

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 36 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Proposed art installation of “Cavalier” by Bill Barret for Finn Square**

WHEREAS: The NYC Parks Department has proposed the temporary installation of “Cavalier”, a bronze sculpture by Bill Barret to be installed in October or November for a period of six months, and

WHEREAS: This installation has the support of representatives of Finn Square and the Parks Department, provided the artist provides insurance, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 has no objection to this installation.

res.july.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 2 OPPOSED 2 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 16 IN FAVOR 19 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **Proposed OTB booth for the Sporting Club at 99 Hudson St.**

WHEREAS: OTB has proposed entering into a five-year contract with the Sporting Club at 99 Hudson Street to provide a two-window booth where patrons of the Sporting Club could bet on horse races, and

WHEREAS: This could happen as an “as of right use” but OTB has requested community input prior to signing the contract, and

WHEREAS: Use of the betting facilities would be limited to patrons of the Sporting Club, which would retain responsibility for security and controlling who can and cannot place bets, and OTB would not allow OTB signage on the exterior of the premises, and

WHEREAS: There are only four recently-opened establishments of this type in New York City (Astoria, Maspeth, Sheepshead Bay and Bay Ridge) and no experience with an establishment of this type in a neighborhood in Manhattan, and

WHEREAS: OTB projects that this will increase the number of patrons at an establishment where there is already a sometimes rowdy crowd, and

WHEREAS: There are concerns about the impact on the neighborhood and the potential to encourage loitering, and

WHEREAS: Notice of this application was not posted in the surrounding neighborhood and the owner of the Sporting Club has not contacted nearby residential buildings to discuss the ramification of this proposal, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 opposes this proposal and recommends that OTB not proceed with this contract.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 36 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **169 Hudson Street, special authorization for residential conversion of the second through seventh floors with a penthouse addition**

WHEREAS: The developer of 169 Hudson St. has applied to the City Planning Commission for a special authorization for conversion of the second through the seventh floors to create 12 residential units of between 4,300 and 8,000 square feet, and

WHEREAS: The developer has assured the Tribeca Committee that the ground floor will be reserved for retail uses, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 has no objection to this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 36 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **452 Greenwich St., application to grant special authorization
by the CPC to allow one on site enclosed accessory off-street
parking space**

BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 has no objections to the granting of a special authorization by the City Planning Commission to allow one on site enclosed accessory off-street parking space.

res.july.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HUDSON RIVER PARK

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **Revised Plans for Pier 26**
- WHEREAS: The River Project has presented revised plans for its proposed “Shad Garden” on Pier 26, and
- WHEREAS: The open space on Pier 26 remains severely underutilized by the public at this time due in large part to a chain-link fence separating the pier from the pedestrian esplanade, and
- WHEREAS: The Hudson River Park Trust (HRPT) has proposed removing the existing chain link fence running north-south across the bulkhead of Pier 26, which now creates a barrier between the pier and the public esplanade, as part of HRPT’s plan to install improvements and amenities on this pier and increase public access and use of this pier, and
- WHEREAS: The Downtown Boathouse, which shares space with The River Project on Pier 26, has objected to the installation of a portion of the proposed “Shad Garden” shown in the revised plans on the ground that it would impede access to the pier by users of its facilities, and
- WHEREAS: The element proposed for the “Shad Garden” near the public esplanade has been relocated to another part of the pier so as not to impede access to the pier by users of the Downtown Boathouse, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 has approved earlier versions of the proposed “Shad Garden”, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 also has called upon HRPT to remove the existing chain-link fence on Pier 26 once the security of the existing programs on Pier 26 could be ensured by other measures, and

WHEREAS:

HRPT now is willing to erect a protective security fence around The River Project's facilities, including the "Get-Down" designed by George Trakas, and/or take any other necessary security measures in conjunction with removal of the chain-link fence separating the Pier from the pedestrian esplanade, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 approves HRPT's plan to remove immediately the existing chain-link fence on Pier 26 and to proceed with installation of a security fence around The River Project's facilities, including the "Get-Down" designed by George Trakas, and/or take any other necessary security measures to secure the Shad Garden.

res.july.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HUDSON RIVER PARK

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Proposed camp site for Pier 26**

WHEREAS: The Hudson River Watertrail Association has designating a small portion of Pier 26 adjacent to the Downtown Boathouse next to the boat rack as a camp site in conjunction with a Statewide camping program, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves this temporary use on Pier 26 as long as this use complies with all insurance requirements.

res.july.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 35 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **Public Pay Phones**

WHEREAS: CB #1 has received 79 proposed locations for the installation of new curbside public pay telephones (PPTs) in our district, and

WHEREAS: The City is in the process of reviewing approximately 20,000 such applications for new PPTs in conjunction with revised federal and City regulations governing PPTs, and

WHEREAS: These new regulations have enabled a number of new companies to enter the PPT market in NYC, and

WHEREAS: The 1995 City law which now governs PPTs allows for the installation of new public telephones at the curbside with advertising, subject to certain restrictions, and

WHEREAS: The sidewalks of CB #1 are among the busiest and most congested in the world and are already filled with mailboxes, newsstands, sign poles, hydrants, street lights, parking meters, street vendors, newspaper boxes etc., and

WHEREAS: Many of our streets are extremely narrow, dating to the 1700s and 1800s, and were never intended to accommodate the many thousands of pedestrians using them everyday, and

WHEREAS: Several of our streets have been converted into pedestrian malls to accommodate the ever growing number of pedestrians, and

WHEREAS: Our Community Board, as well as the local BID (the Alliance for Downtown NY) are on record in favor of limiting additional unnecessary street furniture due to the congestion on our sidewalks, and

WHEREAS: The City has not provided the Community Board with the necessary drawings and photos to properly analyze specific locations, nor do we have the capacity to inspect 79 separate locations, and

WHEREAS: The Board feels that building line phones are preferable to curb-line phones, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 disapproves the proposed installation of new PPTs on streets which are extremely congested and/or narrow and specifically disapproves the proposed installations on the following streets:

Broad Street
Broadway
Canal Street
Chambers Street
John Street
Harrison Street
Nassau Street
Wall Street, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

The Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications (DOITT) and the applicant should provide advance notification to all property owners of proposed PPTs to be installed in the vicinity of their property, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 feels that the new PPTs are too large and obstructive and create safety hazards and any new PPT should be installed so as to minimize interference with pedestrian flow, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

There should be no more than two PPTs per block face including the already existing pay phones, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 requests that DOITT inspect each site prior to granting approval to insure the accuracy of submitted drawings, some of which are five years old, and proper compliance with all siting and spacing regulations, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 asks that all new phones in our district be limited to outgoing calls only, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 strongly objects to the thoroughly inadequate public review process put into place by DOITT which forced our Community Board to review a large number of applications (79) at one time without establishing a mechanism by which we could obtain the adequate materials, drawings, samples and overall information needed to properly assess these applications.

res.july.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 36 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Art Commission**

WHEREAS: Legislation has been proposed (Intro. 756) to eliminate the Art Commission, and

WHEREAS: The Art Commission is the City's design review agency responsible for reviewing and approving all works of art, architecture, and landscape architecture on City-owned property, and

WHEREAS: The Art Commission helps to establish high standards for the design, materials and construction used on City property, and

WHEREAS: The Art Commission consists of eleven volunteer professionals and lay members who help to insure that projects are both suitable and appropriate in a particular neighborhood, and

WHEREAS: Since the Art Commission's founding in 1898, over 85% of U.S. cities have followed NYC's lead and established design review bodies like the Art Commission, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 opposes proposed Intro. 756 to eliminate the Art Commission, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 feels that the Art Commission is important and vital to NYC.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **137 Duane St., application to alter a storefront**

WHEREAS: The committee found the proposed design, using clear glass and mahogany to match existing materials, to be appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The committee commends the addition of an interior ramp for the access of the physically challenged, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC approve the application.

res.july.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **10 Harrison St., application to install a storefront**

WHEREAS: The committee found the proposed design, with folding shutters and loading dock in matching materials and colors, to be appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The committee was concerned with the appropriateness of the proposed signage on the columns, and

WHEREAS: The committee was concerned that the building at 12 Harrison Street which has the same shutter system will look out of place with the newly painted frontage and encouraged the owner to work with the next door building to paint the entire frontage as a single project, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC approve the application subject to consideration of the above comments.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **155 Franklin St., application to install a lift**

WHEREAS: The use of wire glass and steel as the railing materials and sand blasted logo on the railing was in question of its precedent and appropriateness in the historic district, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that there are other alternatives to treat the handicap lift at a loading dock, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC hold over all action on this application until the applicant brings in samples of materials and possibly a model for presentation.

res.july.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **31-33 Walker St., application to install new storefronts and lighting**

WHEREAS: The committee found the proposed design to replace existing glass blocks with wood and the glass block in-fill bays with glass and wood to be appropriate, and

WHEREAS: All existing roll-up gates and entrance lighting on the columns will be removed. The air-conditioning unit will be set back to align with the entrance doors, and

WHEREAS: The committee would like to see if the air-conditioning unit can be replaced so the transoms can be treated the same as the other bays, and

WHEREAS: The committee noted with disappointment that the owner had without permission and inappropriately repainted the sandstone front wall of the building. The committee requests LPC to explore a way to rectify it, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC approve the application after reviewing the above comments.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **14 Wall St., application to install canopies and signs**

WHEREAS: The committee approved the stainless steel signage plaques in replacement of the former Banker's Trust's signage at the entrance and at the corners of the building, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the addition of the window signage on Nassau Street is excessive and should be eliminated from the design, and

WHEREAS: The committee requests that the glass signage canopy not protrude past the stone facade, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC approve the application with the above modifications to the proposed design.

res.july.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **149 Franklin St., application to install a new storefront**

WHEREAS: The design proposed to replace glass and metal/wood molded and paneled bays with full-height clear glass bays, and

WHEREAS: The proposed design is not in keeping with the character of the historic district, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

The committee requests to see the historical record as reference since the proposed treatment is different from the rest of the block, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC hold over this application until the applicant presents historical information to the committee.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **188 Church St., application to construct a new hotel**
- WHEREAS: The use of two different facade materials, white brick and limestone, on each facade of the building is inappropriate to the historic district; there is no precedent to using different materials on each facade, and
- WHEREAS: The horizontal window band at the top on each facade is mis-aligned in scale and design with the other windows and introduces a jarring and inappropriate design element, and
- WHEREAS: The absence of a cornice, a prevalent design element of the entire Duane Street historic block, is unfortunate, and
- WHEREAS: The use of differing window patterns on the two facades does not present an appropriate transition and has no precedent in the historic district, and
- WHEREAS: These differing facade designs, on both the ground floor and upper floors, present bizarre juxtapositions which are inappropriate, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant did not bring samples of materials, perspective and color drawings, site plans or photo boards for a full presentation. The committee usually requests a model for a new structure as part of the presentation, now
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 recommends LPC not approve the application as presented.

AT MEETING THIS ONE THEN REVISED SECOND ONE

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 30 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **60 Hudson St., application to create a new masonry opening on the second floor of the Worth Street facade**

WHEREAS: The purpose for the opening is to accommodate a Con Ed transformer to be installed inside the building, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that this is a “band-aid” type of application without knowing what other intrusion to the facade may be necessary in the future, and

WHEREAS: The haphazard opening of louver windows is a consistent problem for the outlook of this building. CB #1 requested in its previous resolutions for the building owner to come up with a master plan to address the problem. The committee felt strongly that a master plan should be in place and it is futile to address “piece-meal” applications, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends LPC not approve this application until a satisfactory master plan for the whole building is established.

res.july.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 25, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 30 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **60 Hudson St., application to create a new masonry opening on the second floor of the Worth Street facade**

WHEREAS: The purpose of the opening is to accommodate Con Edison-sourced transformers to be installed inside the building, and

WHEREAS: The committee feels that this is another “band-aid” application, and does not know what other intrusions to the facade may be deemed necessary by the owners of 60 Hudson Street in the future, and

WHEREAS: Although CB #1 has requested in its previous resolutions for the building’s owners to devise a master plan to address the continuing haphazard placement of window louvers and myriad other incursions on and attached to the facades, in fact no one master plan has emerged, and

WHEREAS: The committee believes unequivocally that a workable, LPC - approved master plan should be in place to which all further applications can be referenced, and that it is futile to address any more “piece-meal” requests regarding this building, and

WHEREAS: Although 60 Hudson Street’s owners have promised this committee repeatedly that steps would be taken to remove louvers from the lower floors and move them up behind setbacks, and that the present construction would require only one new louver, in fact, concurrent with the present application, the owners of 60 Hudson Street -- claiming previous LPC approval -- have already begun to remove six original mezzanine-level windows on Worth Street, to be replaced with louvers on the last remaining unbroken lower facade of the building, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that the LPC not approve this application, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 urges the LPC to require of the applicant that it establish a satisfactory master plan for the entire building, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 asks the LPC to re-examine the pending installation of the block-long stretch of new louvers on Worth Street.

res.july.00