-stated conditions and stipulations agreed to by the Applicant are incorporated into the "Method of Operation" on the Restaurant Wine License.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

15. 150 West Tenth Street, LLC d/b/a ZZ's, 150 W. 10th St. 10014 (New OP – Restaurant)

i. **Whereas**, the Applicant and the Applicant's Attorney appeared before CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee to present an application to the Liquor Authority for a new on premise liquor license to operate a full service restaurant focusing on seafood and world-class sushi cuisine in a roughly 1,975 sq. ft. ground floor storefront and basement (1,100 sq. ft. in the ground floor and 875 sq. ft. in the

basement) within a five-story apartment (circa 1926) building on the southwest corner of West 10th Street and Waverly Place in a residentially zoned area, this townhouse building falling within NYC LPC's designated Greenwich Village Historic District; and,

ii. Whereas, the storefront premise has been previously licensed as a full-service restaurant (Highlands) with an On-Premise license with a similar method of operation, the Applicant not planning to make any changes to the exterior of the premises, the method of operation being consistent with the prior license for the premises, the maximum capacity for the interior premises being at 59; and,

iii. Whereas, the storefront premise to be licensed does not have French doors or operable windows, there will be no changes to the front façade, the basement premises will be for storage purposes only without patron occupancy, there is no sidewalk café permitted and no outdoor areas for the service of alcohol, with 10 tables with 28 patron seats, 1 bar with 6 patron seats for a total interior patron capacity of 34, there is two bathrooms for patrons, no TV and one entrance/exit for patrons on West 12th Street; and,

iv. Whereas, this Applicant met with the local Block Association and agreed in good faith to certain stipulations for its future restaurant, including the utilization and implementation of a reservation system to manage crowd management so that patrons not waiting or queuing on sidewalk in front of premises, the local block association sending correspondence in support on the Applicant based on the agreed-upon method of operation being proposed; and,

v. Whereas, the hours of operation will be Sunday through Saturday from 5:00 PM to 1:00 AM, music will be background only and not audible in surrounding residences, there will be no DJs, no dancing, no promoted events, no live music, no private parties, no scheduled performances or cover fees; and,

vi. Whereas, the Applicant executed a stipulations agreement with CB2, Man. that they agreed would be attached and incorporated into their method of operation on their On-Premise license and the stipulations are as follows:

1. The licensed premise will be advertised and operated as a full-service restaurant.
2. The hours of operation will be from Sunday through Saturday from 5:00 PM to 1:00 AM.
3. The premises will not operate as a lounge, tavern or sports bar or allow any portion of the premises to be operated in such a manner.
4. The premises will not have televisions.
5. The premises will not permit dancing.
6. The premises will not install or have French doors, operable windows or open facades.
7. The premises will not operate a backyard garden or any outdoor area for commercial purposes or patron seating including a licensed sidewalk cafe.
8. All doors and windows will be closed at all times.
9. The premises will play quiet ambient-recorded background music only. No music will be audible in any adjacent residences at anytime.
10. The premises will not have DJs, live music, cover charges, scheduled performances, velvet ropes or barricades on the sidewalk or promoted events.
11. There will be no pitchers of beer and no all you can eat/drink specials or boozy brunches.
12. There will be no bottle service or the sale of bottles of alcohol except for bottles of wine products.
13. Will not make any changes to existing façade except signage or awning.
14. There will be no roadbed or sidewalk dining pursuant to Open Restaurant application at these premises.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. recommends **denial** for an new On Premise license to **150 West Tenth Street, LLC d/b/a ZZ's, 150 W. 10th St. 10014** **unless** the statements of the applicant as presented to CB2, Man. are accurate and complete, and that those conditions and stipulations agreed to by the applicant relating to the above-stated stipulations are incorporated into the “Method of Operation” on the On Premise License.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

16. Bombay House Hospitality LLC, d/b/a t/b/a, 33 W. 8th St. 10011 (New OP – Restaurant)

i. Whereas, the Applicant appeared before CB2, Manhattan’s SLA Licensing Committee to present an application for an On-Premise liquor license to operate a “neighborhood family restaurant serving Mediterranean food” in a roughly 2,356 sq. ft. premises (1,850 sq. ft. ground floor storefront and 506 sq. ft. basement; basement for storage only and no patrons) within a 5 story, mixed use building (circa 1900) on West 8th Street between 5th and 6th Avenues, a location within the NYC Zoning designated Special Limited Commercial District and also within the Greenwich Village Historic District, and subject to special regulation on both counts; and,

ii. Whereas, the premise was previously operated as a restaurant since 2010, a certificate of occupancy being presented for eating and drinking on the ground floor with a maximum person capacity of 74; and,

ii. Whereas, the full-service restaurant will have 16 tables and 60 patron seats, 1 stand up bar with 8 seats, for a total of 68 patron seats inside, there is full-service kitchen, one bathroom and all existing doors/windows are fixed and not operable; and,

iii Whereas, the location’s long-standing zoning restrictions preclude sidewalk café, operable front windows or an open façade, and applicant has specifically stipulated that they will not seek or have such features should they be allowed in the future; and Pandemic “outdoor dining” roadbed seating appears to be precluded at the location as its frontage faces a pedestrian walkway for nearly its entire width, and applicant has further stipulated that they will not seek such seating in the future if available; and, the operator as further stipulated that they will not use the small back yard area for commercial purposes; and,

iv. Whereas, applicant promised to keep the existing, non-compliant operable front window closed at all times; and, further to bring the venting stack, which drips onto residential terraces, and does not meet code requirements for height, into compliance; and,

v. Whereas, the hours of operation will be 11 AM to 11 PM on Sundays, from 12 PM to 11PM Monday through Wednesday and from 12 PM to 12 AM Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays; and, all doors or windows will be closed at all times, music will be of a quiet ambient recorded background nature, there will be no DJs, no dancing, no promoted events, no private parties, no scheduled performances or cover fees, no velvet ropes, no movable barriers; and,

vi. Whereas, the Applicant having failed to meet with the West 8th Street Block Association, and representatives of said Block Association requesting that the applicant layover the application in so that they might meet with the applicant; and, the applicant, having reviewed them in real time at the meeting, agreeing to and endorsing the Block Association’s standard stipulation language, and promising to meet with them soon after and provide written verification of same; and,

vii. Whereas, the Applicant executed a stipulations agreement with CB2, Man., which will be incorporated into the method of operation on the On-Premise license and those stipulations are as follows:

1. Premise will be advertised and operated as a full-service restaurant.
2. The hours of operation will be 11 AM to 11 PM on Sundays, from 12 PM to 11PM Monday through Wednesday and from 12 PM to 12 AM Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays.
3. Will operate as a neighborhood restaurant, with full-service kitchen open until closing, focusing on Mediterranean cuisine.
4. Will not operate as a Lounge, Tavern, or Sports Bar or allow any portion of premises to be operated in that manner.
5. Will not have televisions.
6. Will not operate a backyard garden or any outdoor area for commercial purposes (including licensed sidewalk café).
7. Will play quiet ambient recorded background music only. No music will be audible in any adjacent residences anytime.
8. Will not install or have French doors, operable windows, or open façades.
9. Will keep all doors and windows closed at all times.
10. Will comply with NYC Department of Buildings Regulations & keep current at all times required Permits & Certificates.
11. Will not have unlimited drink or unlimited food & drink specials. Will not have “boozy brunches”. No pitchers of beer.
12. There will be no “bottle service” or the sale of bottles of alcohol except for the sale of bottles of wine products.
13. Applicant will appear before CB2, Manhattan prior to submitting any changes to any stipulation agreed to herein.
14. Will not have Dancing, DJ’s, live music, promoted events, any event where a cover fee is charged, scheduled performances, velvet ropes or metal barricades, security personnel/doorman.
15. Any future sidewalk or roadbed seating per open restaurants application will end no later than 11 PM every night (all patrons will be cleared by this hour and area closed); no speakers or music played outdoors and no speakers positioned to face outside;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. recommends **denial** of the application for a restaurant on premise license for **Bombay House Hospitality LLC, d/b/a t/b/a, 33 W. 8th St. 10011** **unless** the statements the Applicant has presented are accurate and complete, and that those conditions and stipulations agreed to by the Applicant above are incorporated into the “Method of Operation” on the SLA On Premise License.

Vote: Passed, with 45 Board members in favor, and 1 recusal (D. Gruber).

THE FOLLOWING ARE RESOLUTIONS FOR ALL APPLICANTS THAT WERE LAID OVER, WITHDRAWN, OR DID NOT APPEAR BEFORE THEIR REQUESTED HEARING:

17. Harlem Roasting Company, LLC d/b/a Prodigy Coffee, 33 Carmine St., 10014 (TW-Bar/Tavern) (BW-Tavern) (Sidewalk café) (laid over)

Whereas, prior to this month’s CB2, Manhattan’s SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 3, 2020 the Applicant requested **to layover** this application from further consideration, affirming that they will not submit this application to the NYSLA for consideration without returning to CB2, Man. should they decide to proceed at some time in the future.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premises liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license **Harlem**

Roasting Company, LLC d/b/a Prodigy Coffee, 33 Carmine St., 10014 until the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2's SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

18. Store 3 Pizza, LLC d/b/a Zazzy's Pizza, 201 W. 11th St. 10014 (RW – Restaurant) (laid over at meeting)

Whereas, at this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 3, 2020 the Applicant requested **to layover** this application from further consideration, affirming that they will not submit this application to the NYSLA for consideration without returning to CB2, Man. should they decide to proceed at some time in the future.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premises liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license for **Store 3 Pizza, LLC d/b/a Zazzy's Pizza, 201 W. 11th St. 10014 until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2's SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

19. Corp. to be formed by Christopher Nelson d/b/a TBD, 95 7th Ave. So. 10014 (OP-Restaurant) (laid over)

Whereas, at this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 3, 2020 the Applicant requested **to layover** this application from further consideration, affirming that they will not submit this application to the NYSLA for consideration without returning to CB2 Manhattan should they decide to proceed at some time in the future; and,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Manhattan strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premises liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license for **Corp. to be formed by Christopher Nelson d/b/a TBD, 95 7th Ave. So. 10014 until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2's SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

20.. Corp. to be formed by Steven Bensusan, 117 7th Ave. So. 10014 (OP – Restaurant) (sidewalk café) (laid over)

Whereas, at this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 3, 2020 the Applicant requested **to layover** this application from further consideration, affirming that they will not

submit this application to the NYSLA for consideration without returning to CB2, Man. should they decide to proceed at some time in the future.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premises liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license **Corp. to be formed by Steven Bensusan, 117 7th Ave. So. 10014** **until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2's SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

21. David James or Entity to be formed, 33 W. 8th St. 10011 (OP-Wine Bar/Tapas Bar) (Live Music-Soloist Only-Piano, Violin) (laid over)

Whereas, prior to this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 3, 2020 the Applicant requested **to layover** this application from further consideration at this time, affirming that they will not submit this application to the NYSLA for consideration without returning to CB2, Man. should they decide to proceed at some time in the future.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premises liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license for **David James or Entity to be formed, 33 W. 8th St. 10011** **until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2's SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, Man. should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

22. Pier55, Inc. and Savory Labs, LLC d/b/a Little Island, Pier 55 in Hudson River Park 10014 (BW-Public Park-Amphitheater) (Request to for entire pier/island to be licensed for sale of alcoholic beverages)

Whereas, at this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 3, 2020 the SLA Committee continued its review of and heard from this applicant requesting the service of alcohol throughout the entire island until 11 pm every night; and,

Whereas, because further discussion and consideration is needed to review this application at the Community Board level the Committee requested to hold over this application over and until it meets again at its regularly scheduled meeting at the beginning of January/2021, the Applicant agreeing to such request, this island being situated in place of a pier located in the Hudson River Park, requiring further discussion and consideration at the Committee level before providing its position and recommendations to the NYSLA; and,

Whereas, CB2, Man. requests that this application to the NYSLA not be considered at the NYSLA without receiving the recommendation of CB2, Man. at some time in the next 30 days.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premises liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license for **Pier55, Inc. and Savory Labs, LLC d/b/a Little Island, Pier 55 in Hudson River Park 10014** **until** CB2, Man. has forwarded its recommendation to the NYSLA and requests that the NYSLA suspend any decision on this license for 30 days until this important step is taken and the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

23. 3 Times 818, Inc., 818 Broadway 10003 (New Beer and Cider License) (laid over)

Whereas, prior to this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 3, 2020 the Applicant requested **to layover** this application from further consideration, affirming that they will not submit this application to the NYSLA for consideration without returning to CB2, Man. should they decide to proceed at some time in the future;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premises liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license **3 Times 818, Inc., 818 Broadway 10003** **until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2's SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

24. Tourneau, LLC d/b/a Rolex, 29-35 9th Ave. 10014 (OP-Bottle Club) (Watch Retail Store) (laid over)

Whereas, prior to this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 3, 2020 the Applicant requested **to layover** this application from further consideration, affirming that they will not submit this application to the NYSLA for consideration without returning to CB2 Manhattan should they decide to proceed at some time in the future;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premises liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license **Tourneau, LLC d/b/a Rolex, 29-35 9th Ave. 10014** **until** the Applicant has presented their application in front of CB2's SLA Licensing Committee and CB2 has forwarded a recommendation to the SLA and requests that the SLA send this Applicant back to CB2, should this application proceed directly to the SLA, in order that this important step not be avoided and that the concerns of the Community be fully heard.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

25. 178 Bleecker Café, LLC d/b/a Pending, 178 Bleecker St., 1st Fl. 10012 (New OP-Rear Yard - previously unlicensed location) (Failed to Appear)

Whereas, at this month's CB2, Manhattan's SLA Licensing Committee Meeting on December 3, 2020 the Applicant **failed to appear** with regard to this application and provided no explanation for their failure to appear before the Community Board;

Whereas, an application for this same location was already reviewed by CB2, Man. last month (Nov./2020) and its recommendation was already sent to the NYSLA in November/2020.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that the SLA **deny** any type of proposed on-premises liquor license, tavern wine license, restaurant wine license, any other beer and wine license, corporate change, alteration, transfer or other changes to any existing license **178 Bleecker Café, LLC d/b/a Pending, 178 Bleecker St., 1st Fl. 10012**.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board members in favor.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

1. Resolution requesting a CitiBike station just south of Clarkson & Varick Sts. as an alternative to the proposed King & Varick Sts. location

Whereas the NYC Dept. of Transportation (DOT) presented an overview of 10 new proposed locations for CitiBike stations in Community Board 2 Manhattan (CB2, Man.) at the November meeting of CB2's Traffic and Transportation Committee; and

Whereas one of the proposed locations, King St. & Varick St., in the northeast roadbed, has elicited concerns in terms of safety for both pedestrians and bicyclists; and

Whereas the 7th Ave. S. protected bike lane currently terminates at Houston St. & Varick St. (extension of 7th Ave. S.) with a large bulbout on the southeast corner of Houston & Varick that blocks bicyclists from proceeding further down Varick directly along the curb; and

Whereas the large bulbout jutting out presents an obstacle that is not only unsafe for bicyclists in compelling them to swerve around it into the street and into moving traffic, but also is hazardous for pedestrians standing on the bulbout waiting to cross the street who would be vulnerable to being struck by bicycles on their way to the King & Varick location whose riders may be unable to stop in time to avoid a collision; and

Whereas there has been some discussion about investigating the possibility of continuing the 7th Ave. S. bike lane further south on Varick, however conditions such as Holland Tunnel-bound traffic, local delivery and loading needs, and narrow sidewalks merit an in-depth study of this southern stretch to accommodate bicyclists' safely in balance with all users' needs, which would take a considerable amount of time, and a CitiBike station in this area is needed now; and

Whereas the Hudson Square Connection BID, which covers this area and is vastly familiar with its operations and needs (and also has several CitiBike stations in its precincts), has proposed locating a CitiBike station just south of Clarkson & Varick Sts. (on Varick's east side) as an alternative to the proposed King & Varick Sts. location; and

Whereas the Clarkson & Varicks Sts. location is just a little more than a block north of the King St. one, and would fulfill CitiBike network needs just as effectively; and

Whereas the Hudson Square BID is proposing that the Clarkson/Varick Citibike station they recommend be placed in the floating parking lane that buffers the bike lane at that Varick St. location, safe and convenient for bike lane users, while not interfering with emergency vehicle access. This approach has already been used successfully at 9th Ave. and W. 45th St. in midtown Manhattan; and

Whereas the small businesses adjacent to the proposed Clarkson & Varick St. CitiBike station site favor having the station there, and think it will be good for business; and

Therefore, be it resolved CB2, Man. fully supports locating a new CitiBike station just south of Clarkson & Varick Sts. (on Varick's east side) as an alternative to the proposed King & Varick Sts. location; and

Be it further resolved that CB2, Man. is in favor of the Citibike station being placed in the floating parking lane at the Clarkson/Varick location; and

Be it finally resolved that CB2, Man. urges DOT to install the CitiBike station at the Clarkson/Varick location as soon as possible.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board Members in favor.

2. Resolution recommending a study and plan for Canal St. to analyze and remedy its long-lived dangerous and community-destroying conditions.

Whereas Canal St. has long been a severely dangerous thoroughfare threatening the safety and well-being of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists alike, and its hazardous conditions continue to grow: from 2016 to 2020, at least 2,567 reported crashes occurred on Canal Street between Hudson St. and the Manhattan Bridge - almost 2 per day that injured at least 54 cyclists (killing one), 109 pedestrians (killing one) and 229 motor vehicle occupants (killing one); and

Whereas conditions on Canal St. not only endanger people's lives, but also interfere with the safe and effective conduct of business: the congested streets hinder deliveries to businesses, often leading to double-parking that blocks sidewalks and intersections, while crowded sidewalks limit space allocated to street vendors, resulting in sidewalk conflicts; and

Whereas with curb-to-curb street widths up to almost 100 ft. wide (dimensions more akin to a super highway than a city street), Canal St. creates a vast chasm between its north and south sidewalks, thwarting people's safe crossing from one side of the street to the other and impeding community connections and cohesiveness; and

Whereas as many as seven lanes operate on segments of Canal St. (e.g., the east end of the street (near Bowery/Mott/Elizabeth) has left turn/center medians + three travel lanes in each direction, and btw. Broadway and W. Broadway there are three lanes in each direction + a parking lane that is No Standing during rush hour, in both cases adding up to seven lanes). Many of these lanes are as wide as 12 or 13 ft., some even up to 15 ft., unnecessarily excessive widths not needed to accommodate even the widest trucks; and

["Another Pedestrian is Killed in Chinatown," Streetsblog NYC, Jan. 26, 2020.](#)

[Manhattan Topographical Bureau, Office of the Manhattan Borough President, Manhattan Section Maps 16 and 17.](#)

Whereas pedestrian density on Canal St.'s sidewalks is so intense that pedestrians are often forced to walk in the street where they risk being hit by oncoming traffic. Although pedestrian volumes are three times those of motor vehicles, 90% of street space goes to the vehicles; and

Whereas the heavy, snarled flow of vehicular traffic on Canal wreaks havoc on the orderly progression of vehicles, botching up movement at intersections and crosswalks by blocking vehicular passage and turning movements, while also obstructing and endangering pedestrians crossing the street. Gridlock often prevents drivers traveling east on Canal from moving across the street's many lanes to reach turning points heading north, such as at West Broadway, Greene, Centre, Mulberry and Elizabeth Sts., with drivers often ending up in Brooklyn; and

Whereas bicycling in NYC increased by 116% between 2008-2018, and 34% between 2013-2018. While bicycling figures on Canal St. itself are not available, counts on the Manhattan Bridge which leads into and extends from Canal St. show an average increase in daily bicycle volumes from 6,008 in 2019 to 7,093 by Oct. 2020, all indicating the increased need for safe and accessible bicycle facilities on Canal St.; and

Whereas after almost 35 years, 2-way tolling on the Verrazzano-Narrows Bridge was reinstated on 12/01/2020, removing the impetus for vehicles to skirt an expensive one-way double toll that led New Jersey-bound motorists and truckers to take a long, alternate route over the toll-free Manhattan Bridge and through Canal Street to the westbound toll-free Holland Tunnel, exacerbating traffic congestion on Canal. These new conditions call for a fresh look at Canal St.; and

Whereas congestion pricing now expected, with its potential for eliminating toll-free travel on the Manhattan Bridge, merits a new look at Canal St. as well; and

Whereas Canal St. is in the midst of change, with new occupants moving in and on the cusp of additional change, making it a particularly suitable time ripe for a study to determine how Canal can be improved and to plan appropriately for its future;

Therefore, be it resolved that CB2, Man. urges the NYC Dept. of Transportation (DOT) to immediately conduct a study and create a plan to address the many traffic problems on Canal St. and formulate solutions to them that ensure safe passage and access for pedestrians, accommodation for vehicles of different types that reduce their negative impacts, and street improvements to facilitate the conduct of business and build community life; and

Be it further resolved that CB2, Man. also urges DOT to include as part of a Canal St. improvement plan easy to implement improvements that can be quickly completed to provide swift betterment, using applications such as paint, markings, bollards, delineators and planters, as well as more permanent, built improvements to be accomplished in the long term; and

Be it further resolved that CB2, Man. greatly encourages DOT to seriously consider removing a lane of traffic and/or reducing too-wide traffic lanes to 10 ft. or 10.5 ft. widths (which can easily accommodate a large truck) in order to provide more sidewalk space; and

[NYC Dept. of Transportation, Traffic Engineering & Planning Dept.](#)

[Transportation Alternatives, #Fix Canal Street, Presentation at CB2, Dec. 2020.](#)

[NYC Dept. of Transportation, *Cycling in the City: Cyclists Trends in NYC*, July 2020, p. 10.](#)

[NYC Dept. of Transportation, Bicycle Unit, Cyclist Counts at East River Bridge Locations \(1980-Oct. 2020\).](#)

Be it further resolved that CB2, Man. strongly recommends that DOT design and implement a suitable protected bike lane to serve the needs of the growing number of bicyclists who use Canal St. for crosstown travel, if not on Canal than on a nearby westbound cross street to compliment the eastbound Grand St. lane; and

Be it further resolved that CB2 advises DOT to carefully examine the potential for employing additional means of improvement already proven to be effective in promoting pedestrian safety and creating an equitable and workable balance of street space between pedestrians and vehicular modes, such as neckdowns to shorten crossing distances, pedestrian priority traffic signals like Leading Pedestrian Intervals (LPIs) or split phasing, simplified intersections (some with vehicular left turn bans where appropriate), curbside reform, including increased commercial loading zones and designated space for street vendors, and pedestrian safety islands; and

Be it further resolved that CB2 asks that a timeline be created that firmly establishes the start and completion dates of the study and times for reporting back to the community and receiving input; and

Be it finally resolved that CB2 implores DOT to work quickly to develop a Canal St. study plan and begin timely implementation.

Vote: Unanimous, with 46 Board Members in favor

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie De La Rosa
Secretary
Community Board #2, Manhattan