COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

BOARD VOTE: 25 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **More Subway and Bus Service**

WHEREAS: Ridership on city buses is up an extraordinary 25% on weekdays and 20% on weekends as of March 1998, largely due to fare discounts like free transfers between subways and buses, and

WHEREAS: Subway ridership is at its highest level in a quarter century, and

WHEREAS: Transit officials have failed to add enough service to meet surging ridership, resulting in widespread crowding, slow travel and irregular service, and

WHEREAS: Riders should not have to suffer with slow and packed buses, and all subway riders should be guaranteed a seat in non-rush hours if possible; with rush-hour waits of no more than five minutes or off-peak of more than 10 minutes, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 calls on MTA New York City Transit to provide basic decent levels of bus and subway service for its growing ridership, and to seek the necessary resources from the state and the city to do so.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED
BOARD VOTE: 30 IN FAVOR 1 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED

RE: **Delury Triangle/Fishbridge Park**

WHEREAS: CB#1 has devoted much effort towards addressing the skateboarding problem at Delury Triangle located at Fulton and Gold Streets, and

WHEREAS: Several months ago the Community Board allocated a portion of the Hanover Square Fund towards physical alterations intended to dissuade skateboarders from jumping onto the park's benches and planters, and

WHEREAS: The original group which was to carry out this work, Southbridge Towers, has chosen not to serve in this capacity, and

WHEREAS: The Seaport Community Coalition has offered to take on the Delury Triangle work (which is to cost $30,000) and to spend $5,000 on a new fence and other repairs at Fishbridge Park located at Pearl and Dover Streets, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 approves the proposal put forth by the Seaport Community Coalition to spend $35,000 from the Hanover Square Fund for improvements to Delury Triangle and Fishbridge Park.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 29 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **Paul O'Dwyer**

WHEREAS: In March 1996, CB#1 approved the temporary co-naming of Duane St. for Paul O'Dwyer in recognition of his distinguished career and his contribution to the City of New York and to oppressed people throughout the world, and

WHEREAS: Mr. O'Dwyer, who served as President of The City Council, City Commissioner to the United Nations and Consular Corps., Manhattan Historian, and President of the Mayo Foundation for the Handicapped, recently passed away, and

WHEREAS: With his passing the City is now empowered to permanently co-name Duane St. in his memory, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that the City permanently co-name Duane St., between Broadway and Lafayette St., after the late Paul O'Dwyer.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Police presence in Tribeca**

WHEREAS: CB #1 has repeatedly gone on record requesting increased police presence in CB #1, and

WHEREAS: The number of police assigned to community patrol in the First Precinct continues to be inadequate for the geographic area covered by this precinct, and

WHEREAS: The residential, transient and school aged population in CB #1 is rapidly increasing reinforcing the need for additional police on the street, and

WHEREAS: A recent incident on Chambers Street demonstrated how limited police coverage increases response time, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 sees an urgent need for more police, especially community policing officers, and foot and bike patrol officers throughout the entire CB #1 area with special attention to Chambers Street and other high traffic areas at all hours, including nights and weekends, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: The First Precinct should document and report all incidents, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: Police assigned to the First Precinct should not be pulled for special detail if at all possible, given the shortage of police officers in the precinct, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 appreciates and commends the First Precinct for doing the best they can despite insufficient staff and resources.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 2 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 30 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 4 ABSTAINED (1 FOR CAUSE)

RE: **Restricting Access to Piers 25 and 26**

WHEREAS: HRPC has legitimate concerns about unauthorized access to and use of unsafe portions of Piers 25 and 26, and

WHEREAS: HRPC has proposed cutting a 10 foot section out of each pier to prevent continued access to portions of these piers deemed unsafe, and

WHEREAS: Removing a section of these piers would not only be aesthetically questionable, but could create a potentially greater hazard, and send the wrong message at a time we are trying to restore these piers, and

WHEREAS: Money spent to remove part of the piers could be better spent restoring them or improving access to usable portions, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 objects to removing any portion of the pier and asks that HRPC find an alternative solution to prevent access to unsafe parts of the pier, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 directs those who are permitted users of these piers to observe the directives of HRPC and negotiate directly with HRPC if they require access to or use of closed off sections of the piers.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: WITHDRAWN

RE: **Application for Catering License**

WHEREAS: Apogee Events has applied for a catering license at 480 Canal Street, and

WHEREAS: This business would have an entrance/waiting area at 2 Desbrosses Street as well as indoor and outdoor space on the top floor for weddings, receptions, events, dancing, and dining, and

WHEREAS: A total of 750 people could use this facility at one time, and its planned hours of operation are weekdays from 6 to 10 PM and Saturdays from 7 PM to 1 AM, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 is concerned about increased traffic and noise from this facility and potential negative impact on the people living on Desbrosses Street and other residential blocks, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 has no objection to the granting of this license provided that the owner provides the Community Board with binding written assurances that he will take the following steps to minimize the impact on the neighborhood;

- observe his commitment to the Tribeca Committee to prohibit "club nights" and all other events that collect an admission fee or contribution on-site;
- provide security as needed on the street;
- address concerns related to traffic and parking, including ensuring that cars do not double park or idle in front of or near this facility;
- ensure that patrons entering and exiting the facility and using the outdoor rooftop do not add to the noise level;
- prohibit the use of amplification equipment as well as recorded or live music in the outdoor roof area;

- provide an adequate level of soundproofing so that music and other sounds emanating from the facility do not negatively affect the quality of life of those living in adjoining buildings.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **39 North Moore St., aka 34 Ericsson Place, application to construct rooftop addition**

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension proposed was appropriate in relation to the size, massing and context of the existing building, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension would be not be highly visible either from the street or from neighboring lofts and would be visually overwhelmed by the Ice House extension to the east, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the massing and materials selected, particularly the extension of the party wall in brick, did not detract from the building and resulted in less apparent mass, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design, specifically of the rooftop addition, as proposed, to be appropriate to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the work as presented, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 would like to commend the applicant for the clear and concise presentation.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **365 Greenwich St., application to construct rooftop addition**

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension, while not highly visible from the street, would be extremely visible to many neighboring lofts (Independence Plaza), and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension proposed was inappropriate, confused and lacking any relation to the massing and context of the existing building, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the materials selected, the number and placement of skylights and the type of fenestration proposed detracted from the existing building, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design, as proposed, to be inappropriate to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission not approve the work as presented.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **62 Pearl St., application to legalize installation of flag pole and banners and neon signs**

WHEREAS: The committee found the presentation severely lacking in detail, particularly egregious was the lack of an existing conditions photo given that this is a legalization application, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission holdover or not approve the application as presented.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **253-255 Church St., application to install new storefront**

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the existing masonry facade was simply detailed and that the proposed steel storefront did not detract from the building, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design of the sign, while innovative, to be understated and sensitive to the historic fabric of the district and a good example of the use of contemporary materials and details, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design, as proposed, to be appropriate, and complementary to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the application for this work.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **103 Reade St., application to install an illuminated hanging sign**

WHEREAS: The committee unanimously agreed that because the owners, applicants or their representatives did not show up at the committee meeting, that CB #1 recommend that LPC holdover all action on the application until the owners, applicants or their representatives appear before this Board, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission take the above recommended action with regards to this application.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **27 Leonard St., application to construct rooftop addition, install ground floor infill and remove fire escape**

WHEREAS: The committee applauded the removal of the existing elevator bulkhead which is highly visible and felt that the rooftop extension proposed was appropriate in relation to the size, massing and context of the existing building, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension would be not be highly visible from the street, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the massing and materials did not detract from the building, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the intentions presented to carefully restore and rehabilitate the front facade, the replacement of the 2 over 2 windows in wood, and the new storefront to be highly commendable and fully supports the proposed work which will help unify the buildings with it's adjoining twin, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design to be appropriate to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the work as presented.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **121-133 Hudson St., application for exterior restoration and rooftop addition**

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension proposed was appropriate in relation to the size, massing and context of the existing building, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension would be not be highly visible from the street, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the massing and materials selected, particularly the extension of the party wall in brick, did not detract from the building and resulted in less apparent mass. However the detailing and fenestration of the corner window on the penthouse was questioned and it was felt that either the window should be separated into two windows (one on the side and one on the front) or the brick should be carried around the front of the penthouse with the window, and

WHEREAS: The committee is in support of the restoration of the marquee on buildings in the neighborhood and this project has done so in a creative and sensitive fashion. However the committee would prefer the marquee covering to be entirely in glass and found the introduction of a portion in metal to be awkward in design and detailing and not necessary as we believe that the transmission of light by the marquee to be a good change from the original design, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the use of aluminum windows in the Castree Building to be particularly inappropriate to this beautiful building (however acceptable in the other more current buildings), and would prefer the use of wood 2 over 2 windows, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design as proposed, to be appropriate to in Historic District, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the work as presented with the recommendation that the windows in the Castree Building be changed to wood, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 would like to commend the applicant, in contrast to his previous submission to CB #1, for the clear and concise presentation this time around, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 would like thank the LPC for referring this important project back to CB #1 before holding a final hearing.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT AND ARTS, URBAN PLANNING & DESIGN

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 30 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Historic Battery Park upper promenade, final design**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 approves the final design of the Battery Park upper promenade as put forth by the Conservancy for Historic Battery Park, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 commends the Conservancy for Historic Park for the promenade design and for being so cooperative with and responsive to CB #1 in all its important restoration projects throughout the Park.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY AND BALLFIELDS TASK FORCE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 34 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Battery Park City Ballfields**

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 is very gratified that Governor George Pataki, Chairman James Gill and President and CEO John La Mura have all indicated their commitment to permanently retain the Battery Park City ballfields, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board is greatly disturbed, however, that the BPCA has repeatedly failed in its commitment to meet with the Community Board to review the specific BPCA plan to retain these fields apparently based on the redistribution of FAR, and

WHEREAS: Instead, the Community Board has been forced to rely on gaining information on their plan via leaks and press reports which indicate that the BPCA is contemplating the construction of two buildings along the western edge of the ballfields site and sliding the fields east into the space now occupied by tennis and basketball courts, and

WHEREAS: The active recreation facilities in BPC (including these tennis and basketball courts) are already tremendously overcrowded and, in light of the rapid increase in residential population occurring throughout our Lower Manhattan district including a projected 150% increase in BPC alone and the lack of viable alternate locations to build such recreation spaces, are expected to serve far more people in the years to come, and

WHEREAS: The BPCA , as a public developer, has an obligation to provide the services and facilities to address the needs of our fast growing Lower Manhattan community and to consider providing additional recreation spaces in the north end of BPC, and

WHEREAS: The BPCA has already achieved an increase in the allowable FAR on Site 25 in a recently approved zoning action which allows for the construction of a hotel and movie theatre at this site, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 insists that the BPCA meet and consult with the Community Board as soon as possible and prior to finalizing any specific plan to retain the ballfields and redistribute FAR onto other sites, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 urges the BPCA to carefully take into account the following priorities of the Community Board with regard to the retention of the ballfields sites:

1) The size of the ballfields must not be diminished.
2) There should be no loss of existing recreation space in BPC. We urge the creation of additional open space in the northern end of BPC.
3) We oppose the construction of buildings on the ballfield sites (23/24).
4) All the unused FAR from sites 23/24 need not be redistributed. Larger buildings on sites 18, 19, 25 and 26 are, in fact, more valuable than buildings on sites 23/24 facing West Street.
5) We strongly support the creation of an indoor recreation “Y-type” facility for the community in the north end of BPC.

98.res.july.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JULY 28, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

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

RE: **Application for Catering License**

WHEREAS: Apogee Events has applied for a Catering License at 480 Canal St., and

WHEREAS: This business would have an entrance/waiting area at 2 Desbrosses St. as well as indoor and outdoor space on the top floor and roof for weddings, receptions, dancing, and dining, and

WHEREAS: A total of 750 people could use this facility at one time, and its planned hours of operation are weekdays from 6 to 10 PM and Saturdays from 7 PM to 1 AM, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 is concerned about increased traffic and noise from this facility, and potential negative impact on the people living on Desbrosses St. and other residential blocks, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 is also concerned about the environmental impact from loud music and open rooftop noise; limited parking availability; that Canal St. is an environmental "hot spot", and idling and doubling parked cars, and

WHEREAS: Eating and drinking establishments with entertainment and a capacity of more than 200 persons, or establishments of any capacity with dancing, as defined in use group 12A, require a special permit from the Board of Standards and Appeals, and

WHEREAS: Catering or banquet hall establishments in use group 13B are restricted to private events, not open to the public. It has been shown that the applicant's other establishments, the Madison Club, has events that are open to the public. Therefore use group 13B does not apply to their type of business, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 opposes a catering license at this location, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 believes that the applicant must comply with the requirements for Use Group 12A establishment for a special permit for from the Board of Standards and Appeals, with full community review for the environmental impact of this establishment.

98.res.july.98