DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH & EDUCATION

COMMITTEE VOTE:	9 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	38 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	1 Recused

RE: **YDDP Funding**

- WHEREAS: The Department of Youth & Community Development (DYCD) announced on December 22, 2003 that it is canceling its Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention (YDDP) Request for Proposals (RFP) issued on April 13, 2003 which was to allocate its funding this month, and
- WHEREAS: This decision results in the extension of existing YDDP contracts which gave much of our tiny and ever shrinking CB #1 allocation to a Murry Bergtraum High School program which serves a student population drawn overwhelmingly from outside of CB #1 while reducing the funding for Manhattan Youth which provides very popular and well regarded programs which **do** serve our local youth, and
- WHEREAS: It is quite disturbing that DYCD took this action following a long and extensive YDDP review process wherein Community Board members, youth serving agencies, and DYCD staff devoted countless hours to participate in a process that selected qualified organizations to be funded, which was totally ignored and for naught, and
- WHEREAS: This cancellation will likely discourage community members from participating in youth planning issues in the future, and
- WHEREAS: Although the DYCD "Community Share" funding for NYC is \$15.25 million, CB #1 was only allocated a total of \$60,000 for this RFP and by extending the existing YDDP contracts CB #1 will receive only \$41,000 this year, and
- WHEREAS: This Community Board remains thoroughly dissatisfied and outraged by DYCD's continued failure to provide our very rapidly growing residential youth population with its fair share of funding for necessary youth programs, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 urgently requests that the City take immediate steps to rectify the gross inequity of our scant and inadequate YDDP allocation, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

Any replacement youth funding process under consideration by DYCD must include meaningful Community Board participation so that our clear, explicit and reasonable wishes are not ignored in the future.

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:9 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained0 RecusedBOARD VOTE:34 In Favor0 Opposed1 Abstained0 Recused

RE: **Proposed Development at 408 Greenwich Street**

- WHEREAS: The Ramirez Brothers presented a development project for a nine (9) story building consisting of ground floor retail and parking garage, four floors of commercial use, two floors of private residents for the developer and two floors of residential "for sale or rent" condominiums. The overall FAR requested exceeds the allowable 5.0 FAR by over 60%, and
- WHEREAS: For many years Community Board 1 has striven to maintain the character of the manufacturing and mixed use natural of the community and has endeavored to keep the height and bulk of any new construction within the permissible limits set in the zoning resolutions of The City of New York, and
- WHEREAS: The development site and the area immediately surrounding the development site are occupied by low-rise structures and certain non-conforming structures that predate the current zoning, and
- WHEREAS: The developer has characterized this development as being compatible with and in conformity with the surrounding building structures. The Community Board has determined that the only structures used for comparison presented by the developer were nonconforming structures and that the square footage and bulk of this proposed structure is well beyond the current zoning resolutions for the surrounding area, and
- WHEREAS: The developer claims that the 60% increase in square footage above the allowable square footage permitted under the current zoning resolutions is only a <u>minimal variance</u>. The Community Board strongly disagrees with such characterization and firmly believes that the structure proposed will have a severe negative impact on the character of the immediately surrounding neighborhood and an adverse impact on the character of the Tribeca community in general, and
- WHEREAS: The developer's claim that the site development creates an economic hardship because the site has unique physical conditions, such as, sand and loose fill subsoil conditions, it is a small site, an adjacent building may need to have foundation supports during construction and the current one story building on the site is obsolete. All of these claims are deemed to be without merit by the Community Board because (a) most sites west of West Broadway have sand and loose fill subsoil conditions that are easily discernable by looking at the topographical and soil maps at any surveyor's office, (b) that the one story building that the developer plans

to tear down was on the site when they purchased it (and never intended to retain) and can not now be claimed to be an economic hardship, (c) the size of the site is not unusually small for the community and there are many sites of similar size that have been developed without a hardship claim, (d) many of the older buildings in the Tribeca area need some form of lateral support if deep foundation work is being performed adjacent to them, as is the case for this site because of the size and height requested by the developer, creating its own hardship, and

- WHEREAS: The developer makes a claim of an economic hardship yet is seeking a bulk variance to add two (2) very expensive for sale condominiums to the project, in addition to the two private residences the developer is retaining for its own use, all four residential units with values in excess of \$800 per square foot, and
- WHEREAS: Community Board 1 is extremely concerned that to develop the site with a larger, bulkier, building, than permitted under current zoning resolutions, will open the entire area to further nonconforming uses, and
- WHEREAS: While the Community Board has not been opposed to residential uses in this area in the past, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 strongly objects to the current development plans for 408 Greenwich Street, NY, NY, and rejects the claim by the developer that the site's development creates an economic hardship, and

BE IT

FURTHER

- RESOLVED
- THAT: Community Board 1 strongly disagrees that this is a minimal variance or that this variance is needed to make this project economically viable and offers other developments in the surrounding community as evidence that this variance is not necessary or required, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 calls upon the Board of Standards and Appeals to reject the request for a variance because it fails to meet the required criteria for a hardship and fails to maintain the 5.0 FAR of the current zoning and to support the Community Board's efforts to maintain the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:7 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained0 RecusedBOARD VOTE:37 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained0 Recused

RE: New rules relating to the installation of public pay telephones in areas under LPC jurisdiction

- WHEREAS: Community Board #1 supports the bulk of the proposed new rules by the Landmarks Preservation Commission to restrict and carefully define the installation of public pay telephones in front of areas and properties under its jurisdiction, and
- WHEREAS: As regards Section 2-21 (c) (1) (ii), we believe that the proposed enclosure dimensions are too big, with or without advertising, and
- WHEREAS: The Community Board is already on record as opposing advertising on public pay telephone enclosures, and this is nowhere more applicable than on those adjoining landmark properties and within landmarks districts, and
- WHEREAS: We believe that, while the illumination specifications are a step in the right direction, the appropriate definition should allow just enough illumination for public pay telephones to be usable, and for the enclosures to be safe, and
- WHEREAS: As regards Section 2-21 (d), we do not believe that any public pay telephones should be placed anywhere other than at curbside, as defined in these new proposed rules, and that no such phones, in any case, should be attached to or installed next to buildings within landmark districts or designated as individual landmarks, now

THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED

- THAT: The Community Board endorses these rules provided that they are amended to:
 - Reduce the size of the enclosure;
 - Eliminate advertising on public pay telephone enclosures within landmark districts and adjacent to individual landmarked buildings;
 - Restrict illumination to that needed to ensure pay telephones are safe and usable.

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:7 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained0 RecusedBOARD VOTE:34 In Favor0 Opposed2 Abstained0 Recused

RE: Relocation of the statue of Mayor DePeyster from Hanover Square to the north east corner of City Hall Park

- WHEREAS: The making of the British Memorial Garden in Hanover Square resulted in a request to relocate Abraham DePeyster's statue which had been placed in Hanover Square from its original location at Bowling Green when Bowling Green was repaired, and
- WHEREAS: Given DePeyster's extensive work in New York government in the 1600's it was felt that City Hall Park would be a good location, and
- WHEREAS: The north east corner in the park between the subway entrance and Chambers Street was picked as it was close to Horace Greely's statue which was also made of bronze and was of similar size and cast in the 1890's, and
- WHEREAS: The statue would be angled but face the subway and the area would be landscaped with miniature evergreen bamboo and the statue would be lit at night, and
- WHEREAS: Mayor DePeyster's relatives had been consulted and supported the new location, and
- WHEREAS: The statue would be moved in the summer when the work on the British Memorial Garden would start, now

THEREFORE	
BE IT	
RESOLVED	
THAT:	CB #1 supports the relocation of the Mayor DePeyster statue to City Hall
	Park.

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:10 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained0 RecusedBOARD VOTE:35 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained0 Recused

RE: Reconstruction of Chambers Street from Broadway to West Street

- WHEREAS: In June 2004, the New York City Department of Transportation will begin the reconstruction of Chambers Street from Broadway to West Street as part of the rebuilding of the streets in Lower Manhattan and the work will continue for a period of up to 2 years, and
- WHEREAS: This reconstruction project will also include the replacement of water mains and other utilities, and
- WHEREAS: Chambers Street is one of the main arteries of Lower Manhattan and a project such as this will be a major disruption to the residents, businesses and many schools located on this corridor, and
- WHEREAS: As part of this project, DOT is proposing to replace existing curbs with new granite curbing and to replace existing street lampposts with the more historic "M" poles such as those recently installed on Greenwich Street, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 calls upon DOT to minimize the impact on the community as much as possible, coordinate between all agencies and utilities to expedite the project quickly and efficiently as possible and to keep the businesses and residents directly affected informed of the disruptions caused by this project, and

BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 supports the installation of granite curbs and the "M" pole street lamp posts.

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:9 In Favor1 Opposed0 Abstained2 RecusedBOARD VOTE:31 In Favor0 Opposed3 Abstained0 Recused

RE: **185 Duane Street, liquor license application for 185 Duane Street Restaurant Inc.**

- WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with 18 tables and 36 seats and a bar with 10 seats, and
- WHEREAS: The proposed hours of operation will be noon until 12 AM Sunday to Thursday and 2 AM on Friday and Saturday, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant will have background music only and agreed to provide adequate sound-proofing, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant will not be seeking a sidewalk café license or a cabaret license, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Subject to compliance with the foregoing conditions and limitations, CB #1 does not oppose the new liquor license application for 185 Duane Restaurant at 185 Duane Street of two years provided that the closing time is changed to 11:30 pm on weekdays and 12 am on Saturday and Sunday.

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:10 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained0 RecusedBOARD VOTE:34 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained0 Recused

RE: 25 Hudson Street, liquor license application for Shinobi NY

WHEREAS: The applicant failed to appear before the committee in person or through an authorized representative and did not submit a completed check list for the transfer of a liquor license, now

THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED

- THAT:
 - CB #1 requests the State Liquor Authority require the applicant to provide all required information and to actually appear before the Tribeca Committee before taking any action on the subject application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:7 In Favor1 Opposed1 Abstained1 RecusedBOARD VOTE:32 In Favor0 Opposed2 Abstained0 Recused

RE: 250 West Broadway, liquor license application for Della Rovere

- WHEREAS: The applicant proposed to operate a restaurant with 40 tables and 120 seats and a bar with 15 seats, and
- WHEREAS: The proposed hours of operation will be from 11:30 AM until 1 AM Monday to Thursday and 11:30 AM until 2 AM on Friday and Saturday, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant will have background music only and agreed to provide adequate sound-proofing, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant will be seeking a sidewalk café license but will not be seeking a cabaret license, and
- WHEREAS: This establishment is directly across the street from a religious institution at 245 West Broadway and new liquor licenses are not legal within 200 feet of religious institutions, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant does not have a premises Certificate of Occupancy for the establishment, and
- WHEREAS: The committee expressed serious concerns about the lack of an adequate plan to deal with the black cars that usually wait outside a large scale establishment such as this, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 takes no position on the proposed application for Della Rovere at 250 West Broadway and urges the State Liquor Authority to hold a 500 foot hearing to address the above concerns and thereafter require the applicant to appear before the Tribeca Committee again before taking any action on the subject application.

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:6 In Favor0 Opposed1 Abstained2 RecusedBOARD VOTE:31 In Favor0 Opposed3 Abstained0 Recused

RE: 25 N. Moore Street, liquor license application for Brandy Library Lounge LLC.

- WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a bar/lounge with seating for 48, and
- WHEREAS: The proposed hours of operation will be until 12 AM Sunday to Thursday and 2 AM on Friday and Saturday, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant will have live and background music and agreed to provide adequate sound-proofing and to have no amplified music after midnight, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant will not be seeking a sidewalk cafe license or a cabaret license, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant will not have a kitchen, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Subject to compliance with the foregoing conditions and limitations, CB #1 does not oppose the new liquor license application for Brandy Library at 25 N. Moore Street, but requests the State Liquor Authority hold a 500 foot hearing to address the above concerns.

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:8 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained0 RecusedBOARD VOTE:34 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained0 Recused

RE: Liberty Plaza, new design

- WHEREAS: Brookfield Properties has proposed a new design by Cooper Robertson for Liberty Plaza, and
- WHEREAS: This action is a minor modification to the zoning resolution which first created Liberty Plaza in 1968, and
- WHEREAS: The new design will address the severe grade change from Broadway to Trinity Place by tilting the plaza in a unique design that eliminates the need for many stairs, and
- WHEREAS: The new design will include a grove of 52 trees, increased seating areas for up to 600 people, and lighting from light panels which will be installed in the surface of the plaza as well as the Alliance for Downtown New York fixtures on the plaza's perimeters, and
- WHEREAS: The construction will begin in the spring and be completed by the end of 2004, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 supports the new design of Liberty Plaza and applauds Brookfield Property's efforts to restore this important public space.

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:8 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained0 RecusedBOARD VOTE:25 In Favor1 Opposed8 Abstained0 Recused

RE: Co-naming of N/E/C Park Row and Beekman Street "Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton Corner"

- WHEREAS: Two of the leaders of the women's right's movement in America, Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, published their newspaper, The Revolution, from an editorial office at 37 Park Row from 1868 to 1869, and
- WHEREAS: These two women made enormous contributions towards achieving basic civil rights for women in this country including the right to vote, and
- WHEREAS: Few leading women have received their proper acknowledgement for their contributions to the history of our country, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 supports the proposal to co-name the northeast corner of Park Row and Beekman Street "Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton Corner".

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:9 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained1 RecusedBOARD VOTE:31 In Favor0 Opposed1 Abstained0 Recused

RE: **5 Beekman Street, BSA application to retain existing atrium and open** access stairway in the residential conversion

- WHEREAS: 5 Beekman Street, aka The Temple Court Building and Annex, which was built in 1881 is being converted to a residential building, and
- WHEREAS: The building code does not allow atriums or open access stairways, as exist at 5 Beekman Street, in residential buildings, and
- WHEREAS: The owners have agreed to add new sprinklers, smoke detectors, a smoke purge system, a fire alarm and communication system, and an emergency power system to meet fire safety standards, and
- WHEREAS: The atrium and stairway are magnificent elements which must absolutely be preserved, and
- WHEREAS: This new use for this beautiful landmark building is an appropriate one, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 urges the Board of Standards and Appeals to approve the 5 Beekman Street application to retain the existing 10-story atrium and open access unenclosed stairway as part of their residential conversion.

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:9 In Favor0 Opposed0 Abstained1 RecusedBOARD VOTE:31 In Favor0 Opposed3 Abstained0 Recused

RE: 140 Fulton St., liquor license application for Fulton Fire House Inc.

- WHEREAS: The applicant will operate a restaurant for 35 people with 5 tables and 20 seats which will include a bar area with 15 seats, and
- WHEREAS: The hours of operation will be 11:30 AM until 2 AM on Sunday through Thursday and 11:30 AM until 4 AM on Friday through Saturday, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to properly manage the recorded music and have adequate soundproofing, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant will not be seeking a cabaret license or a sidewalk cafe license, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 does not oppose the new liquor license application for Fulton Fire House at 140 Fulton Street based on the above hours of operation.

DATE: JANUARY 20, 2004

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH & EDUCATION

COMMITTEE VOTE:8 In Favor1 Opposed0 Abstained1 RecusedBOARD VOTE:37 In Favor0 Opposed1 Abstained1 Recused

RE: Site 5C Recreation Center

- WHEREAS: Community Board #1 will soon be reviewing the proposed new residential building planned for site 5C adjacent to PS 234, and
- WHEREAS: The Community Board reiterates our October 21, 2003 resolution which rejects the currently proposed building on site 5C and instead proposes a building containing less bulk and being more in context with the surrounding low rise nature of Tribeca on this site, and
- WHEREAS: Another critical component of any development on site 5C is to be a new 40,000 s. f. recreation center for Manhattan Youth Recreation and Resources which operates all our local after school programs as well as a wide range of other free youth and recreation programs throughout the district, and
- WHEREAS: Manhattan Youth Recreation and Resources urgently needs a new facility to enable it to continue to provide new programs and services in our growing community, and
- WHEREAS: It is important that we carefully consider the long-term benefit to our community which would result from a new community recreation center on site 5C as we deliberate on this matter, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 affirms that any new building on site 5C must include a 40,000 s. f. community recreation center for MYRR containing a 25 yard pool as part of a first class aquatic facility for both families and senior citizens and a full size gym, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: We strongly urge that a solution be sought which achieves this most important community objective.