

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 12 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 33 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED

RE: **102 North End Avenue, sidewalk cafe application for Suntech II International**

WHEREAS: The applicant has agreed to reduce the number of tables to 36 and chairs to 74 and to create a 10' sidewalk clearance at the corner of North End Avenue and Murray Street, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

Community Board #1 recommends approval of the referenced application with the revisions that were agreed to as cited above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	16 IN FAVOR	18 OPPOSED	1 ABSTAINED

RE: **Repaving of Moore Street (between Pearl and Water Streets)**

WHEREAS: Moore Street is a one-block cobblestone street located just north of Whitehall Street between Pearl and Water Streets, and

WHEREAS: This cobblestone street has fallen into serious disrepair resulting in large puddles of stagnant water and difficulty in keeping it clean, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 is dedicated to the retention of cobblestone streets in our historic districts and Moore Street is not located within a historic district, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has had great difficulty getting the City to maintain, repair or reconstruct any of our cobblestone streets because of the very high cost of such repairs, and

WHEREAS: Property owners and the Alliance for Downtown NY have requested Community Board approval to resurface this street, over the cobblestones, to create a smooth and clean asphalt roadway, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 approves the asphalt resurfacing of Moore Street.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	32 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **80 John Street, BSA application to allow a physical culture establishment**

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends the approval of the BSA application to allow a physical culture establishment (health club) at 80 John Street on the 1st floor.

res.jan.01

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 12 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 34 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED

RE: **15 South William Street, liquor license application**

WHEREAS: The applicant will conduct a restaurant for 125 people, and

WHEREAS: The hours of operation will be 12 PM until 2 AM, and

WHEREAS: The applicant will have only background music and agreed to add an adequate sound proofing, and

WHEREAS: The applicant will not be seeking a sidewalk cafe permit or a cabaret license, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application if approved, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends the SLA approve a liquor license for two years with the above agreed conditions of operation included in the application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 12 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 34 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED

RE: **1 Wall Street Court, liquor license application**

WHEREAS: The applicant will conduct a restaurant for 140 people, and

WHEREAS: The hours of operation will be 12 PM to 9 PM, and

WHEREAS: The applicant will not be seeking a sidewalk cafe permit or a cabaret license, and

WHEREAS: There will be no music live or otherwise on the premises, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends the SLA approve a liquor license for two years with the above agreed conditions of operation included in the application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 12 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 35 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED

RE: **281 West Broadway, sidewalk cafe renewal application for
Pepolino for 5 tables and 10 seats**

WHEREAS: The applicant has applied for a renewal of a sidewalk cafe permit,
and

WHEREAS: The application is for 5 tables and 10 seats, and

WHEREAS: The sidewalk cafe will be open until 11 PM on weeknights and 12
AM on weekends, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the 5 year renewal application for Pepolino.

res.jan.01

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 25 IN FAVOR 8 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

- RE: **217-219 West Broadway, application to demolish the existing building and construct a new six story plus penthouse building**
- WHEREAS: Since this application requires the demolition of an existing building within the Tribeca East Historic District, an issue which must be considered independently of the merits of the proposed new construction, and
- WHEREAS: The existing building in question is easily the most famous and one of the most felicitous in the Tribeca East Historic District, and
- WHEREAS: The existing building, while not a textbook example of a contributing property in terms of materials and style, is, nevertheless, so very much a part of the fabric of Tribeca that a significant group of residents appeared before the committee to plead for its survival, and
- WHEREAS: The building, known colloquially as “El Teddy’s,” is famous for its eclectic stucco facade, dazzling and even brilliant Pattern and Decoration Movement interpretation of the traditional Tribeca canopy, estimable Op Art window sculptures and legendary crown, and
- WHEREAS: The “El Teddy’s” building is an emblem of Tribeca and New York City and appears in almost every guidebook, and was, for over a decade, the opening sequence for a national network television program, appearing under the announcer’s phrase, “Live from New York” making the building synonymous all over the country with New York City’s creative, vivacious and cosmopolitan spirit, and
- WHEREAS: If those qualities – and the love of the community itself – do not contribute more than any other factors to the meaning of an historic district, then this committee is at a loss to define what a contributing structure is, and

WHEREAS: Notwithstanding the above, the committee praises architect Richard Cooke's sober, conscientious and compatible design for the proposed new building, and rich use of materials, and

WHEREAS: The committee does object to a lack of horizontality in the proposed base, and would prefer 2 over 2 windows in five penetrations across per band, rather than the fenestration presented, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: The committee urges the LPC to reject the destruction of 217-219 West Broadway as it currently exists, regardless of the merits or demerits of the proposed new infill building.

res.jan.01

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 35 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **132 Duane Street, application to replace a rear yard extension**

WHEREAS: The application calls for a relatively minor change to the rear yard of the building in Tribeca South Historic District, and

WHEREAS: Part of the proposal calls for the removal, restoration and reinstallation of original shutters from the ground floor extension to openings on higher floors, and

WHEREAS: The remainder of the proposal calls for raising the parapet of the rear yard extension 18 inches, and

WHEREAS: Both these elements are an improvement over existing conditions, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

The committee recommends that LPC approve this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 33 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **333 Greenwich Street, application to amend a previously approved ground floor design**

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.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 33 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **150 Nassau Street, application to enclose the arcade, alter the south elevation, renovate the storefronts and building entrances and construct a rooftop addition**

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.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 33 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **115 West Broadway, application to construct a rooftop stair
bulkhead**

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.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 3 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 22 IN FAVOR 10 OPPOSED 2 ABSTAINED

- RE: **123 Chambers Street, application to construct a two-story rooftop addition and install a new storefront**
- WHEREAS: The committee unanimously found the proposal to restore the facade of the building by restoring the original limestone, replacing the windows with new two-over-two wooden windows to be painted black, and to restoring the cornice/"yankee gutter" and removing the fire escape appropriate, and
- WHEREAS: The committee unanimously found the removal of the non-original storefront and the proposed new storefront being based on the historically appropriate design including a nine foot wooden door height, to be painted black, of the restored clear glass commercial storefront appropriate and was pleased by the sensitivity of the design of the storefront and its appropriateness for the historic streetscape and that the only signage was to be gold colored paint on the reflective glass of the storefront, and
- WHEREAS: The committee noted that the slight modification to the size of the fifth floor "vent" window on the West side of the building to a size of one foot six inches by one foot two inches appropriate and that the scale of the drawing for the "vent" window on the East side of the building was incorrectly shown on the plan as slightly larger than one foot six by one foot two inches, and
- WHEREAS: A majority of the committee was not pleased with scale of the proposed 18 foot two-story roof addition, which was partially visible from a number of locations, and although the first story addition was set back 14 feet from the front wall of the building and the second set back 30 feet and the addition was to be constructed of stucco and aluminum windows and a door on each story, which were to be painted a beige color to help the structure fade into the background of the AT&T building which was visible to the rear of the building and that whilst there will not be mechanical equipment on the roof, the plumbing vents would add to the visibility, it was felt that the scale was inappropriate for the

Historic District and that the proposal be scaled back to a single story addition which would not be visible from any location, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application subject to a roof addition being limited to one story and that there is no visibility of the addition from any location.

res.jan.01

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 35 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **388 Broadway, application to install a storefront**

WHEREAS: The committee endorses the applicants intention to restore the four cast iron columns and the cornice, and

WHEREAS: According to the Tribeca East Historic District designation report “part of the cast-iron cornice is visible; additional historic cast iron elements may remain behind the more recent storefront. A pair or wood and glass doors, a wood framed transom and a portion of the stepped vault remain in the southern bay”, and

WHEREAS: The committee requests that the two commercial bays be matched to the existing historic door in the southern bay in both proportion and materials, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

LPC approve the restoration of the cast iron elements (the columns and the cornice) and that LPC request that the applicant apply the wood and glass elements to the existing southern bay and to the two commercial bays.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 16, 2001

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 33 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **320 Pearl Street, application to revise proposal for a new hotel**

WHEREAS: The applicant requested to be calandered on the January 11, 2001
CB #1 Landmarks Committee agenda, and

WHEREAS: The applicant did not appear at the Committee meeting or notify
CB #1 that they would not appear, and

WHEREAS: This is the second time the applicant requested to appear before the
Committee and then, without notice, did not appear, and

WHEREAS: The Committee wants to be reassured that the materials presented
to it are the same materials presented to the Landmarks
Preservation Commission, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 votes to hold over the application, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 urges LPC to instruct the applicant to be more responsible
in its treatment of the members of CB #1 so when the applicant
requests to appear before CB #1's Landmarks Committee it does so
with all applicable and accurate materials, or the applicant at least
informs the Committee, with appropriate prior notice, of its
intention not to appear.