

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 13 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused  
PUBLIC VOTE: 1 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 42 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 360 Broadway, liquor license application for Lower Manhattan Pool  
Gallery Inc.

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate an art gallery along with an eating and  
drinking establishment in a 3000 square foot space at 360 Broadway, and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 6:00 PM until 3:00  
AM Thursday through Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The proposed location is adjacent to several residential buildings and some  
local residents have expressed strong concerns about the environmental  
impact of this establishment on the neighborhood, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 shares these concerns and questions the need for an art gallery to  
sponsor evening entertainment, and

WHEREAS: A venue of this size, to be run by artists without experience operating this  
sort of eating and drinking establishment, is also very problematic, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 strongly opposes the new liquor license application for Lower  
Manhattan Pool Gallery Inc. at 360 Broadway and requests the State  
Liquor Authority hold a 500 foot hearing to address the above concerns.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 14 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 41 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 134 West Broadway, sidewalk cafe renewal for Jada Restaurant Inc. d/b/a  
Petite Abeill

WHEREAS: The applicant has applied for a sidewalk cafe renewal license for 7 tables  
and 14 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed hours of operation will be 8 AM until midnight Monday  
through Thursday, 8 AM until 1:00 AM on Friday and Saturday and noon  
until midnight on Sunday, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has not received any complaints of loud noise or opposition from  
the local community, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not object to the sidewalk café renewal license for Jada  
Restaurant Inc. d/b/a Petite Abeill at 134 West Broadway for a period of  
two years.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed outdoor restaurant seating for Stone Street between Coentis Alley and Hanover Square including Mill Lane by Ahead Realty from April 1, 2006 through November 30, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street activity permit filed by Ahead Realty scheduled for April 1, 2006 to November 30, 2006 during the hours of 10 AM to 1 AM on Stone Street between Coentis Alley and Hanover Square.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Water Street between Fulton Street and Broad Street by Ziva USA Inc. for May 6, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by Ziva USA Inc. scheduled for May 6, 2006 during the hours of 9 AM – 7 PM on Water Street between Fulton Street and Broad Street.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Maiden Lane between South Street and Water Street by Community Board #1 for May 19, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by Community Board #1 scheduled for May 19, 2006 during the hours of 9 AM – 7 PM on Maiden Lane between South and Water Streets.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Maiden Lane between South Street and Water  
Street by Community Board #1 for June 16, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by  
Community Board #1 scheduled for June 16, 2006 during the hours of 9  
AM – 7 PM on Maiden Lane between South and Water Streets.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Water Street between Moore Street and Fulton Street by the Pearl Street Park Association for July 4, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by the Pearl Street Park Association scheduled for July 4, 2006 during the hours of 8 AM – 10 PM on Water Street between Moore and Fulton Streets.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Maiden Lane between South Street and Water Street by Community Board #1 for July 7, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by Community Board #1 scheduled for July 7, 2006 during the hours of 9 AM – 7 PM on Maiden Lane between South and Water Streets.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street event for Water Street between Broad and Beekman  
Streets by the Team Championships International for August 5 and 6,  
2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street activity permit by  
Team Championship International scheduled for August 5 and 6, 2006.  
During the hours of 8 AM – 5 PM on August 5 and 8 AM to 11:30 AM on  
August 6 on Water Street between Broad and Beekman Streets.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Maiden Lane between South Street and Water  
Street by Community Board #1 for August 11, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by  
Community Board #1 scheduled for August 11, 2006 during the hours of 9  
AM – 7 PM on Maiden Lane between South and Water Streets.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Water Street between Fulton and Moore Streets by  
the Seaport Community Coalition for August 19, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by the  
Seaport Community Coalition scheduled for August 19, 2006 during the  
hours of 9 AM – 7 PM on Water Street between Fulton and Moore Streets.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Maiden Lane between South Street and Water  
Street by Community Board #1 for September 15, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by  
Community Board #1 scheduled for September 15, 2006 during the hours  
of 9 AM – 7 PM on Maiden Lane between South and Water Streets.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 11 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Old Slip between South Street and Water Street by  
the NYC Police Museum for September 29, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by the  
NYC Police Museum scheduled for September 29, 2006 during the hours  
of 8 AM – 8 PM on Old Slip (north side only) between South and Water  
Streets.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 11 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Water Street between Fulton and Broad Streets by  
the Bowling Green Association for October 9, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by the  
Bowling Green Association scheduled for October 9, 2006 during the  
hours of 9 AM – 7 PM on Water between Fulton and Broad Streets.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Maiden Lane between South Street and Water  
Street by Community Board #1 for October 20, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by  
Community Board #1 scheduled for October 20, 2006 during the hours of  
9 AM – 7 PM on Maiden Lane between South and Water Streets.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 11 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street fair for Water Street between Fulton and Broad Streets by  
John Huess House for November 10, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street fair sponsored by John  
Huess House scheduled for November 10, 2006 during the hours of 9 AM  
– 7 PM on Water Street between Fulton and Broad Streets.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 35 Cedar Street, liquor license application for BMD Pastry LLC

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with approximately 18 tables and 60 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 7:00 AM until 10:30 PM Sunday through Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to have background music only as appropriate for an establishment located where it is, and to provide adequate sound-proofing, and

WHEREAS: The applicant represented that it will not be seeking a cabaret license nor a sidewalk café license, and

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

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the liquor license application for BMD Pastry LLC at 35 Cedar Street for a period of two years subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 6 Murray Street, transfer liquor license application for NYC UK  
Hospitality Consultants LLC

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with 16 tables and 64 seats  
and with 15 seats in the bar, and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 11 AM until 11 PM  
Sunday through Thursday and 11 AM to 1 AM Friday and Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to have music as appropriate for an establishment  
located where it is, and

WHEREAS: The applicant represented that it will not be seeking a cabaret license nor a  
sidewalk café license, and

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

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the liquor license application for NYC UK  
Hospitality Consultants LLC at 6 Murray Street for a period of two years  
subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions  
set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH & EDUCATION

COMMITTEE VOTE: 11 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 37 In Favor 1 Opposed 2 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Beekman Street School Catchment Area

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 supports and expects that the planned Beekman Street school will begin construction on schedule, and

WHEREAS: This new 630 seat school is intended to serve grades pre-Kindergarten through 8<sup>th</sup> grade, and

WHEREAS: Recognizing that our Lower Manhattan district is experiencing dramatic population growth and that it is critical that we provide additional school seats now to address this serious issue, Community Board #1 received wide support and a commitment from the Mayor, the School Chancellor and Dept. of Education, the Governor, the LMDC and all our local elected officials to build the new Beekman Street School, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board is particularly grateful for the aggressive and effective work of Speaker Sheldon Silver and Council Member Alan Gerson for lining up the support of all the necessary governmental agencies and for persuading the developer of the Beekman Street building, Forest City Ratner, to set aside the needed space for the new school at this location, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 acknowledges that the presence of high performing local schools including PS 234, PS 89, and PS 150 have contributed greatly to making Lower Manhattan an attractive place for families to move to and raise their children in our community, and

WHEREAS: These schools, particularly PS 234, are now either seriously overcrowded or approaching that level and their appeal to local parents and children will wane unless we take immediate steps to relieve this overcrowding, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 has solid data indicating that our local Community Board population is growing at a very high rate, with over 15,600 new units of housing scheduled to be completed in the very near future, and

WHEREAS: Additional housing is being contemplated in large parcels such as Greenwich South, the World Trade Center site, 250 Water Street, the South Street Seaport, etc., which could easily swell this number further, and

WHEREAS: This population growth and overcrowding is precisely the reason that all the key decision makers have agreed to build this new school to serve the Community Board #1 district, and

WHEREAS: It is essential that the new school not only relieve the pressure on local schools created by this population growth but also be a high performing academic school to attract local parents, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 is also interested in offering local parents a choice of several excellent schools to which to send their children while at the same time assuring parents that they will be able to send their children to their closest local school, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 is also sensitive not to recreate history and the divisive situation that existed in our community for many years whereby children living east of Broadway were zoned for a lower performing local school resulting in the vast majority of these families either sending their children to private or parochial schools or being forced to provide deliberately inaccurate addresses in the PS 234 catchment area, since such a situation would fail to serve the growing population or relieve school overcrowding, and

WHEREAS: We are very pleased that we have a wonderful opportunity to create additional elementary and middle school seats to enable our Lower Manhattan Community Board #1 district to continue to grow and thrive as we move forward, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 intends to present its recommendations on the educational and administrative configuration of the Beekman Street School (*e.g.*, PreK-8 or PS/IS, etc., school designation) in a separate resolution following additional discussion (and, if a PS/IS configuration were to be recommended, this separate resolution would also address zoning for the IS portion of the new school), now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 strongly urges the NYC Department of Education and Region 9 to zone the new Beekman Street elementary school to serve the Community Board #1 district so that these additional school seats would serve the surging population of Community Board #1, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that the Beekman Street school assure seats to students residing east of Broadway and south of the Brooklyn Bridge and take all steps to maintain a rigorous academic environment and high academic levels of achievement, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 further recommends that after accommodating all interested children residing east of Broadway and south of the Brooklyn Bridge, local children residing elsewhere within Community Board #1 have first preference for remaining seats in the school, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that this approach also be taken with PS 234 and PS 89 whereby after accommodating the local children in their immediate local catchment zones, with the new PS 234 catchment zone shrinking to include its current catchment area except for those living east of Broadway and south of the Brooklyn Bridge, these two schools would also give first preference for remaining seats to local children residing elsewhere in Community Board #1, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: This proposed zoning approach would offer local parents a choice of elementary schools, through the variance request process, which we firmly believe is the best approach for all concerned and in particular our local children, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Any east of Broadway children attending PS 234 prior to the opening of the Beekman Street school, as well as their siblings, will be eligible to continue attending PS 234 through graduation, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 strongly reiterates its demand that the new schools promised to our Lower Manhattan community, the Beekman Street School and the PS 234 annex, be immediately restored to the City budget so that their construction and opening is not delayed to the great detriment of this community.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 13 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused  
PUBLIC VOTE: 1 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 42 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 156 Chambers Street, wine and beer license application for Tribeca  
Kitchenette, Inc.

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with 12 tables and 55 seats,  
and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 8:00 AM until 11:00  
PM Sunday through Thursday, 9:00 AM to 11:00 PM on Friday and  
Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant represented that it will not be seeking a cabaret license and  
are uncertain if they will apply for a sidewalk café license in the future,  
and

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

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the restaurant wine license application for Tribeca  
Kitchenette Inc. located at 156 Chambers Street for a period of two years.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 45 Peck Slip, unenclosed sidewalk café application for DoDo – Birds Inc.,  
for 10 tables and 20 seats

WHEREAS: The applicant has applied for a sidewalk cafe license for 10 tables and 20  
seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed hours of operation will be 8 AM until 9 PM Monday  
through Saturday, noon until 9 PM on Sunday, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has not received any complaints or opposition from the local  
community, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not object to the unenclosed sidewalk café license for DoDo-  
Birds Inc. located at 45 Peck Slip for a period of two years.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: 1 Pace Plaza, liquor license application for Lackmann Food Service Inc. at Pace University, 1 Pace Plaza

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with approximately 57 tables and 175 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 8 AM to midnight Monday-Friday, 10 AM to midnight Saturday and Sunday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant will not have any type of music, and

WHEREAS: The applicant represented that it will not be seeking a cabaret license nor a sidewalk café license, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed that alcoholic beverages will be served during school sponsored events only, and

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

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the liquor license application for Lackmann Food Service Inc. at 1 Pace University, 1 Pace Plaza for a period of two years.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street activity permit for MS Walk on John Street between South and Front Streets by the National MS Society on April 23, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the street activity permit request by the National MS Society for their annual MS Walk scheduled for April 23, 2006 during the hours of 5 AM – 6 PM on John Street between South and Front Streets.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 15 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
PUBLIC VOTE: 2 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 42 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Jack Parker Group Application for Amendment to Zoning

WHEREAS: Over the past several years Community Board #1 (“CB#1”) and the New York City Department of City Planning (“DCP”) have been working in a joint effort to develop a comprehensive plan for the entire study area of the northern part of the Tribeca Mixed Use Special District (the “Study Area”), and

WHEREAS: Representatives of DCP subsequently presented a preliminary comprehensive rezoning plan for the entire Study Area to the Tribeca Committee of CB#1 and advised CB#1 that an Environmental Impact Statement would be required to change the zoning in the entire study area and that DCP would assign an employee to work on the project and address questions presented by CB#1, and

WHEREAS: CB#1 requested schematics for several Floor Area Ratio (FAR) variations of the proposed comprehensive rezoning plan for the Study Area and answers to various questions concerning the entire Study Area that have not been provided to date, and

WHEREAS: The Jack Parker Group has filed an application for an amendment to the Zoning Resolution requesting the following actions: (a) the rezoning from M1-5 to C6-3A and C6-2A of four blocks in the Special Tribeca Mixed Use District; (b) certain text amendments to the Special Tribeca Mixed Use District; and (c) a Special Permit under Sections 13-562 and 74-52 to permit a public parking garage of 180 spaces in a proposed, new, primarily residential building to be constructed on Block 224 bounded by West, Washington, Watts and Desbrosses Streets (collectively, the “Parker Application”), and

WHEREAS: At a public hearing the Tribeca community testified overwhelmingly against the Parker application and local elected officials have written letters in opposition to the Parker application (letters attached), and

- WHEREAS: The Parker Application covers an arbitrarily chosen segment of the Study Area and was certified without an Environmental Impact Statement (“EIS”) and without any consideration of the significant potential adverse environmental impacts of the proposed changes on the entire Study Area, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 strongly disagrees with the issuance of a Negative Declaration (dated February 6, 2006 and signed February 3, 2006) by DCP permitting the Parker Application to proceed without requiring an EIS and without giving CB#1 and elected officials an opportunity to determine whether or not (a) the proposed thirty eight (38%) percent increase in the allowable FAR would have a significant adverse environmental impact on the surrounding community or (b) the proposed change in the *use* permitting hundreds of new residential units in the area would have a significant adverse impact on the social infrastructure (schools, stores, hospitals, fire, police and other services), the physical infrastructure (water table, sewerage, light and air), and traffic (congestion, increased demand for parking) of the surrounding community, and
- WHEREAS: CB#1 strongly believes that approval of the Parker Application would have a significant adverse impact not only on the entire Study Area but the entire neighborhood of Tribeca and that the determination not to require an EIS deprives the public of an opportunity to participate in a “scoping session” where the public would receive an in-depth analysis including possible alternative configurations, and
- WHEREAS: DCP issued a Positive Declaration on February 25, 2005 for a similar proposal that had a taller height limit, but only a slightly different FAR on the grounds that it would (a) alter the existing land use and zoning patterns by permitting new as-of-right residential development and establishing new use and bulk regulations within the affected area, (b) result in development which could differ from the existing urban design elements in the affected area (c) alter the existing neighborhood character of the affected area (d) the DEIS to be prepared for the proposed action will identify and describe any other potential effects on the environment” and all of these factors are still valid even though the height was reduced to 160 feet and the FAR was slightly diminished, and
- WHEREAS: CB#1 supports DCP’s recommendation to change the *use* from the current Manufacturing District, which prohibits any new residential construction and severely limits residential conversions, to a C6 District, which would permit residential *uses* as-of-right, and
- WHEREAS: CB#1 believes, however, that the proposed *use* change in and of itself creates significant pressure to build taller residential buildings (requiring rear yards) even if the FAR remains unchanged and that the unique characteristics of the neighborhood will already be significantly altered even without any increase in the permitted FAR, and

WHEREAS: The Parker Application purports to describe the context of the neighborhood from the perspective of the non-contextual Washington Street Urban Renewal Area to the south rather than the waterfront northward to 14th Street and the Tribeca Historic District to the east. These areas give a much more accurate perspective of the former manufacturing district located in the Study Area or the broader perspective of the fabric of historically significant buildings located throughout Tribeca, and

WHEREAS: The presence of wide streets is only one of a number of considerations taken into account under New York City's comprehensive zoning plan to determine FAR along with other considerations such as the presence or absence of mass transit and subsurface soil conditions are also considered, which explains why the area along West Street from the site of the Parker Application to 14th Street currently has an FAR of 6 or less, and

WHEREAS: CB#1 strongly believes that the grant of a 7.5 FAR in connection with the Parker Application should be considered "spot zoning" in violation of the comprehensive zoning plan and should be rejected, and

WHEREAS: The proposed change from manufacturing *uses* to residential *uses* will permit the up to approximately 765,000 square feet of new residential units with an FAR of 5 while the proposed 7.5/6.0 FAR would increase the maximum bulk of such new residential units to approximately 1,060,000 square feet, and

WHEREAS: Assuming 2,000 square feet as the average size of a typical residential unit, the contemplated *use* change would permit 380 new residential units to be built under the current FAR of 5.0 but would permit approximately 150 additional units (530 in total) to be built if the proposed FAR increase is approved on just the 4 blocks covered by the Parker Application, and

WHEREAS: The Special Permit to construct a 180-space parking garage without an Environmental Impact Statement is being applied for as part of the Parker Application in reliance on the Applicant's statement "[t]hat such use will not create or contribute to serious traffic congestion and will not unduly inhibit surface traffic and pedestrian flow" despite the fact that the entire Study Area may subsequently be changed to permit hundreds of residential conversions and construction of new residential units as-of-right after a comprehensive zoning review, thus increasing the number and frequency of vehicles and pedestrians in the surrounding neighborhood, and

WHEREAS: The Tribeca North Historic District covers a portion of the area proposed for rezoning under the Parker Application (specifically all of Block 217 and the Washington Street frontage of Block 218, which includes the four historic structures located 250-255 West Street and 410-412 and 416-424 Washington Street) as well as six historic buildings within 90 feet of the proposed rezoned area, including 397, 399, 410-411 and 451 Washington Street and 70-72 and 74 Laight Street, and which are considered to be contiguous as defined by the New York City Department of Buildings (DOB), and

WHEREAS: The Fleming Smith Warehouse, an individual New York City landmark listed on the National Register of Historic Buildings (451 Washington Street/135 Watts Street) lies directly across the street from the northernmost block of the area proposed for rezoning under the Parker Application and within 60 feet of the proposed construction site, and

WHEREAS: Although the proposed Tribeca North Rezoning qualifies as a Type 1 action under SEQRA regulations, CB#1 strongly disagrees with DCP that the Environmental Assessment Statement submitted in connection with the Parker Application constitutes a comprehensive analysis of potential adverse impacts to nearby historic buildings or that an EIS is not clearly required, and

WHEREAS: CB#1 is extremely concerned about the potential negative environmental impact of demolition, pile driving, digging foundations and other construction activities due to poor soil conditions and the shallow water table in the area proposed for rezoning, including dewatering and other potential damage to adjacent historical structures, and

WHEREAS: Preservation of the many other historic structures in and adjacent to the rezoning area is vital to Tribeca North's character and future and will be addressed in a resolution from CB#1 Landmarks Committee, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 strongly and unequivocally opposes the Parker Application (ULURP application) on the grounds that it is inappropriate for the area and untimely in light of the proposed rezoning of the entire northern portion of the Special Tribeca Mixed Use District, especially since this area will continue to undergo the cumulative impact of significant traffic, noise and other environmental effects of all the Lower Manhattan redevelopment projects (including the Route 9A project which will directly interact with the Parker site) and these effects should have been taken into account by City Planning in evaluating whether or not to issue a negative declaration, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: If the Parker Application is not rejected at this time or postponed until after action is taken on the current proposed rezoning, we strongly recommend the following:

1. An EIS should be required to consider geo-technical and other environmental impacts and to enable CB#1, City Planning Commission and elected officials an opportunity to reasonably consider the potential environmental impacts of the proposed increase in the number of permitted residential units due to the change of *use* and any increase in FAR, including but not limited to effects on the social infrastructure (schools, stores, hospitals, fire, police and other services), the physical infrastructure (water table, sewerage, light and air), and traffic (congestion, increased demand for parking) of the surrounding community as well as the potential negative environmental impact of demolition, pile driving, digging foundations and other construction activities due to poor soil conditions and the shallow water table in the area proposed for rezoning, including dewatering and other potential damage to adjacent historical structures, and
2. The FAR for both the newly proposed C6-3A and C6-2A should be the same as the FAR applicable to the rest of the Tribeca Special Mixed Use District (namely 5.0) based on the precedent for a lower FAR than the standard C6-2A FAR established by the TMU in the southern part of the district, and
3. The applicant should not be permitted to (a) redistribute permitted floor area without regard to the district boundaries, (b) merge bulk in the C6-2A district bulk in the C6-3A building, or (c) to vary the standard set-back and height regulations for each district, and
4. The boundary line between the C6-3A and the C6-2A districts should be MID-BLOCK in order to bring more light and air to the narrow streets, and
5. The standard height limit of the C6-3A district should be maintained as is and not increased to the heights requested by the Parker Application, and
6. The characteristics of the neighborhood context for deciding the bulk of the proposed area should be the surrounding historically designated Tribeca neighborhood and the former manufacturing buildings to the east and north and not the non-contextual Urban Renewal area to the south (please see attached examples from the district).
7. DCP should explain to CB#1 and elected officials how a 7.5 FAR was determined, considering that the entire C6-2A district in the Tribeca Special Mixed Use Special District is a 5.0, the current M1-5 Manufacturing FAR is 5.0 and all of the waterfront land northward up to 14th Street is currently a 5.0 or 6.0, which even includes recently approved zoning changes in Hudson Square and the West Village, and

8. No “Large Scale Development” Zoning regulations should be permitted within the Tribeca Mixed Use Special District in this new area A4 and developers should not be permitted to merge development rights across any streets from one block to another, and
9. The Community Facility FAR should be equal to the Residential FAR in the Special District, and
10. Any changes to North Tribeca’s use groups proposed within the Parker Application would affect the Quality of Life of the neighborhood and must be studied carefully before any decisions are implemented, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 is very concerned about potential adverse traffic, environmental and quality of life impacts of any large scale destination commercial/retail establishment that would be permitted on the ground floor in the A4 area and opposes the proposed 20,000 square foot maximum per zoning lot as too large for the wide street and the 10,000 square foot maximum as too large for the side streets under the Parker Application, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 strongly urges that the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (“LPC”) review the Parker Application with a view to protecting all the historic structures within and 90 feet adjacent to the proposed rezoning area under the Parker Application, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 urges that LPC review and recommend modifications to the protection and monitoring plan proposed under the Parker Application to comply in all respects with “Technical Policy & Procedure # 10/88” of the DOB to reduce the risk of construction related damage to any such historic buildings, and

BE IT  
FINALLY  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 strongly opposes the application for Special Permit for a 180-car parking garage in the absence of an EIS covering the entire Study Area in which residential *uses* would be permitted under the proposed comprehensive rezoning proposal because the segmented scope of the traffic study and analysis of potential congestion does not reflect what will actually occur if residential *uses* are permitted or if a destination retail establishment is created on the ground floor of the four blocks that are the subject of the Parker Application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 15 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
PUBLIC VOTE: 2 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 42 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 53/55 Beach Street, BSA application to allow Montessori school on the third floor

WHEREAS: In 2003, Community Board #1 and the BSA approved variance applications to permit the operation of a Montessori school at 53/55 Beach Street in portions of the first and second floor, and

WHEREAS: The applicant is now seeking to expand this pre-school use (Use Group 3) into the third floor, and

WHEREAS: The Montessori School has proved to be quite successful serving approximately 150 students with a staff of 25, and

WHEREAS: The proposed expansion would allow approximately 60 additional children to attend to be serviced by 10 additional teachers, and

WHEREAS: This school serves local children from Tribeca and vicinity, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that the BSA approve application #359.02-BZ to permit the expansion of the existing Montessori school at 53/55 Beach Street to the third floor.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 31 In Favor 0 Opposed 2 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Co-naming intersection of Gold Street at Beekman Street for Elizabeth Blackwell

WHEREAS: Elizabeth Blackwell (1821-1910) was the first woman to graduate from medical school in US history, and

WHEREAS: She overcame tremendous bias against admitting women to medical schools and after graduating became the first female physician in the United States, and

WHEREAS: In 1853 Ms. Blackwell opened a small hospital in the slums of NYC which in 1857 was incorporated as the NY Infirmary for Women and Children, and

WHEREAS: The NY Infirmary later merged with the Beekman Street Hospital to become what today is the New York Downtown Hospital, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 supports the efforts to recognize Elizabeth Blackwell as both a medical and social pioneer who cared for the impoverished women and children of Lower Manhattan, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 supports the proposal to co-name the intersection of Gold Street and Beekman Street for Ms. Elizabeth Blackwell.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 22 In Favor 3 Opposed 5 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street activity permit for Whitehall Street between Morris and Beaver Streets by Federation of Hellenic Societies of Greater NY for March 31, 2006

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street activity permit submitted by the Federation of Hellenic Societies of Greater NY for a Greek Independence Day event on Whitehall Street between Morris and Beaver Streets on March 31, 2006 during the hours of 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused  
PUBLIC VOTE: 2 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 31 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 117 Hudson Street, aka 50-54 North Moore Street, application for approval to create a mezzanine above the level of the sixth floor and a one-story rooftop penthouse addition

WHEREAS: The application is to replace the windows with wood 2-over-2 painted frames as were originally used, the color of which will be based on a paint analysis which is yet to be completed, and

WHEREAS: The missing cast iron capital will be restored and replaced in cast iron, and

WHEREAS: A 1200' one-story roof top addition will be added by removing and lowering the original roof by 4' 11", resulting in the addition being 2' 10" higher than the existing parapet front wall, 9' 7" higher than the existing back wall, and

WHEREAS: The addition will only be visible from the following:

- as seen from the view study position from the Westside Highway
- as seen from the view study position from Greenwich and North Moore looking East
- as seen from the view study position from Laight Street
- as seen from the view study position from North Moore
- in each case the bulkhead and railing are only slightly visible except from Laight Street where 6" of the penthouse will be visible, and

WHEREAS: The penthouse and bulkhead will be made of stucco and a matching red brick on the back wall, and

WHEREAS: The applicant did not have a profile drawing of the building but agreed to supply one for CB#1's review, and

WHEREAS: The applicant committed to building exactly what is drawn and approved by LPC, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to be carefully monitored by the Community to ensure full compliance with any approval made by LPC, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 recommends that LPC approve the application, after a paint color is provided for the windows and a profile drawing of the building has been reviewed.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
PUBLIC VOTE: 2 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 31 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 254 Front Street, formerly Jeremy's Ale House, application for approval to do a total demolition of the building, and build an 8-story building that includes condos on 7 stories and 1 retail tenant on the ground level

WHEREAS: The applicant's historian explained that the building was noted as non-contributing in the Designation report while the new building drew inspiration from other modern buildings in the Seaport Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The 8- story building of full height corrugated metal pilasters, used to connote brick columns, veneer wood like panels around the windows to recall brick on neighboring buildings, and a totally bland stucco penthouse addition would, it is claimed, be a comfortable and contributing modern building on this very visible historic corner site, and

WHEREAS: The ground floor would be covered by a metal and glass canopy with a metal signage band with directional up-lighters, and

WHEREAS: The building would be built to an FAR of 5.78, although as of right is 6.02, with a front wall of 85', a total height of 100', as such it would be the tallest building on the street and the second tallest on the entire block, and

WHEREAS: The Committee commended the applicant for the quality of the presentation and their good work in other Historic Districts, but felt this design was too big for this location and was inappropriate for the Seaport District, and

WHEREAS: The Committee noted that the historian's references to other Seaport buildings were not appropriate examples to justify this building and the Ale House was a long time location for Seaport residents and workers, and

WHEREAS: The side of the building would be of solid brick, which the Committee thought was an poor transition to the very modern front façade, and

WHEREAS: The rear of the building would have balconies, which the Committee felt were inappropriate, and

WHEREAS: As all aspects of the building would be visible from the pedestrian walkways on the Brooklyn Bridge, it was felt the bland stucco penthouse and rear metal balconies would look terrible from this view point, and

WHEREAS: Most Committee members felt the massing was too big for this site, and

WHEREAS: The public comments were all against the height and design of the building, and

WHEREAS: The Committee concluded that a lot of work was needed to address these comments, and ensure the new building was appropriate for the Historic District, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

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

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
PUBLIC: 2 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 31 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Parker Rezoning Proposal, impacts on historic resources

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 strongly disagrees with the opinion of the Landmarks Preservation Commission staff that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required for the rezoning proposal under consideration because “development under rezoning would not have the potential for significant adverse impacts on this historic resource (the Fleming Smith Warehouse, at 451 Washington Street),” (DCP letter dated 02/09/06), and

WHEREAS: The L.P.C. makes no mention of all the other historic structures affected by this application, and

WHEREAS: Besides the Fleming Smith Warehouse, an individual New York City Landmark and a building designated on the National Register of Historic Places and sited within 60 feet of the proposed rezoning area, the Tribeca North Historic District covers a portion of the area proposed for rezoning, including four historic structures located at 250-255 West Street, 410-412, 416-424 Washington Street, and six historic buildings within 90 feet of the proposed rezoned area including 397, 399, 410-411, 451 Washington Street, 70-72 and 74 Laight Street, which are all considered to be contiguous as defined by the Department of Buildings, and

WHEREAS: As such, CB #1 believes that the rezoning application qualifies as a Type 1 action under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and

WHEREAS: In “A Report on Negative Impacts and Necessary Protections Related to Adjacent Construction” written by Marie Ennis 02/24/06, a preservation engineer articulates the potential damage to the Fleming Smith Warehouse specifically relating to the building’s foundation system, settlement and cracking, masonry arches, windows and parapet walls, amplifying certain specific concerns, as follows:

- a) **Vibrations** – old masonry buildings are more susceptible to vibration damage, particularly from low-frequency vibrations, pile driving especially, in poor soil conditions;
- b) **Demolition** – specifically jack-hammering and structural elements impacting on the ground will generate vibrations through the soil,

- c) **Dewatering** – potentially problematic because the soils present in the area will compact and settle when drying, thereby causing adjacent structures with timber piles that remain saturated by ground water for many years to dry out causing the weakened timbers to crush under a building’s weight, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

Landmark designation should ensure that when construction occurs near a landmark building, construction procedures will be specified and monitored by qualified professionals, and that Department of Buildings “Technical Policy & Procedure #10/88,” the main requirements of which follow, be applied with special rigor at developer sole expense to landmark-designated buildings and districts:

- a) Pre-Construction Survey – A documentation of a buildings exterior and interior condition.
- b) Geotechnical Studies and Guidelines – Developer’s Engineers will need to obtain soil borings in order to design the new building’s foundations and evaluate the potential for and magnitude of soil settlement due to dewatering and/ or pile driving.
- c) Vibrations Controls – Use of non-displacement piles that are inserted in bored or augured holes rather than driven into the ground using impact equipment. All other equipment causing vibration should be monitored.
- d) Movement Monitoring - Should be used to determine if vibrations, soil displacement or dewatering activities that are adversely impacting the structural stability, a controlled Inspector hired by the Developer should monitor movement using the following devices:
  - Seismographs installed at the basement level at the upper levels of the buildings. The seismographs should have an alarm that would trigger a signal when movement of a certain level is surpassed
  - Crack gauges installed on select cracks on façade and bearing walls to provide readings of any movement throughout the course of construction.
  - Developer should have a survey crew to periodically determine if settlement occurs.
  - Tilt-Meter movement gauges can be utilized to determine if a wall or column are moving laterally.
  - Rodent Control, although not structural, Developer should implement rodent control measures before and during excavation work to protect adjacent infestations.
  - Preconstruction periodic photos should be taken to document the landmark buildings, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

LPC should put its weight behind the necessity of an EIS in connection with this rezoning proposal, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: The Landmarks Preservation Commission should protect all other buildings in Tribeca North (see list of photos attached) which have not yet acquired landmark status.

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 31 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 140 Nassau Street, proposed designation

WHEREAS: 140 Nassau St., The Morse Building, was designed by Silliman & Farnsworth in 1878-80 and because of its popularity, enlarged with a five story addition by Bannister & Schell in 1900-02, and

WHEREAS: The Morse building was also the first important commercial building in New York City to use terra cotta, and

WHEREAS: The Morse building combines the German Rundbogenstil with the French Neo-grec in its continuous piers defining the corners and central bays, paired segmentally-arched windows set within larger segmental arches, raised structural lintels and polychromatic brickwork in red and black, and

WHEREAS: After a slipshod renovation by an insensitive developer in the 1980s left 140 Nassau St. in Landmark limbo, the residents of the building on their own accord, painstakingly repaired, rebuilt and restored 140 Nassau St., using the criteria mandated by Landmarks, and

WHEREAS: 140 Nassau is the final piece to be Landmarked, of the newly designated historic district created by Shipo in the fall of 2005, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 highly commends the restoration of 140 Nassau St. and strongly recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approves this application for designation, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 urges that LPC review and recommend modifications to the protection and monitoring plan proposed for the Rattner Project on the Beekman parking lot directly adjacent to 140 Nassau St., to comply in all respects with "Technical Policy & Procedure # 10/88" of the DOB to reduce the risk of construction related damage to any such historic buildings.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
PUBLIC VOTE: 1 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 31 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 253 Broadway, application for window replacement

WHEREAS: This 1892 Harding and Gouch building has windows that are in poor condition, and

WHEREAS: The proposal is to follow the window replacement scheme previously approved by LPC for the neighboring 256 Broadway, and

WHEREAS: The rusted metal, non original, windows will be replaced with new aluminum to match the original profile of double and single hung windows throughout the building and

WHEREAS: A tilt and turn mechanism will be used for ease of cleaning, the hinges of which will not be visible on the profile of the windows, and

WHEREAS: The windows will be painted an appropriate historic beige color, and

WHEREAS: There will be up to 80 temporary window mounted AC units, but the masterplan is for the building to be fully converted to central AC in the future, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

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

06resmarch21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 21, 2006

COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA AND LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	2 Opposed	1 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	2 In Favor	1 Opposed	1 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	15 In Favor	22 Opposed	1 Abstained	2 Recused

RE: 180 West Broadway, modifications to the proposed building and BSA application

WHEREAS: The variance request to “build full” on the 180 West Broadway footprint, which is actually a combination of two lots, when zoning requires a 1,200 square-foot courtyard with a 30-foot setback, is still before the Bureau of Standards and Appeals, which has asked this Community Board for comment, and

WHEREAS: It remains the general position of Community Board #1 that zoning and building regulations – often hard-won – are there to be honored, and that hardship claims should truly arise out of hardship, for instance, that of an inheritor of a piece of land made unusable because of regulation changes prior to the inheritance (and there are vast numbers of other examples), and

WHEREAS: This speculative development’s sponsor had the opportunity to conduct a proper due diligence, and had a choice to make when considering both the acquisition transaction and receipt of air rights, and no laws affecting construction on the property in question have changed since the due diligence period, and

WHEREAS: Nearby residential buildings already suffer from the quality-of-life deprecations arising from the noise and pollution of 60 Hudson Street, and the developers of 180 West Broadway intend to construct their two-story mechanicals and chiller rooms on that part of their building where the required courtyard would have been otherwise located, facing 60 Hudson Street and adding to the noise cacophony, and

WHEREAS: It should not be for the residents of the block to beg for a variance from a variance, but for the developers to follow zoning law unless there is a fearfully compelling reason to request otherwise, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 asks that the Bureau of Standards and Appeals reject the variance in question.