

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 29 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **Cabaret license for Shine's nightclub at 285 West Broadway**

WHEREAS: Shine, a nightclub at 285 West Broadway (at Canal), has applied for a cabaret license, and

WHEREAS: Shine's has proven itself a good neighbor since it opened at this location almost one year ago, as evidence by unsolicited support from other tenants of 285 West Broadway and the absence of complaints to the 1st Precinct, and

WHEREAS: The owners of Shine have stated that they have no plans to change the operations or format of the club, but simply want to accommodate patrons who are moved by the music to dance, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: Community Board #1 has no objection to Shine's application for a cabaret license, provided that:

- 1) The license is non-transferable and limited to the current owners/operators.
- 2) Granting this permit complies with all zoning regulations, including the requirements for a BSA special permit for dancing in drinking establishments with entertainment and a capacity of more than 200 persons which appears to be applicable.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

- RE: **Closing of Pace Little School**
- WHEREAS: On November 23rd Pace University announced that in May 1999 it was closing the Pace Little School which is now in its 27th year, and
- WHEREAS: The Pace Little School is the only pre-school located east of Broadway in CB #1 and has an outstanding reputation and an extremely loyal following, and
- WHEREAS: The timing of the closing shows total disregard by Pace University for the parents and administrators of the school who wish to keep the school going at another location, and
- WHEREAS: It will be practically impossible to locate and open a new Little School by next September and parents who planned to send their children to Pace next year have virtually no time to explore other programs since the deadlines for applying are mid-December, and
- WHEREAS: The timing of the closing is also very inopportune since the residential population of Lower Manhattan is rapidly expanding including many new units east of Broadway, and
- WHEREAS: Pace University has a very poor record in terms of providing programs or services to the residential community of Lower Manhattan, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 feels that Pace has an obligation to the parents and children and should not simply abandon this very successful and special program and leave it in a very precarious situation but should be helping to save this most valuable resource for the children of Lower Manhattan, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 strongly objects to the decision of Pace University to close the Pace Little School and particularly condemns Pace's clear disregard for the children and parents who have been terribly impacted by this unanticipated decision, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 strongly urges that Pace University agree to allow the Little School to continue operating in Pace for a reasonable transition period of two years or less so that it is not forced to close as new space is sought, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

Pace University allow the Little School to transfer all the current equipment, furniture and supplies it now uses when it moves, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 requests that Pace University agree to participate in a serious discussion with parents, Kate Delacourt, elected officials and the Community Board to seek an amicable resolution to this situation so that the Little School can continue normal operation during a period of transition to another space.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **361 Broadway, application to construct a rooftop addition and restore the facades**
- APPLICANT: A design presentation was made by Joseph Pell Lombardi Architects for the project.
- WHEREAS: The committee found the proposed building to be of significant architectural character and important to the area, and
- WHEREAS: The committee found the intentions presented to restore and rehabilitate the facades and storefront to be highly commendable and fully supports the proposed work, and
- WHEREAS: The committee felt that the two story rooftop extension proposed would be visible from streets in the Tribeca (west of the building) area, and
- WHEREAS: The committee felt that the glass "greenhouse" materials selected, and the fenestration pattern proposed for the roof top addition would be appropriate and VERY IMPORTANT to the perception of the "lightness" of the addition, and
- WHEREAS: Some members of the committee felt that the two story rooftop extension proposed was inappropriate in size in relation to the size of the existing building and would be a highly visible addition to the building when viewed from other buildings and non-pedestrian vantage points and should be scaled down, now
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB#1 is fully in support of the proposed work to restore and rehabilitate the facades and storefronts and CB#1 recommends that LPC APPROVE the application, specifically for the facade work, as presented, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB#1 requests that the LPC review the rooftop addition with specific regards to its height in relation to the size of the existing building and the exact details of the glazing before acting on the application.

98.res.dec.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **74-76 Reade St., application to construct a one story rooftop addition**
- WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension would be very visible, especially from Chambers Street over an existing one story building (Ralph's Discount) and from neighboring lofts due to the fact that the majority of the adjoining buildings are only five story buildings, and
- WHEREAS: The committee felt that while the bland massing and materials selected for the addition did not detract from the district, the extensive handrails and stairs at the front did. It was proposed that by moving the addition and the handrails back a minimum of 8 ft (they are currently proposing a 15 ft setback) this would greatly improve the sight lines, and
- WHEREAS: The committee felt that, given the above concern, the LPC should consider supporting a minor (8 ft) modification of the rear yard height and set back requirements, and
- WHEREAS: The committee found the design of the rooftop addition, as proposed in it's current location, to be inappropriate, to the Historic District, now
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB#1 recommends that LPC NOT APPROVE the application for the rooftop addition as presented, and
- BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT: CB#1 would support a similarly sized rooftop addition if it were moved further back from the façade, or that the handrails and stairs at the front where significantly reduced or eliminated.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **107-113 Franklin St., application to legalize the installation of a sign**
 39 Vestry St., application to construct a rooftop addition
 28 Water St., application to legalize installation of flagpole and banner and alteration to a window

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

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB#1 recommends that LPC take the above recommended action with regards to these applications.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **20-26 N. Moore St., application to alter the ground floor infill and install railings**
- APPLICANT: A design presentation was made by the Joan Humphreys Architect for the project.
- WHEREAS: The committee noted the beauty and intricate detail of the existing storefront, and
- WHEREAS: The committee felt that the proposed storefront did not detract from the existing storefront or the building, and
- WHEREAS: The committee asked the applicant to further consider the extension of the entry doors (both pairs) to the full height of the window bay as they probably were originally, 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 LPC review closely the details of the proposed storefront renovation and if acceptable APPROVE the application for this work.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **106-110 Hudson St., application to extend the fire escape at the ninth floor**

APPLICANT: A presentation was made by the Paul Alter from Lee Skolnick Architect for the project.

WHEREAS: The committee found the building to be one which contributes to the architectural character of the Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the extension of the fire escapes across the facade, which will obscure some of the most important architectural features of the building, was not appropriate and that the required means of egress should be provided in an alternative way, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the proposed renovations were not appropriate to the character of either the building or the District, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB#1 recommends that LPC NOT APPROVE the application for the work as presented.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **265 Water St., application to enlarge window openings and create new window openings on side and rear elevations**

APPLICANT: A presentation was made John Hume Architect of the project.

WHEREAS: The committee found that there are existing side façade double hung windows in character with other lot line of windows in the Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The proposed windows are in keeping with the current windows, and

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

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

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **62 Pearl St., installation of sign**

APPLICANT: A design presentation was made by consultants for the project.

WHEREAS: The committee was not in favor of the bright yellow color the building was painted or the extensive neon signage in the windows that was approved by the LPC as part of a prior legalization application, and

WHEREAS: The committee does not believe that ADDITIONAL signage should be approved unless some of the existing neon signage is removed, and

WHEREAS: The committee feels that the new sign proposed is far more appropriate than the neon signage already legalized, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB#1 recommends that LPC NOT APPROVE the application as presented unless an agreement can be reached to remove some of the existing neon signage before installing the more appropriate wooden sign.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **415 Greenwich St., review of sight lines**

APPLICANT: A presentation was made by Roy Gee of Emery Roth Associates. Architect for the project.

WHEREAS: When the applicant previously presented the project to the Board the sight line data presented at that time minimized the visibility of the rooftop addition from Greenwich St., and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that, based upon the information now provided, the rooftop extension would, contrary to our prior understanding, be visible from Greenwich Street, and

WHEREAS: Previously the committee felt that the bland materials and fenestration selected for the roof top addition would be acceptable because we believed that little, if any, of this structure would be seen from the street. However, as a now visible structure on an elegant and contributing building, we do not believe these materials, i.e. corrugated metal, or the large "punched" window openings, appropriate or representative of materials or fenestration methods found in the Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The committee supported the other aspects of the proposed renovation and restoration of the building but found the materials and fenestration selected for the now visible penthouse design, to be inappropriate, to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB#1 recommends that LPC NOT APPROVE the roof top addition as presented, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB#1 thanks the LPC for their diligence with regards to the establishment and presentation of accurate sight line information for roof top additions in Tribeca and for asking the applicant to return to the Board with more accurate information.

98.res.dec.98

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

**COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: BALLFIELDS TASK FORCE AND
BATTERY PARK CITY**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Collaborative design process for ballfields site**

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 has been the catalyst behind the creation of and retention of the Battery Park City ballfields, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has successfully collaborated with the BPCA on design efforts leading to Robert F. Wagner Jr. Park and Rockefeller Park, both of which are widely praised and are extremely popular, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 is very interested in working in a positive, productive manner with the BPCA towards the creation of permanent ballfields and an indoor recreation center to serve the community, and

WHEREAS: It is our understanding that the BPCA plans to initiate the next phase of design for these sites in the very near future, and

WHEREAS: The success of our previous collaborative design efforts with the BPCA lead us to believe that this is the best way to proceed with the design of the ballfields and indoor recreation center, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 requests that the BPCA agree to institute a collaborative design process with the Community Board on all future phases of work on the ballfields and indoor recreation center.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 15, 1998

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

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

RE: **Drumgoole Square Renovations**

WHEREAS: In May 1997 CB #1 approved a proposed plan for the renovation of Drumgoole Square, and

WHEREAS: The Department of Design and Construction (DDC) has now responded with its own design concept for Drumgoole Square which is based on our recommendations, and

WHEREAS: Representatives of DDC agreed in committee to incorporate several suggested modifications put forth by the Community Board which would result in a restored Drumgoole Square with:

- 6 chess tables and 12 benches
- 8 Worlds Fair benches around the memorial
- 4 B-12 type light poles with Riverside luminaires, and

WHEREAS: DDC has also expressed its willingness to work with the Community Board in addressing the serious pigeon problem at Drumgoole Square by seeking DOT approval to put up webbing or another barrier to prevent the pigeons from nesting in the overhead ramp support structures, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 approves the Drumgoole Square conceptual design put forth by DDC with the agreed upon modifications cited above.

