

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

Date: December 10, 1991

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	3 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	24 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

**RE: Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC), Proposed Fees**

**WHEREAS:** In June, 1991, CB #1 passed a resolution in opposition to the application and processing fees as proposed by LPC, and

**WHEREAS:** CB #1 has continued to review these proposed fees and their potential impacts on the Lower Manhattan community we represent, and

**WHEREAS:** Such review has indicated a rapidly growing negative public reaction to fees, which would gravely jeopardize both the proposed and potential historic districts as well as individual landmarks within the CB #1 area, and

**WHEREAS:** The LPC has been attempting, with measurable success, to simplify the application process, and

**WHEREAS:** The institution of a fee structure will have the opposite effect, and

**WHEREAS:** Such review has illuminated the failure of the LPC's mechanism to assess fines for the non-conformance by building owners, thereby losing for the agency a potentially lucrative source of income, while unfortunately allowing non-compliance to go quietly ignored, now

**THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED**

**THAT:** CB #1 continues to oppose any new processing fees and recommends that fines be collected for those LPC standards which are not already met.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

Date: December 10, 1991

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HOUSING**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	3 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	24 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **IMD's in In Rem Status**

WHEREAS: A substantial proportion of IMD loft buildings are located in the CB #1 district, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 strongly feels that it is important to preserve these units for residential occupancy, and

WHEREAS: If these buildings are subject to an In Rem procedure, their IMD status is endangered because of an exemption of city-owned buildings from Article 7c protection, and

WHEREAS: It was the clear legislative intent of Article 7c to exempt only buildings owned by the City at the time of its enactment, and not to exempt buildings falling into In Rem, which is a temporary status, and

WHEREAS: The HPD has disregarded the failure to correct health and safety requirements of Article 7c in recommending the return of In Rem loft buildings to former owners, and

WHEREAS: Stipulations by owners to legalize loft buildings have proven unenforceable, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 urges the City to leave all protection of article 7c in effect for residents of IMD's placed in In Rem, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 urges that the HPD mandate correction of all health and safety violations necessary to legalize an IMD as a necessary condition for return of an In Rem building to its former owner.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

Date: December 10, 1991

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HOUSING**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	3 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	24 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: **"Tenant Protection Act of 1991"**

WHEREAS: The Resolution Trust Corporation, which was created by Congress to take over failed savings and loan institutions and their assets, is currently trying to override rent control and rent stabilization laws in New York City, and evict rent regulated tenants in buildings it holds in receivership, and

WHEREAS: It was never the intent of Congress to give the Resolution Trust Corporation this power, and

WHEREAS: New York State rent regulations were authorized by the State Legislature in recognition of housing emergency, and

WHEREAS: Legislation has been introduced into Congress (S1692/HR2244) which would make any further authorization of funds to the Resolution Trust Corporation contingent upon the preservation of local rent and eviction control laws, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 urges that Congress not authorize any new funds for the Resolution Trust Corporation unless legislation is enacted to preserve local rent and eviction control laws.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

Date: December 10, 1991

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WATERFRONT & ENVIRONMENT**

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	17 In Favor	0 Opposed	9 Abstained

RE: **Amazon Club, Pier 25**

WHEREAS: On May 14, 1991, CB #1 approved a resolution giving the Amazon Village (aka Amazon Club) approval to operate on Pier 25 for a six month period provided they operated in accordance with the eight provisions agreed to in advance by the Amazon Village and spelled out in the resolution, and

WHEREAS: The conditions under which CB #1 gave its conditional approval were subsequently included as conditions under which the SLA granted the seasonal liquor license, and

WHEREAS: During the operation of the club this past season CB #1 and area residents realized problems which they had foreseen and which had been pointed out in the May 1991 Board resolution, specifically: complaints about loud music and noise associated with the operation of the Club itself and patrons arriving and departing, and

WHEREAS: In addition to the numerous complaints about loud music and noise generated by patrons, the operation of the Amazon Club has resulted in hazardous pedestrian and vehicular traffic conditions, traffic congestion and noise caused by the honking of car horns and motorists screeching to a halt on the West Side Highway, and

WHEREAS: Despite numerous meetings with the Community Board and area residents, and despite their repeated assurances that steps were being taken to ameliorate these safety and environmental problems, the management of the Amazon Club has proven unable or unwilling to adequately address these problems or to comply with the conditions of our May, 1991 resolution, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 believes that the existence of these problems is a serious matter and that all the counter-proposals put forth by the Amazon Club will not be able to solve them, and

WHEREAS: Our May, 1991 resolution stipulates that "should Amazon Village fail to abide by these provisions, CB #1 will actively oppose the continued operation of the restaurant and move to have its licenses and approvals rescinded and/or not

renewed", now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 requests that the New York State of Transportation (NYSDOT) cancel the duration of lease for the operation of the Amazon Club on Pier 25, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 requests that the SLA not renew the liquor license for the Amazon Club to operate on Pier 25, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 implores that NYSDOT never again lease Pier 25 to the Amazon Club or to any other open-air, live music operation which will likely result in the same type of unmitigated noise, congestion and inconvenience to the adjacent residential community.