COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	1 Opposed	1 Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **17 State Street, Urban Open Space Modification (M 860313-A-ZCM)**

WHEREAS: The proposed changes do not alter the dimensions of the urban open space nor zoning calculations for 17 State Street, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 supports the above referenced application for a modification of the previously certified Urban Open Space.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	1 Opposed	1 Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	19 In Favor	4 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **Application for existing newsstand - S/E/C of Broadway and Wall Street**

WHEREAS: The siting of the newsstand is on a block which is very heavily congested with pedestrian traffic, especially during morning and evening rush hours and during lunch hour, and

WHEREAS: The newsstand is located within several feet of a subway entrance, thereby further impeding pedestrian flow to and from the entrance, and.

WHEREAS: The Community Board has submitted a number of complaints to the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) alleging that the newsstand operates in violation of legal requirements in that two rows of crates on which newspapers are stacked are in regular use, and in effect increase the size of the newsstand, and

WHEREAS: The Department of Consumer Affairs has on at least 2 occasions issued violations, fines, a suspension and notices that the operator appear for departmental hearings, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 strongly opposes the continued existence of the above referenced sidewalk newsstand.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	22 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **Proposed Newsstand, S/E/C of Broad Street and Wall Street (AKA 15 Broad Street)**

WHEREAS: The proposed siting of the newsstand is on a block which is extremely congested with pedestrian traffic, especially during morning and evening rush hours and during lunch hour, and

WHEREAS: The proposed location is across the street from the landmark Federal Hall National Memorial Museum, (26 Wall Street) and therefore would not allow an unimpeded view from Broad Street, and

WHEREAS: The corner of Broad Street and Wall Street is in the heart of a major tourist area, the historic New York Stock Exchange Building is directly across the street and the construction of a newsstand would therefore limit the viewing of one of New York City's most important historical buildings, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 is strongly opposes to the installation of a sidewalk newsstand at the above referenced location, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: The Department of Consumer Affairs instruct City departments reviewing this application to conduct inspections during AM and PM rush hours or lunch hour to make inspectors aware of the heavy pedestrian traffic and congestion at this location.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORGIN: CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	1 Opposed	1 Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	13 In Favor	5 Opposed	5 Abstained

RE: **Application to reinstate license of existing newsstand N/E/C of Fulton Street and Gold Street**

WHEREAS: The owner of the newsstand has been issued violations and fines and has had his license revoked by the Department of Consumer Affairs, and

WHEREAS: The newsstand continues to display illegal signage on its exterior, advertising Lotto, and

WHEREAS: The newsstand is located in an area which is very heavily congested with pedestrian traffic, especially during morning and evening rush hours, and is not in compliance with City regulations which require a minimum of 9 foot 5 inches of unobstructed sidewalk clearance for pedestrians, and

WHEREAS: The location of this newsstand presents a very hazardous traffic problem for both drivers and pedestrians crossing the street, by preventing the both driver and pedestrian from seeing each other due to the curvative of the street, and

WHEREAS: The newsstand fails to provide Sunday newspaper service, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 strongly opposes the continued existence of the above referenced sidewalk newsstand, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: The Department of Consumer Affairs instruct City departments reviewing this application to conduct inspectors during AM and PM rush hours or lunch hour to make inspectors aware of the heavy pedestrian traffic and congestion at this location.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	16 In Favor	4 Opposed	3 Abstained

RE: **Application by the Battery Park City Authority to construct a pile supported platform. (Revised resolution 9/7/88)**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board's approval of construction of a platform is conditioned on the Battery Park City Authority extending the proposed platform to the corresponding area (approximately 300' long by 43' wide) immediately West so as to make this land, already mapped as "parkland", - but which is currently not usable for this purpose - into much needed park/esplanade space.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: This resolution shall not be construed to imply consent to any further northward expansion of the landfilling or platforming beyond the present northern property line of Battery Park City which Community Board #1 vehemently opposes.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE:	In Favor	Opposed	Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	21 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained

RE: **375 South End Avenue, Battery Park Swim and Fitness Center (BSA #822-87 BZ)**

WHEREAS: As the result of a series of meetings and negotiations between the applicant and both the Battery Park City Committee and the Gateway Plaza Tenants' Association agreement has been reached on the critical issues of security and access to the club by Gateway Plaza tenants, now

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 recommends approval of the above referenced application, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: The Community Board #1 withdraws its previous opposition to the application as expressed in a resolution adopted May 10, 1988.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE:	In Favor	Opposed	Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	21 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained

RE: **Response to Council Member Carol Greitzer's article in New York Newsday**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 authorizes the Board Chairperson to write a letter to **New York Newsday** in response to the above referenced article.

NY 48 NEWSDAY, MONDAY, AUGUST 29, 1988

ABOUT TOWN

Double Dealing On the Hudson

By Carol Greitzer

SUDDENLY there's a media spotlight on the good life in Battery Park City, where 92 idyllic waterfront acres contain 20 residential and office buildings, with more under construction. The quiet neighborhood is secluded and safe. There are no homeless people asleep in its parks, no hassling drug dealers or beggars. There are no shelters, welfare centers or halfway houses, no sirens or honking, no bus depots, tow pounds or noisy sanitation garages. In short, no NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) headaches.

As one resident put it, "Psychologically, once you cross the highway, you put the rest of the city behind you." Apparently, condo buyers were led to believe by the state's Battery Park City Authority, which created and planned the development, that it would be ever thus.

But the apparent triumph of urban planning that gives Battery Park City its serenity comes at the expense of neighborhoods to the north innundated with noxious waterfront facilities — from heliports to the 386-inmate prison barge the city proposes to anchor at Pier 40 and serve with back-up pier facilities for hundreds of staff. That dramatic imbalance highlights the City Planning Commission's abdication of its responsibilities — both for Battery Park City, whose planning it has effectively ceded to the state authority, and for the violated riverfront neighborhoods nearby.

Carol Greitzer has been a City Councilwoman from Manhattan since 1969, representing midtown and Greenwich Village north of Houston Street.

Several years ago, when the city Department of Sanitation told the City Council of its need for new facilities to replace an outmoded Canal Street garage serving two sanitation districts, I suggested modifying the Battery Park City plans, still on the drawing boards, to include such facilities. Everybody thought this a terribly amusing idea whose time would never come. They were right: today there is no messy sanitation garage in Battery Park City, just plans for the elite Stuyvesant High School.

Meanwhile, outside this fantasy island, facilities deleterious to the environment compete for waterfront space. The area from Greenwich Village north to Midtown houses sanitation facilities, a car pound, a bus garage, a heliport, a concrete factory — and, now proposed, the floating prison.

West Side communities thought they had won unspoiled access to the waterfront with a river esplanade, a component of the West Side replacement road proposal which was released last winter by a special task force appointed by the governor and the mayor. And why shouldn't they have such access? The beginnings of a splendid esplanade are already in place — in Battery Park City. Yet the city now plans to locate the prison barge permanently at Houston Street, without regard for the esplanade, the pending Greenwich Village historic waterfront district or elementary planning procedures prescribed by law.

—Continued from Page 48

That is an affront not only to local residents and environmentalists but also to people committed to enlightened corrections policies. While the prison barge is supposed to be part of a work-release program, the Koch Administration seems to be using it more to park inmates than to rehabilitate them. The corrections department's original request was for a temporary berthing until a permanent facility could be made available at Rikers Island; now we're told there will be no room at Rikers in the foreseeable future.

The barge proposal has gotten an unexpected boost from a City Planning Commission finding that an environmental impact statement isn't needed, and the commission has plunged ahead with hearings preliminary to voting on the proposal on Sept. 27. But the proposal does require an environmental statement, and, for that matter, a master plan for the total prison population that outlines possible expansion at Rikers. Since state and federal permits are also needed for construction in the river, the city should immediately halt its steamroller tactics.

Even without waiting for the Charter Revision Commission to redefine its role, the planning commission should do what it was set up to do — plan, instead of merely react, usually by assenting, to proposals by powerful authorities, agencies and developers. Judged by that standard, both the splendid isolation of Battery Park City and the chaotic conditions to its north are two sides of the same coin.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: 55 WHITE STREET AD HOC COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE VOTE:	In Favor	Opposed	Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	24 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **55 White Street, Application to the LPC for Certificate of Appropriateness**

WHEREAS: The owners of 55 White Street have asked Community Board #1 to review their proposal to alter that Landmark, which they own, and to make recommendations to the Landmarks Preservation Commission at a Certificate of Appropriateness hearing, and

WHEREAS: These individuals have also asked Community Board #1 to review their proposal to alter the adjacent buildings at 51 and 49 White Street, which they do not own, and

WHEREAS: Their proposal to alter these buildings is predicated on the use of certain development rights to properties at 74, 78, and 80 Franklin Street, which they stated they do not own, and

WHEREAS: At both the first presentation of these various proposals on July 21 by the applicant and its architect and a second presentation in August, the applicant was questioned regarding the ownership issue, and

WHEREAS: The proposal presented raises issues of serious concern regarding either present, pending, or future ownership in as much as other property owners involved were not present to comment, and

WHEREAS: The proposal of a nine and a twenty five story tower above and a top the landmark at 55 White Street constitutes an inappropriate incursion both aesthetically in terms of the landmark building's integrity and visually in terms of the street wall facade of the surrounding historic structures, and

WHEREAS: The construction of these two towers would necessitate the structural penetration of the landmark building with columns varying in size from nine 20 inch square columns to several columns measuring 44 inches square, designed to support these towers, resulting in the nine story tower placed to the west of the landmark with approximately five feet of the tower directly above the landmark resting on its bearing wall and the 44 inch columns, and

WHEREAS: There is a threat of serious physical danger and damage to the fragile cast iron facade and the building's structure caused by both the placement of heavy equipment within the building for the installation of the columns as well as the physical stress caused by their actual installation, and

WHEREAS: The actual construction of these towers, with the resultant vibration and movement, would pose a serious and potentially disastrous threat to 55 White Street as well as other adjacent landmarks and historically significant buildings, both structurally and aesthetically, and

WHEREAS: The visual incursion of these towers will be manifest in views of the landmark from both adjacent historic buildings, including another landmark structure, and the surrounding area, creating a negative and distorted view of the landmark at 55 White Street, and

WHEREAS: Changes to the front facade include the addition of an inappropriate canvas awning on part of the facade, where there is no evidence of any previous marquee, and a directory for the building's proposed functions which would be mounted on the exterior in front of and blocking a window, and

WHEREAS: Changes to the east facade include the addition of a fire exit door to Franklin Place, which does not relate to the window line configuration, the addition of another similar directory sign for the building, and the incompatible reconfiguration of two windows, and

WHEREAS: Changes to the rear facade include permanently closing steel shutters on two windows which would create a negative impact on its appearance, and

WHEREAS: The proposal would have a major overall negative impact on the proposed Washington Market/Tribeca Historic District, in which White Street, with its many fine examples of intact, late 19th century mercantile buildings would be included, disrupting the street wall scale with a new 8 story building at 49 White Street with fenestration incompatible to its neighbors, potential alteration of the historically significant building at 51 White Street, as well as the incursion of two towers whose bulk, scale and design is both incompatible and inappropriate to the adjacent historic structures, creating a major visual disruption to the perception of this uniquely preserved block, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 urges the Landmarks Preservation Commission to deny this application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 seriously questions the legality of this application in light of the applicants' statement that they do not at present have ownership of real estate and development rights necessary to carry forward their proposal, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: Any further consideration by the LPC of the applicants' proposal cease until such time as all property owners involved state that they have transfered ownership to the applicant, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 again asks, with the utmost urgency, that the Landmarks Preservation Commission act to immediately calendar a hearing on the Tribeca/Washington Market Historic District before the character and unique sense of place which this district still possesses is lost forever.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	22 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **Tunnel Under Vietnam Veterans Park**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 approves the application (ULURP #C880 236 GFM) by Olympia and York for renewal of a 10 year revocable consent to continue to use and maintain a tunnel under Vietnam Veterans Park, connecting the building of 55 Water Street and 4 New York Plaza.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	In Favor	Opposed	Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	22 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **75 Wall Street, Modification of Previously Approved Urban Plaza**

WHEREAS: The owners of 79-89 Wall Street have requested approval to modify the urban open space/urban plaza design which was previously approved by the City Planning Commission on November 1, 1984, and

WHEREAS: Due to subsurface conditions, the number of trees to be planted in the plaza is to be reduced from 25 to 18 and the number of street trees from 28 to 19, and

WHEREAS: In order to compensate for the loss of 7 trees from the plaza the 18 remaining trees will 6" or greater in caliper instead of the 3 1/2" caliper trees orginally called for, and

WHEREAS: The owner has also agreed to plant nine additional trees on a public site as agreed to by Community Board #1 and the Parks Department, and

WHEREAS: The total number of trees to be provided, 46, still exceeds the 34 required in the Zoning Resolution, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 approves application #M850069 (A) ZCM to modify the urban open space/urban plaza at 75 Wall Street.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	In Favor	Opposed	Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	21 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **Proposed Newsstand, N/E/C of Stone and Whitehall Street**

WHEREAS: The proposed siting of the newsstand is on a block which is extremely congested with pedestrian traffic, especially during morning and evening rush hours, and during lunch hours, and

WHEREAS: There already exists a newsstand on the N/E/C of Stone Street and Whitehall Street, and

WHEREAS: The proposed siting is only a few feet away from a subway entrance, which would cause a further impediment to pedestrian traffic flow, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 strenuously opposes the installation of a sidewalk newsstand at the above referrenced location, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: The Department of Consumer Affairs instruct City departments reviewing this application to conduct inspections during AM and PM rush hours or lunch hours to make inspectors aware of the heavy pedestrian traffic and congestion at this location.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	In Favor	Opposed	Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	21 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **Proposed Newsstand, S/E/C of Beaver Street and Broadway**

WHEREAS: The proposed siting of the newsstand is on a block which is extremely congested with pedestrian traffic, expecially during morning and evening rush hours and during lunch hours, and

WHEREAS: Drawings submitted by the architect are clearly misleading, since the sidewalk along Beaver Street narrows to a considerably lesser width than the 16 foot width indicated in the drawing, and

WHEREAS: The proposed siting of the newstand would impede the view of historic Bowling Green from viewpoints looking west on Beaver Street, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 strenuously opposes the installation of a sidewalk newsstand at the above referenced location, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: The Department of Consumer Affairs instruct City departments reviewing this application to conduct inspections during AM and PM rush hours or lunch hours to make inspectors aware of the heavy pedestrian traffic and congestion at this location.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	In Favor	Opposed	Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	21 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **Proposed Expansion of Newsstand, N/W/C of Hanover Square and Water Street**

WHEREAS: The proposed expansion of the newsstand is on a block which is extremely congested with pedestrian traffic, especially during morning and evening rush hours, and during lunch hours, and

WHEREAS: The newsstand is located in front of 10 Hanover Square, whose owners adamantly object to the existence of this newsstand, maintaining that it impedes on their 3,000 square foot plaza, and that even at its current dimensions, it is an eyesore in relation to the open space of its surroundings and does immeasurable aesthetic damage to the area, and

WHEREAS: 10 Hanover Square and 7 Hanover Square already have newsstands located within their buildings, which adequately supply the needs of customers in the area, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 strenuously opposes the proposed expansion of the sidewalk newsstand at the above referrenced location, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: The Department of Consumer Affairs instruct City departments reviewing this application to conduct inspections during AM and PM rush hours or lunch hours to make inspectors aware of the heavy pedestrian traffic and congestion at this location.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS, ART & CULTURAL AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	24 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **"Portrait of Audubon", Hudson Triangle**

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 approved the temporary installation of "Portrait of Audubon" by artist Fred Wilson sponsored by the Public Art Fund at the Hudson Triangle, and

WHEREAS: Approval was granted based on a model that differs substantially from the sculpture as executed, and

WHEREAS: The community expressed concerns that the work not become a magnet for derelicts, and

WHEREAS: Concern regarding damage to the trees and plantings as well as litter, broken glass, and other pedestrian hazards were initially expressed, and

WHEREAS: As this represents the current state of the sculpture, now

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 urges that the sculpture be removed as soon as possible.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: September 14, 1988

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS, ART & CULTURAL AFFAIRS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	In Favor	Opposed	Abstained
FULL BOARD VOTE:	24 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **Public Art "Bus Stop" at Battery Park City**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 defers its recommendation on this item pending a full review by our Executive Committee, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: Temporary art proposals which are brought before the Community Board must be presented with full, clear and accurate representations of the artwork in its proposed site.

lma
(resoluti.sep/7)