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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: ARTS, URBAN PLANNING AND DESIGN, FINANCIAL DISTRICT AND SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 2 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 2 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **Lower Manhattan Rezoning Proposal**

WHEREAS: The Dept of City Planning is proposing the establishment of a new Special Lower Manhattan District to replace the existing zoning for Lower Manhattan south of Chambers Street, and

WHEREAS: The new district would eliminate the Special Manhattan Landing and Greenwich Street Development districts, make the Special South St. Seaport District a subdistrict of the new district and establish an Historic and Commercial Core, and

WHEREAS: The proposal before the Community Board actually consists of a zoning text amendment, a zoning map amendment and the Eighth modification of the Brooklyn Bridge Southeast Urban Renewal Plan, and

WHEREAS: The objectives of the rezoning proposal are to:

* foster the reuse of existing underused commercial buildings
* allow a wider range of commercial uses that better support an increasing residential population
* assure development that is consistent with historic fabric, including the existing scale and density of the area
* remove obsolete zoning controls that do not respond to present day needs and desires
* promote the orderly growth and development of the waterfront, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 has made known to the Dept. of City Planning many times in recent years our clear desire that the South Street Seaport Historic District be downzoned and that the East River piers, aprons and marginal streets within CB #1 be downzoned to prevent any structure more than one to two stories high and to insure public open space (a minimum of 65% of all piers, aprons and marginal streets, and

WHEREAS: The DCP's Lower Manhattan Rezoning proposal utterly fails to address these two priorities of CB #1 and would instead permit the construction of massive new high-rise buildings in the South St. Seaport Subdistrict and all waterfront zoning lots of up to 21.6 FAR, and

WHEREAS: This rezoning proposal fails to accomplish several of its stated objectives such as assuring that "development is consistent with historic fabric, including existing scale and density of the area". In the South Street Seaport Historic District, for example, the existing average building is roughly 5 stories tall while DCP's plan would allow buildings ten times that size, and

WHEREAS: While the City has instituted a number of programs to encourage the development and creation of new residential units in Lower Manhattan, this proposal thoroughly fails to address the growing need for such services as parks, schools and libraries for these new residents, and

WHEREAS: These zoning changes were originally conceived several years ago at a time when the Lower Manhattan real estate market was in the midst of a serious downturn and today that same market is dramatically healthier and hardly in need of the same zoning remedies intended to revitalize it, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board is extremely disappointed that after a very positive and collaborative working relationship with the Department of City Planning for the Tribeca Rezoning plan the DCP chose to employ for this proposal a rarely convened (three times in two years) Advisory Committee made up primarily of real estate developers and to reject every effort made by the Community board to have this massive rezoning plan address important priorities of CB #1 and this community, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 strongly recommends the disapproval of the proposed creation of a Special Lower Manhattan District and the concomitant zoning text amendment, zoning map amendment and urban renewal plan modification since this proposal thoroughly fails to address what the Community Board considers to be several of the most important needs of our district which can and should be addressed through this zoning package including:

* the downzoning of the South St. Seaport Historic District
* the downzoning of the East River piers, aprons and marginal streets as per our January 25, 1994 resolution
* incentives to encourage or mandate the creation of the necessary parks, schools and other services including improved public transportation needed to accommodate the existing and new residential population of Lower Manhattan
* relocation of development receiving sites within the South Street Seaport Historic District and over the East River and East River piers to outside the South Street Seaport Historic District and inland from the East River bulkhead, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 supports the elimination of the Manhattan Landing Special District but favors a new zoning for this area consistent with the type of waterfront uses recommended by CB #1 in our January 25, 1994 resolution (attached).

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Burrito Bar sidewalk cafe renewal, 305 Church Street**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 has no objections to the 5 year renewal of the sidewalk cafe at the Burrito Bar located at 305 Church St.

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 11 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Illegal signage at Holland Tunnel Exit**
Block 190 Lot 37 billboard in parking lot corner Beach & Varick
Block 190 Lot 38 billboard mounted to building wall, 10 Beach St.
Block 220 Lot 31 billboard painted on wall
Block 220 Lot 21 two billboards painted & attached on wall
Block 212 Lot 24 billboard on roof
Block 177 Lot 24 wall sign, 51 Leonard St.

WHEREAS: Appendix C page A-22 of the NYC Zoning Resolution indicates that the: Holland Tunnel exits and approaches and the West Side Highway from 72nd St. to the Brooklyn- Battery Tunnel are considered Arterial Highways or Toll Crossings, and

WHEREAS: Section 42-53 of the NYC Zoning Resolution states that "no advertising sign shall be located, nor shall an existing advertising sign be structurally altered, relocated, or reconstructed within 200 feet of an arterial highway… or toll crossing", and

WHEREAS: It is the desire of CB #1, in Tribeca and the Historic Districts, to discourage the erection of all illegal and inappropriate advertising signs, which are also clearly disapproved of in the NYC Zoning Resolution for the districts, and

WHEREAS: The above listed properties have, we believe, existing advertising signs that are in violation of the above NYC Zoning Resolution, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 requests that the DOB and LPC issue a violation and/or stop work order for the signs listed above and seek their immediate removal, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 requests that the City Council pass a moratorium to mandate that DOB cease from issuing further permits for illegal signs in this area.

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **116 Hudson Street**

Issue to review: Application is to construct a penthouse and enlarge a stair bulkhead.

WHEREAS: The committee noted that the 8' extension of the stair bulkhead will block the rear/side windows of the adjoining N. Moore St. building, and

WHEREAS: The committee found that the penthouse extension would only be minimally visible as long as the adjoining lot remained empty, and

WHEREAS: The committee would like to see the owner deal with the unsightly and inappropriate elevator bulkhead which is highly visible (but constructed pre-designation) on the Hudson St. facade, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design to be generally appropriate to the District character and in keeping with previous approvals, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC approve the application, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC encourage the applicant to include some treatment of the existing elevator bulkhead in their design proposal.

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **144 Duane Street**

Issue to review: Application is to replace storefronts.

WHEREAS: The committee noted that the existing cast iron columns at the storefront level are one of a series of excellent and important facades along Reade and Duane Streets and the LPC should encourage that they be restored to their original grandeur, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the overall design of the new storefront unacceptable, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the bay windows and entry doors, in standard aluminum storefront materials proposed, were inappropriate, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that LPC not approve the application as presented.

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 2 IN FAVOR 1 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 1 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **146 Beekman Street**

Issue to review: Application is to replace a storefront, and remove existing marquee which currently covers only half of the facade.

WHEREAS: The committee found that the marquee on this building, even the half remaining, to be an important element in the South Street Seaport Historic District as there is a continuous marquee, starting at this building, and continuing around to South Street which imparts a significant character to the Seaport Historic District especially in these blocks near the market, and

WHEREAS: The committee feels that the restoration and extension of the existing portion of the marquee across the entire facade, even in a simple translucent industrial material, would be important to maintaining the district character, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design to be generally appropriate to the District character and in keeping with previous approvals, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that LPC approve the application for the storefront and work with the applicant to enable the retention and restoration of the marquee, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC seek to insure the retention of the painted facade signage.

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 2 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **372 Broadway**

Issue to review: Application is to alter storefronts.

WHEREAS: The committee found the overall design of the new storefront generally acceptable, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the two solid doors were too opaque and closed in relation to the other storefronts in this area and suggested that the applicant incorporate glazing into these doors. It was also felt that the continuation of the module and fenestration across the four bays, as per the uniformity of the windows above, would be more appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design otherwise to be generally appropriate to the District character, except for the ground floor fenestration issues cited above, and significant improvements over the existing conditions, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that LPC approve the application if some revisions to the ground floor fenestration are made.

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **27-29 N. Moore Street**

Issue to review: Changes to previously approved, restoration include additional lot line windows, changes to ground floor storefronts and the addition of a catwalk linking the roof of the separate sides of the buildings.

WHEREAS: The committee found the design to be generally appropriate to the District character and in keeping with previous approvals, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC approve the application.

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Proposed rules relating to Historic District Master plans and authorizations to proceed**

WHEREAS: The purpose of the proposed rules is to encourage the community to apply to the LPC for approval of master plans for work in the Historic Districts (both limited and general in scope) which would allow the LPC staff, upon adoption of such master plan implementation rules, to issue authorization to proceed for certain types of alternation work in the Districts as covered in the Master plan, and

WHEREAS: The committee is highly supportive of this proposal which allows for a high level of community participation and which will result in a clearer, simplified process for property owners to alter their buildings in an appropriate and compliant manner, and

WHEREAS: The committee intends to take full advantage of this procedure to streamline and make more effective the landmarks reviews undertaken by CB #1, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 is in full support of the proposed rules relating to Historic District master plans.

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **165-167 Hudson Street**

Issue to review: Application is to enlarge a lot line window opening.

WHEREAS: The committee had no objection to the enlargement of the window or the installation of the thru-wall air conditioner, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt, however, that it would be important to continue with the double-hung windows existent in the rest of the building instead of the casement windows proposed and enlarge the window with either a pair or three double-hung units, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC approve the application if the revisions to the window type are made.

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 31 IN FAVOR 1 OPPOSED 5 ABSTAINED

RE: **Racist accusation by Community School Board #2 member**

WHEREAS: The Community Board has learned from a variety of sources of some offensive comments made by Community School Board #2 member Jon Nalley during their public meeting regarding the zoning of PS 89 last month at PS 234, and

WHEREAS: According to the Tribeca Trib, Mr. Nalley called the residents of Southbridge Towers "racist and classist" for wanting to attend PS 234 instead of PS 126 and went on to say "good riddance to bad rubbish" in reference to the CSB resolution zoning SBT children out of PS 126, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 considers these antagonistic comments to be extremely distasteful, divisive and uncalled for, and

WHEREAS: Southbridge Towers is very likely the most racially and economically integrated housing complex in Lower Manhattan, and

WHEREAS: It has also come to our attention that Community School Board #2 member Douglas Robinson, also at last month's meeting, strongly implied that our local elected officials and their staff representatives were racists for supporting the CB #1 recommendations, and

WHEREAS: If Mr. Nalley or Mr. Robinson had attend the CB #1 sponsored hearing on this subject which attracted approximately 400 local residents they would have seen a racially integrated group of Southbridge Towers residents as well as the vast majority of attendees speaking on behalf of creating a school zone enabling all the children in CB #1 to attend the two schools located in CB #1, PS 234 and PS 89, and

| | |
|---|---|
| WHEREAS: | Mr. Nalley has chosen to make ignorant statements which show a lack of understanding about our neighborhood and instead labeled a diverse housing community with hateful comments, now |
| THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: | CB #1 calls on Jon Nalley and Community School Board #2 to apologize to Southbridge Towers and this entire community for the shameful comments made by Mr. Nalley at last month's meeting, and |
| BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: | CB #1 calls on Community School Board #2 to investigate Mr. Nalley for his irresponsible comments and asks that the School Board do a better job of speaking out on its own against this type of false and inflammatory language in the future. |

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY**

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

RE: **Cove Diner sidewalk cafe renewal**

WHEREAS: The Cove Diner, located within the Cove condominium building at 2 South End Avenue has operated an illegal sidewalk cafe for several years and is now seeking to legalize this use, and

WHEREAS: The condominium Board of Directors of the Cove Club were contacted by the Community Board and the Cove Board supports the approval of the sidewalk cafe and indeed considers it to be an amenity to the building, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 endorses the proposed sidewalk cafe at Cove Diner (2 South End Ave.) subject to DCA and the applicant's acceptance of the following conditions:

1) The sidewalk cafe will close no later than 10:30 PM.
2) There will be no outdoor sound or music.
3) The restaurant will assure that their patrons are properly behaved and that there are no problems with regard to sanitation, noise, pedestrian flow or rowdiness
4) This approval is expressly for a one year period only.

98.res.mar.98

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

DATE: MARCH 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 2 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 34 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Proposed playground in the easement behind PS 234**

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 approves in principle use of the black top easement space west of PS 234 for an interim playground to include fixed playground equipment, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 reserves final approval until the following issues have been resolved.

1) Hours of operation.
2) Who will be responsible for opening and closing the area?
3) Who will be responsible for the maintenance?
4) Community access and security.

98.res.mar.98