

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 21, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	28 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Traffic regulations prohibiting riding bicycles on sidewalks**

WHEREAS: New York City Traffic Regulations forbid adults riding bicycles on sidewalks at any time and mandate that bicycle riders have to follow all provisions of the NYC Traffic Rules as a car would, and

WHEREAS: These rules apply at all hours of the day and night and to both bicycles used by commercial establishments as well as being used by people for recreational use, and

WHEREAS: Violators of these rules are subject to a summons, and

WHEREAS: These rules are there to prevent accidental injury to both adults and children who may inadvertently get in the way of bicycles, and

WHEREAS: There appears to be inadequate enforcement of these rules at Battery Park City, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 requests that both the NYPD and the Battery Park City Authority work to design a comprehensive plan, including education and enforcement, to remedy this situation and to give greater priority to correcting this problem.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 21, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	12 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	26 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Canal Park**

WHEREAS: The New York City Parks Department presented CB #1 a plan for “Canal Park” within the footprint defined by NYC/NYS DOT at the triangle on Canal Street between Washington Street and West Street (Route 9A), and

WHEREAS: This park will be a public park built by NYS DOT as part of the Route 9A Reconstruction Project and is to be maintained by the NYC Parks Department thereafter, and

WHEREAS: The plan presented is based on the historical design of the original (Canal Street Park) by Calvert Vaux and Samuel Parsons, and is adjusted to accommodate all the accessory utilities at this site, and

WHEREAS: The park would have a City Hall Park type fence on the outside of the park, with an option to be locked at night which will be reviewed with the Community Board at a later time, and

WHEREAS: The shorter fences on the inside of the park will have gates to allow access to the grass lawn areas. Signage to “keep dogs on leashes” would be posted, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 appreciates the effort, timeliness and sensitivity to the community exhibited by the Parks Department, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 acknowledges the efforts of the community groups and community members who worked on the historical research of the original park, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 supports the NYC Parks Department plan for Canal Park, now

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 urges NYS DOT to expedite the completion of this project.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 21, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	28 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Proposed traffic modification at the Holland Tunnel Rotary**

WHEREAS: The existing traffic patterns at the St. John's Rotary exit of the Holland Tunnel, are problematic and cause gridlock and major back ups, and

WHEREAS: In an effort to mitigate the difficulties at these exits, the Port Authority (P.A.) presented CB #1 with a short term experimental plan for exits 1 and 2, as well as a longer term, capital improvement plan for exits 3, 3A and 4, and

WHEREAS: The experimental plan at exits 1 and 2 would begin by the end of November and last for 90 days, and

- Exit 1 would allow only two lanes for traffic to precede west towards West Street connecting to Route 9A North and South. The right turn onto Hudson Street would no longer be allowed. In coordination with NYC DOT, Laight Street parking regulations would also be adjusted to increase efficiency of movement.
- Exit 2 would direct traffic to either make a right turn onto Hudson Street heading north and uptown or onto Beach Street heading west to Greenwich Street and then south.
- There would be new signage to indicate the new patterns at Exits 1 & 2 as well as new paint and stripping. There would be no permanent physical changes.
- These changes would be monitored and the Port Authority will come back to CB #1 within 90 days to give the results of their findings.

WHEREAS: In the projected long term plan, exit 3 would allow traffic to proceed east only onto Beach Street from Ericsson Place. There would be a new exit 3A built that would direct traffic onto Varick Street heading only south and downtown. The traffic pattern at exit 4 would remain the same onto Canal Street.

WHEREAS: The Port Authority would release to public pedestrian use its part of the triangle directly adjacent to exit 4 on Varick Street, Laight Street and Canal Street which is now being used as a parking area, and

WHEREAS:

The Port Authority has just instituted new parking regulations changes without any consultation with local businesses whose legal and permitted loading and unloading operations will be impacted, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 endorses traffic changes at exits 1 & 2 with the following recommendations and considerations:

- The P.A. should pay specific attention to exit 1 is merging of the local traffic lane on Laight Street into the two lane tunnel exit and its impact on the pedestrian crossing
- The P.A. should consult the businesses on Laight Street and ensure that there is no disruption to them before asking NYC DOT to change any parking regulations permanently.
- The signage out of the tunnel should be visually efficient and placed in such a way as to help the motorist anticipate the different patterns at these exits
- When presenting the results of their findings to CB #1 within 90 days the P.A. should have more detailed plans for exits 3, 3A and 4.
- The P.A. should consider adding extra lanes in the Rotary to funnel traffic more efficiently.
- The P.A. should present plans for the necessary improvements and repairs to the pedestrian footbridge on Laight Street
- The P.A. should work with the 1st PCT to improve the street parking at Ericsson Place and at the proposed exits 3, 3A and 4
- The P.A. should pay attention to the aesthetics and the greening as well as access into the interior of the rotary, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 supports the offer for the release of the triangle area adjacent to exit 4. There should be pedestrian safety devices and sidewalks should be installed at this vulnerable area of Canal Street. This area should be developed as a public amenity, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

P.A. should also look at improving the pedestrian crossings and traffic patterns at the entrance to the Holland Tunnel at Hudson Street and Canal Street.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 21, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 25 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 2 ABSTAINED

RE: **43-45 Walker Street, application to construct a two story roof addition and replace the store infill**

WHEREAS: The proposed work to the storefront: installing new wooden black painted doors, using clear glass, repairing the decorative grills and signage limited to the building's number "45" is considered appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The proposed work to the front and rear of the main body of the building: installing new wooden stone painted double hung clear insulated glass windows, repairing the cornice, removing the fire escape, restoring the cast iron columns, replacing the back sky lights, repairing and painting stone colored metal shutters on the back of the building is considered appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The two story addition with 18' front and 40' rear set-backs and a total additional height of 25' including the mechanical equipment on an existing 6 story building which was highly visible from the mock-up seemed inappropriate as was the excessive use of glass, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC reject this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 21, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

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

WHEREAS The applicant has not performed any historical research and the replacement of a portion of the non-original storefront with aluminum and glass was not appropriate and the Committee advised the applicant to take this opportunity to replace the storefront with one which is more contextual and historically appropriate, and

WHEREAS The awning was a non- approved addition and the Committee felt that the awning should be removed and that the applicant should consider more appropriate signage in keeping with the historic district, and

WHEREAS The reduced height (now at six feet) of the copper clad stair bulkhead, whilst highly visible was an acceptable addition, and

WHEREAS The new wooden one-over-one hung and insulated clear glass windows were acceptable and the repairs to the window lintels were welcome, and

WHEREAS The repairs to the cornice was welcomed, and the striping back of the painted brick and the colors were appropriate, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that the current application be rejected and the applicant work with the LPC staff to develop a more appropriate proposal.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 21, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **23 South William Street, application to construct a two story roof top addition and alter rear facade and lot line windows**

WHEREAS: The Committee found the proposal to alter the commercial building into a residential (2/3 apartments per floor) including steam cleaning the building and installing new wooden clear glass windows and the inclusion of new window apertures to provide cohesion to the original concept, and

WHEREAS: The roof addition of an infill of existing brick panels, being made of glass and aluminum and being set back 20' on the William Street elevation and that there was limited visibility from the South Street Seaport Historic District and none from William and Stone Streets was considered appropriate, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC approve this application.

res.nov.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 21, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **55 Wall Street, application to install a metal and glass enclosure at the terrace on the second floor**

WHEREAS: The Committee found the proposal to install a temporary enclosure of five bays (58') in length on the right side of the second floor terrace of the Regent Wall Street Hotel over the months of September to April reasonable, and

WHEREAS: The materials of clear lexan plastic (1 1/2" thick) and bronze fixings and brackets were appropriate and that the fittings to the building would be to existing fixings as the canopy was free standing and would be without signage, and

WHEREAS: The Committee recommended that LPC request notification from the owner when the enclosure is taken down in order to ensure it remains a temporary addition, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC approve this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 21, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	25 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **320 Pearl St., modified plan for new hotel**

WHEREAS: The Committee found the changes to the design by the removal of one story; the elimination of the angled set-backs; the raising of the height of the stone base to align with the base of the adjacent building to the north; and the simplification of the ground floor facade and signage to be more appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The large plate glass windows directly above the ground floor entrances are not contextual to the South Street Seaport Historic District (SSSHD), and

WHEREAS: The entrance doors to the hotel are recessed 18" and the entrance doors to the commercial space are recessed 8" and the Committee felt the entrance doors to both the hotel and the commercial space should be equally recessed, and

WHEREAS: Although the roof cornice now aligns with the roof cornice of the adjacent building to the north, the proposed building rises one additional story at the street wall above the cornice line before the first set-back adding to the appearance of oversize mass and bulk, particularly given that Pearl Street slopes dramatically down to the south, and

WHEREAS: The building should be further reduced in height by one story and the first set-back should more appropriately be at the roof cornice, and

WHEREAS: Unlike other new construction in the SSSHD, all of which have floor-to-ceiling heights that match the higher floor-to-ceiling heights of the historic buildings in the SSSHD, this proposal, by cramming six stories into the space of five stories, is highly non-contextual to the SSSHD, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC reject this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 21, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	27 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **188 Church St., modified plan for new hotel**

WHEREAS: The application presented to the Committee represents insignificant changes to the proposal previously presented to the Committee, and

WHEREAS: The objections stated in CB #1's October 17, 2000 resolution regarding this application still stand:

- The translucent canopies on the Church Street facade have no precedent whatsoever in any Tribeca historic district;
- The door and window treatments on Duane Street are out-of-context with the rest of the block;
- The roof bulkheads are ill-defined and the HVAC headhouse is much too visible;
- The attempt to disguise two interior stories (to be used as hotel rooms within a one-story street-level exterior shell, the lower story half below grade and the upper story's floor at eye level to Church Street) with a series of retractable opaque metal screens at street level on Church Street is embarrassing and an affront to good design in any context, much less in an historic district;
- The Duane Street floor-to-ceiling heights should more closely match those of the buildings immediately to the west, thereby reducing the total number of interior floors;
- All these issues begging the question of whether a 66-unit building on a conventional 25-by-100 foot lot with a low F.A.R. ratio on a quintessential Tribeca west Historic District loft block is appropriate in the first place; and

WHEREAS: Any changes to the proposal that would affect the structural design and the construction of the building could have a severe impact on the structural integrity of the adjacent building on Duane Street, and

WHEREAS: The Committee received a petition representing overwhelming opposition to this proposal and a neighborhood study outlining in detail perceived flaws in the design and the negative impact on the surrounding community, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 urges LPC to reject this application.