COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

BOARD VOTE: 21 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Noise Code**

WHEREAS: Excessive noise in CB #1 is a major quality of life concern, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has repeatedly gone on record calling for changes to the noise code to abate noise and step up enforcement of the noise code, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 supports the resolution of Community Board #8 adopted on July 17, 1998 (attached) calling for changes to the noise code and urges the City Council and the administration to take prompt action on this resolution.

98.res.september

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	21 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	1 ABSTAINED

RE: **New Trash Receptacles for Downtown**

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 previously preferred the black trash receptacles presented by the Downtown Alliance, and

WHEREAS: After testing these receptacles on the street it has been shown that the silver receptacles show less dirt and wear than the black, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 approves the placement of silver trash receptacles on the streets of our district by the Downtown Alliance.

98.res.september

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

BOARD VOTE: 22 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Dumpsters and storage of garbage**

WHEREAS: CB #1 has narrow and heavily congested streets, and

WHEREAS: There has been a dramatic increase in our residential and daytime population in recent years, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has received an increasing number of complaints, from residents, regarding garbage stored in dumpsters near their homes and garbage left sitting on sidewalks for many hours or for days awaiting collection, and

WHEREAS: Many dumpsters tend to be smelly, unsightly and overflowing with trash as well as nesting areas for rats and vermin, and

WHEREAS: The Department of Sanitation has announced its intention to begin to require adherence to existing regulations which prohibit refuse or receptacles being left out on City streets and sidewalks on non-collection days, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 supports the pilot program of compliance announced by the Department of Sanitation regarding dumpsters and the storage of garbage awaiting pick-up, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 urges local business establishments, the private carting industry and the Department of Sanitation to work together to comply with these regulations intended to improve the cleanliness of CB #1, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 reserves the right to comment on and evaluate this pilot program.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	22 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **122 Hudson Street**

WHEREAS: A design presentation was made by the Engineer for the project, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that while the proposed sidewalk did not detract from the building all memory of the glass lights would be lost by this renovation, and

WHEREAS: The committee, understanding the cost implications, asked the applicant to try and include some amount of the new glass lights in their renovation to provide a link to the past, and

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 recommends the LPC approve the application for this work.

98.res.september

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED
BOARD VOTE: 11 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 11 ABSTAINED

RE: **140 Franklin Street**

WHEREAS: The committee commended the Owner and Architect for their restraint in the proposed size of their penthouse and felt that the rooftop extension proposed was appropriate in relation to the size, massing & context of the existing building, and

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

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension would not (based upon the information provided) be highly visible from the near-by streets, and

WHEREAS: Some members of the committee felt that the rooftop cooling tower enclosure in copper was out of context with the existing building and would be highly visible from the near-by streets, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the intentions presented to carefully restore and rehabilitate the front facade, the replacement of the 4 over 4 windows in wood, and the new storefront to be highly commendable and fully supports the proposed work, and

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 recommends LPC review closely the cooling tower treatment and massing with the committee concerns in mind and if acceptable approve the work as presented.

98.res.september

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	22 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **159 Duane Street**

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the proposed storefront did not detract from the building, and

WHEREAS: The committee asked the applicant to include the adjoining "sister" storefront in the elevation drawing and provide a sample of the actual color of the adjoining Duane Park Restaurant storefront at the LPC presentation, and

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that LPC review the color in relation to the adjoining, highly green storefront and if acceptable approve the application for this work.

98.res.september

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	21 IN FAVOR	2 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **24-30 Laight Street**

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, and

WHEREAS: The committee commended the Owner/Architect for the design and fenestration of the eastern facade currently (and previously) occupied by a large billboard, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that LPC approve the work as presented.

98.res.september

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	24 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **239-245 Church Street, aka 66-70 Leonard Street**

WHEREAS: The committee applauded the reduction of the previously proposed penthouse both in height (8 foot reduction) and in bulk. The revised proposal also increases the setback distance from Franklin and Leonard Streets for the second level, and

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 massing and materials did not detract from the building, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension would not (based upon the information provided) be highly visible from the near-by streets. However, the distant sightline views of the proposal prepared for the last presentation were not shown with the revised proposal to the committee at this hearing, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that these distant views were important to our rejection of the previous scheme and the Applicant would prepare and present the distant views to the LPC and the public hearing, and

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that LPC approve the work as presented.

98.res.september

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	22 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **58 Walker Street**

WHEREAS: The committee found the intentions presented to carefully restore and rehabilitate the front facade, the replacement of the windows in wood, and the new and storefront to be highly commendable and fully supports the proposed work, and

WHEREAS: The committee was presented with the facts that the rooftop extension was not visible from any public thoroughfare, and

WHEREAS: The committee requested that the Applicant articulate the fenestration of the rooftop extension to help reduce it's apparent mass, and

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

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that LPC review the visibility of the penthouse as presented and, if not visible as indicated by the applicant, approve the work as presented.

98.res.september

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	22 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	1 ABSTAINED

RE: **"Hoop It Up" basketball event on Water Street**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: Community Board #1 approves the contribution of $2,000 to Manhattan Youth Recreation and Resources Inc., by Hoop It Up.

98.res.september

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE:	23 IN FAVOR	0 OPPOSED	0 ABSTAINED

RE: **2-12 Fulton Street**

WHEREAS: The committee was in general support of the project and the efforts of the Seaport Museum, a valued Lower Manhattan cultural institution, to expand their program space and make the Museum more visible and accessible, and

WHEREAS: The committee was supportive of the modern expression of the proposed building and felt that the architect, who has already produced a very acceptable modern building at Fulton and Front Streets in the Seaport, has here designed a very exciting and dramatic building for this vacant corner, and

WHEREAS: The committee had the following specific comments on the design:

- The committee was worried about the visibility of the cooling tower/mechanical "crown" on the building especially when viewed from the Fulton/Water Street vantage point. The Architect did not have sightline drawings from this point, the committee requested that they prepare and present these distant views to the LPC at the public hearing.
- The committee was not comfortable with the material fenestration of the "transition zone" between the glass wall and the adjoining historic buildings.
- Some members of the committee where concerned about the height of the building in relation to the fabric.

WHEREAS: The committee found the design, in general except for the comments listed above, to be appropriate, to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The LPC review the distant views with the concerns of the community in mind and if the visible part of the mechanical systems is as minimal as indicated by the applicant CB #1 recommends that LPC approve the work as presented, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: CB #1 asks, given the significance of this project, the LPC to refer this project back to the Board if changes to the design presented are made following the LPC review of the project.

98.res.september