

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 3 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **Washington Market Park Expansion**
- WHEREAS: As part of the Greening of Greenwich St. project, the west sidewalk of Greenwich St. will be expanded between Duane St. and Chambers St. adjacent to Washington Market Park, and
- WHEREAS: To accommodate the growing number of children in this area, there is a need to expand the size of Washington Market Park to provide more active play areas for children which will comply with safety design criteria (regulations), and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 was presented a revised plan by Lee Weintraub, architect for the Washington Market Park Board, for the expansion of the park, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 supports the Farmer's Greenmarket and its placement on the sidewalk adjacent to Washington Market Park which could be accommodated within Lee Weintraub's, revised plan, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 has concerns at the n/w corner of Greenwich St. and Chambers St. with the safety of pedestrian traffic, especially the crisscross movement of the large number of students going to and from the many schools in the immediate area, and
- WHEREAS: The area outside the park entrance is a social space where people tend to congregate. The design of the expanded park fence into the sidewalk would block the main pedestrian north/south path along Greenwich St. and it creates a corner area at the park entrance that could potentially become a nuisance, now
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:
- CB #1 supports Lee Weintraub's revised plan for the expansion of Washington Market Park with the following modifications:
- 1) There should be an increase in width of sidewalk space at the n/w corner of Greenwich St. and Chambers St. to insure the safety of pedestrian crossing at this dangerous and congested intersection.
 - 2) The curved fence which will enclose the row of honey locust trees within the park should match the existing fence.
 - 3) The placement of this curve should be sensitive to the Friends of Greenwich St. wishes to preserve the canopy line of this row of trees within the constraints of the utility lines beneath the sidewalk.

- 4) The extended park entrance should be redesigned in order to provide a more open entrance area, including removal of the current fixed fence segment projecting at right angles into the sidewalk, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

Remaining elements of the Miller Highway be safely stored and incorporated into the Hudson River Park design.

res.sept.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 11 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 25 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Proposed film project “Time After, Time Along, The River” by Marie Jose Burki to be projected on the Holland Tunnel Ventilation Building**

WHEREAS: Minetta Brook, a non-profit art organization, has proposed the screening of a 90-minute film, “Time After, Time Along, The River”, on the Holland Tunnel New York River Ventilation Building at Pier 34 for a 2 week period from April 21, 2001 - May 6, 2001. This film is a sequence of stills with no sound projected and is to be screened twice each evening beginning at dusk, and

WHEREAS: This presentation would comply with all the rules and regulations of government agencies, and

WHEREAS: This presentation schedule could be adjusted at that time should there be any complaints, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 supports granting permission to this art project.

res.sept.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 11 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 25 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **79 Worth Street, BSA application to permit a physical culture and health establishment**

WHEREAS: CB #1 was presented with a BSA application to permit a physical culture and health establishment at 79 Worth Street, and

WHEREAS: This would be an extension of the pre-existing Eastern Athletic Club at 78 Leonard St., which has been a physical culture establishment with no history of any violations or complaints, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the BSA application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

**COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY AND
YOUTH AND EDUCATION**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 29 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Battery Park City proposed zoning text amendment**

WHEREAS: The Battery Park City Authority has put forth a zoning text amendment which:

- Designates public open space on Sites 18, 19, 23 and 24
- Modifies regulations governing mandatory street walls and building heights on Sites 18, 19, 23 and 24
- Reduces building heights on Sites 2 and 3 from 400 ft to 369 ft in the South Residential Neighborhood
- Extends the 135 ft front building wall along the full Battery Place frontage of Site 3
- Allows ground floor commercial uses on Sites 2 and 3
- Modifies the regulations governing permitted obstructions to reflect Unified Bulk Program guidelines, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has long sought to create permanent, high quality and durable ballfields on Sites 23 and 24 to serve our fast growing community, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board has also sought to address our severe lack of indoor recreation space in our district by building such a facility in Battery Park City, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 is appreciative that the Battery Park City Authority has agreed to retain and make permanent the ballfields on Sites 23 and 24, and

WHEREAS: The ballfields and indoor center, as currently proposed by the Battery Park City Authority in conjunction with these text changes, do not meet the needs of our community, and

WHEREAS: The residential population of our Lower Manhattan district is continuing to grow at an astounding pace and even the facilities being requested by the Community Board are inadequate to address the Battery Park City community or the current and future recreation needs of our overall district, and

WHEREAS: Given the very tight real estate market in Lower Manhattan, there are no other potential sites for locating ballfields in our district and very few for indoor recreation space, and

WHEREAS: The buildings proposed for Sites 23 and 24 as well as the massive building slated for Site 26 will cast additional shadows on the ballfields which will negatively impact the ballfields, and,

WHEREAS: The Battery Park City Authority declined numerous earlier opportunities to work with the Community Board over recent years to redistribute bulk to other sites which were not adjacent to the ballfields and therefore would not have cast the kind of detrimental shadows now projected for the ballfields, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board agreed to an earlier text amendment allowing for the construction of the Embassy Suites Hotel and movie theatre complex in return for explicit commitments from the BPCA to retain the ballfields and make them permanent, and

WHEREAS: Many issues raised by the Community Board in the course of many months of discussions with the Battery Park City Authority concerning the design and programming of the ballfields and indoor community center remain unresolved, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 regretfully rejects the proposed Zoning Text Amendments (N 010057 ZRM) put forth for Battery Park City unless the Battery Park City Authority resolves the following critical concerns and issues to our mutual satisfaction:

- The buildings located on Sites 23 and 24 should be repositioned, reduced in height or otherwise modified to reduce their detrimental shadow on the ballfields
- The indoor community recreation center should be increased in size to a minimum of 45,000 square feet and include:
 - two gymnasiums of 9,000 s.f. each with dividers which should also be suitable for performances
 - teen game room
 - senior citizen room including a kitchen
 - art room
 - music/dance space
 - toddler, pre-school aged space
 - photography room including a dark room
 - community room suitable for and available to local organizations for meetings
- Given the extensive shadows cast on the ballfields, coupled with the on-going growth of our community, lights should be installed on the ballfields which would also permit increased utilization of the fields into the early evening (particularly during soccer season from September through November)

- A community advisory committee should be established to oversee the fields, the community center and the programming of these facilities. CB #1 should appoint one half of the members of this committee
- Our local leagues (Downtown Little League and Downtown Soccer League) should be assured of priority access to the fields during their playing season. They use the fields during weekday afternoons (primarily for practice) and most of the day on weekends
- The indoor facility should be exclusively available for use by organizations which serve the population of Community Board #1. 50% of the hours should be programmed by the BPC Parks Corporation and 50% should be set aside for programs by CB #1 based groups and schools
- The fields should have a very durable turf intended for steady, heavy use by the local leagues and other groups
- Storage space for the two local leagues and an office for them should be built into the Parks Corporation space
- The fields should include a concession stand (run in conjunction with the leagues), a pitcher's mound, a scoreboard and an announcer's booth
- Provisions should be jointly made for the leagues to operate during construction. Consideration should be given to staging construction to allow for use of a portion of the field during construction. Other nearby sites should be made available for league use as well – Rockefeller Park (for children 9 and under), Vesey Green, Governor's Island, Central Park and the East River ballfields
- The tennis courts and basketball courts which are now adjacent to the ballfields and are scheduled for removal should be relocated to another site within Battery Park City
- The cost of these new facilities should be borne by the BPCA annual surplus. These costs should not be passed on to current residents of Battery Park City.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **100 Broadway, application to install new storefronts**

WHEREAS: The owner of 100 Broadway proposes to bring forward to the front row of two rows of columns the two-story street level glass facade, and

WHEREAS: The glass is presently divided by an anodized black aluminum spandrel between the first and second floor, and

WHEREAS: The glass above the spandrel is a dark tint and clear glass is proposed for below the spandrel, and

WHEREAS: An 1898 photograph of the facade, which the Landmarks Preservation Commission has not yet seen, clearly shows an attractive decorated bronze spandrel, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 requests that the glass both below and above the spandrel be clear and that, rather than the proposed black anodized aluminum spandrel, a spandrel be replicated to reflect the decorated bronze spandrel in the 1898 photograph, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT: With the above considerations, CB #1 does not oppose the application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 1 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Clock at Millennium Triangle**

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the installation by the Alliance for Downtown NY of a four sided clock on a pedestal at Millennium Triangle (just south of City Hall Park) along with a small plaque dedicating the clock to banker David Rockefeller.

res.sept.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 12 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 30 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **Commercial Signage Zoning Text Amendment**
- WHEREAS: There is a very serious problem with regard to the proliferation of commercial signs in CB #1 and throughout the City, and
- WHEREAS: Most of these signs have been installed illegally in violation of existing City regulations, and
- WHEREAS: Current zoning provides few regulations for signs in manufacturing districts, except to prohibit advertising signs near parks and arterial highways, and
- WHEREAS: Large flexible vinyl signs which are attached to the sides of buildings are increasingly visible in both commercial and manufacturing districts, and
- WHEREAS: The proposed text amendment is intended to not only create zoning regulations for signs in manufacturing districts (similar to those in C8 Districts) but also seeks to:
- limit the conversions of accessory business signs to advertising signs near arterial highways
 - establish controls for flashing signs along the waterfront
 - prohibit signs with excessive illumination levels, and
- WHEREAS: There is also legislation being introduced in the City Council intended to strengthen enforcement of signage laws by increasing fines and allowing for civil enforcement proceedings against outdoor advertising companies, now
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 supports the proposed commercial signage zoning text amendment (N010065ZRY), as well as City Council legislation to strengthen enforcement of signage laws, and
- BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 strongly feels that there needs to be substantially more enforcement of both existing and new signage regulations and we recommend that the Department of Buildings survey existing signage to determine which signs are legal and illegal and establish a new enforcement unit exclusively to deal with illegal, non-conforming signage, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 requests the removal of all currently illegal (non-accessory) signs located in proximity to arterial highways and parks including:

- FDR Drive
- Route 9A
- Brooklyn Bridge/Park Row
- Battery and Holland Tunnels, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 urges that the City place a moratorium on all new signs pending action on this proposed text amendment, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 request that a special study be conducted to assess the safety of animated electric signs, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 urges the Mayor to swiftly appoint a new Buildings Commissioner who should devote the needed resources to address this serious problem.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 3 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 24 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **Holiday Crafts Fair on Whitehall Street**

WHEREAS: A Holiday Crafts Fair has been proposed for Whitehall Street between Stone and Beaver Streets to run from November 24th to December 24th, and

WHEREAS: A Holiday Crafts Fair has been conducted in Lower Manhattan for a number of years, and

WHEREAS: The beneficiaries of this crafts fair are the NYC Police Museum and the Forum's Children's Foundation which arranges for life saving operations on terminally ill children from impoverished nations around the world, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 approves the proposed Holiday Crafts Fair on Whitehall Street from November 24th to December 24, 2000

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **73 Hudson St., application to construct two rooftop additions**

WHEREAS: The Board has no objection to the enlargement of a rooftop mechanical room and the addition of another, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

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

res.sept.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **23 Wall Street, restoration in conjunction with the new New York Stock Exchange Headquarters**
- WHEREAS: The Board has reviewed this application specifically, and without regard to the design scheme for the overall New York Stock Exchange project, and
- WHEREAS: The 23 Wall Street alteration and restoration plans are generally of merit, including removal of the non-original dormers, and
- WHEREAS: Signage placement is of some concern, including (1) the asymmetrical location of new signage at the front entrance, on an otherwise very symmetrical main facade where no signage had existed previously, and including (2) a large amount of recessed side window signage (to the extent that the latte is within the Board's purview), and
- WHEREAS: The proposed new skylight should not be visible from any street sightline, now
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application, after taking into consideration the above issues.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **82 Franklin Street, application to legalize storefront installed without LPC permits**
- WHEREAS: This application attempts to legalize a storefront virtually completed without prior Community Board review and LPC permitting, and
- WHEREAS: It is the Board's understand that the LPC has since reviewed the installation, and
- WHEREAS: The Board concurs with the LPC that mullions separating elements of the front plate windows need to be reapportioned, and
- WHEREAS: The Board also concurs with the LPC that the color of the wooden infill be darkened to ebony, and
- WHEREAS: The Board believes that the proposed cream paint details actually be cream colored, and not the white paint currently applied to the facade, now
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application, with the above provisos.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **401 Greenwich Street, application to construct a new six story building**
- WHEREAS: This application calls for the demolition of a non-contributing one-story garage built in the 1940's, and
- WHEREAS: The blockfront upon which the proposed new structure will be situated is composed of relatively undistinguished buildings of varying dimensions and uses, and
- WHEREAS: The proposal is for a commercial building (including a top-floor caretakers' residence) whose overall height, floor-to-ceiling heights and careful massing are not only sensitive but praiseworthy, and
- WHEREAS: The proposed building's many details are very fussy, and their articulation is not at all appropriate to the Tribeca West Historic District:
- 1) the bris-soleil is out of place,
 - 2) the awning at the front entrance is objectionable,
 - 3) the skeletal metal framing suggestive of a loading dock is absurd, and
 - 4) the spandrel glass illumination is imaginative but wildly out of balance with the landmark district, and
- WHEREAS: Some members object to the roof trellis as de trop, and
- WHEREAS: Some members take exception to the enormity of the proposed vertical painted wall sign along the building's south edge, although others believe a modified version would be in keeping with the type of commercial signage found throughout historic Tribeca, now
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission reject this application and refer back to the Community Board any revised proposal for review.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **257-263 Water Street, application to construct a ramp and install signage and lighting**

WHEREAS: The Board does not find the handicapped-accessible ramp objectionable, and

WHEREAS: The proposed storefront lighting is appropriate to the Seaport area, and

WHEREAS: The applicant did not provide a sample of the proposed plastic signage material at the time of the committee hearing, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

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

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **320 Pearl Street, application to construct a new hotel**

WHEREAS: The applicant did not appear before the committee, and

WHEREAS: The applicant did not appear after insisting that the proposal be scheduled on the committee's agenda, and

WHEREAS: This is not the first time that the applicant has apparently misrepresented the Community Board's review to the LPC, and vice versa, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 urges the LPC to hold over this proposal, and make clear that the applicant's misleading tactics are not in the best interest of the community, the LPC, or the applicant himself.

res.sept.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **133 West Broadway, application to remove and replace a portion of existing storefront; create new residential entrance and construct a stair bulkhead on roof**

WHEREAS: The applicant did not appear before the committee, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: The Landmarks Preservation Commission hold over this application until the applicant makes its presentation before the Landmarks Committee of Community Board #1, Manhattan.

res.sept.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **188 Church Street, application to construct a new hotel**

WHEREAS: The applicant did not appear before the committee, and

WHEREAS: The applicant did not appear after insisting that the proposal be scheduled on the committee's agenda, and

WHEREAS: This is not the first time that the applicant has apparently misrepresented the Community Board's review to the LPC, and vice versa, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 urges the LPC to hold over this proposal, and make clear that the applicant's misleading tactics are not in the best interest of the community, the LPC, or the applicant himself.

res.sept.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 22 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Proposed aggregate noise bill, legislation intended to regulate noise emanating from multiple sources**

WHEREAS: The proposed legislation is intended to regulate noise emanating from multiple sources throughout the City, and

WHEREAS: The current rules and regulations do not either address a particular source or level of noise, by an operator or landlord, and

WHEREAS: The source of these noises have effected the quality of life for the residents of New York City, and

WHEREAS: The legislation is a step in the right direction and has the support of the Mayor's office, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 supports the proposed legislation before the City Council.

res.sept.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 24 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **2 South End Avenue, sidewalk cafe application for an unenclosed sidewalk cafe with 38 tables and 78 seats**
- WHEREAS: The applicant has operated a restaurant since 1994 at this location with no record of complaints and has applied for an unenclosed sidewalk café to be open 7 days a week from 10 AM to 10 PM, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant has agreed to 31 tables and 63 seats with a 30” removable railing surrounding the tables, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant has agreed to keep open a walk way through the arcade for pedestrians, now
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 recommends approval of this application for one year.

res.sept.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 24 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **53 Ann Street, application for an on premises liquor license**

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 has tried to reach the applicant, and

WHEREAS: The applicants phone number and address appear to be incorrect,
now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 recommends the SLA not process any application from this proposed business until ownership has been verified and they first appear before CB #1 for review.

res.sept.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 1 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 24 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **121-133 Hudson Street, application for an on premises liquor license**
- WHEREAS: The applicant has applied for an on premises liquor license, and
- WHEREAS: The application is for seating of 100 people in the dining room, 30 people in the private dining room on the cellar level and 33 people at the bar with the entry on Hudson St., and
- WHEREAS: The hours of operation will be M-F 12 noon to 12 AM, and 10:30 AM to 12 AM on Saturday and Sunday, and
- WHEREAS: The owner has stated that there will be no live music and the premises will not be operated as a lounge and they are not applying for an outdoor cafe permit on their loading dock this year, and
- WHEREAS: The owner and representatives stated they will arrange for valet parking for their customers and agreed to put "black cars" on call away from the premises and inform their customers when they call for reservations of such, and
- WHEREAS: The owner agreed to reappear before the committee if complaints are received about parking in the area, now
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 recommends approval of an on premises liquor license with the above agreed upon conditions.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 24 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **134 Reade St., application for an on premises liquor license**

WHEREAS: The applicant has applied for an on premises liquor license for a restaurant seating 90 people to be open 7 days a week, and

WHEREAS: The applicant has agreed to operate from 12 PM to 11 PM Monday to Thursday and 12 PM to 12 AM on Friday to Sunday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant stated that there will be no live music and the premises will not be operated as a lounge, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 recommend approval of an on premises liquor license with the above agreed upon conditions.

res.sept.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 19, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 22 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Proposed aggregate noise bill**

WHEREAS: Noise is the number one quality of life concern in New York City,
and

WHEREAS: The proposed amendment to section 24.237 of the administrative
code would prohibit a person from operating one or more
circulation devices such as air conditioners in violation of the
applicable noise control standards, and

WHEREAS: The purpose of this legislation is to prohibit the operation of
multiple pieces of circulation devices that in the aggregate, exceed
the applicable standard of 45 decibels, and

WHEREAS: By amending the code to clarify that the circulation equipment
standard applies to one or more pieces of equipment under the
control of an operator, DEP can enforce this provision of the Noise
Code more effectively, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 urges the City Council to approve the proposed legislation
as quickly as possible.