

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC MEMBER:	2 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 415 Greenwich Street, City Planning Commission Special Permit to allow an attended accessory parking garage and authorization to allow residential conversion below the third floor

WHEREAS: The owners of 415 Greenwich Street have applied to the City Planning Commission for a Special Permit to allow an attended accessory parking garage with a maximum capacity of 90 spaces in portions of the first floor and cellar, as well as authorization to allow residential conversion below the third floor in a building where the lot coverage is 5,000 S.F. or more, and

WHEREAS: The premises are located in an M1-5 Zoning District within which residential uses are not permitted as-of-right, and

WHEREAS: The proposal is for conversion of an existing 8 story building and construction of a one story rooftop addition for a total of 90 loft dwellings with approximately 5,000 S.F. of commercial space on the first floor to be located on the Greenwich Street side, and

WHEREAS: The owners of 415 Greenwich Street acknowledged and agreed that if the requested Special Permit is granted (a) the proposed accessory parking garage will be used only for accessory parking for residents of 415 Greenwich Street and their guests and in strict compliance with any other conditions imposed by the City Planning Commission, (b) they will not seek a license from the Department of Consumer Affairs or any other agency to operate a transient or permanent public parking garage in the building and the proposed accessory parking garage will not be used for transient or permanent public parking under any circumstances, (c) there will be no signage whatsoever advertising the proposed accessory parking garage or any other exterior signage other than that required by law for pedestrian safety, (d) all necessary steps will be taken to ensure that the foregoing restrictions on use are legally binding on any successor owner or operator of the garage, and (e) any failure to comply with such restrictions on use shall be deemed to be grounds for revocation of the requested Special Permit, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: The Community Board approves the City Planning Commission granting of a Special Permit for an attended accessory parking garage with a maximum capacity of 90 spaces expressly subject to the foregoing conditions and limitations and such other conditions and limitations as the City Planning Commission deems necessary or appropriate, including without limitation that the proposed accessory parking garage be used only for accessory parking for occupants of 415 Greenwich Street and their guests and in strict compliance with any other conditions imposed by the City Planning Commission, and not for transient or permanent public parking, that there will be no signage whatsoever advertising the proposed accessory parking garage or any other exterior signage other than that required by law for pedestrian safety, and that any failure to comply with these restrictions on use shall be deemed to be grounds for revocation of the requested Special Permit, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: The Community Board approves the City Planning Commission granting an authorization to allow residential conversion below the third floor in a building where the lot coverage exceeds 5,000 square feet.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	13 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC MEMBER:	2 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	1 Recused

RE: Tribeca Family Festival street activity permit

WHEREAS: The Tribeca Family Festival has applied for a street activity permit for Greenwich Street from Hubert to Duane Street for April 28th, 29th and 30th as part of the 4th Annual Tribeca Film Festival, and

WHEREAS: This is the same request which has been previously granted for the last two years, and

WHEREAS: The organizers of the festival have worked closely with those impacted by the festival to mitigate the effects of the street closures, including the Independence Plaza Tenants Association, Friends of Greenwich Street and businesses in the area, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: The Community Board approves the granting of a street activity permit to the Tribeca Family Festival for April 28th, 29th and 30th.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 32 In Favor 4 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 100 Maiden Lane, CPC special permit to allow a public parking garage with 62 spaces in the cellar level and portions of the first floor of an existing building

WHEREAS: Maiden Lane Properties, LLC has submitted an application to the Department of City Planning for a special permit to allow an attended public parking garage with a maximum capacity of 62 spaces on portions of the cellar level and portions of the first floor of an existing residential building with 336 units located at 100 Maiden Lane, and

WHEREAS: The access to the garage will be on Cedar Street via a one lane, two-way ramp leading to the cellar level to a 10 space reservoir area off street, and

WHEREAS: The proposal for an attended public parking garage will help meet the parking needs of a growing residential community and provide some additional parking for workers and visitors as well, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the application for a special permit pursuant to Sections 13-562 and 74-52 of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York to allow a public parking garage with 62 spaces located in the cellar level of 100 Maiden Lane.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE:	9 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	1 Opposed	1 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Route 9A South Promenade Project

WHEREAS: The New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) has begun the reconstruction of Route 9A from West Thames Street to Battery Place at Washington Street, and

WHEREAS: As part of that project, the pedestrian portions along the east and west sides of Route 9A will be improved, and

WHEREAS: The western portion today has the Hudson River Park bikeway/walkway and Little West Street, with much of that in disrepair and fenced off, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1, upon seeing the original plans for the western promenade, approved a resolution calling on NYSDOT to add active recreation areas within this promenade project, and

WHEREAS: A task force of Community Board #1 members and some local residents worked with NYSDOT to redesign the south promenade, and

WHEREAS: The new design calls for plazas at the intersections of 1st, 2nd and 3rd. Place which, as one moves north, will be more active and community oriented in nature with areas for children to play and families to meet and sit. Game tables and ample seating will be installed along with an exercise circuit, and

WHEREAS: This design will create a large green space between 3rd Place and West Thames Street using Little West Street and this area will allow for more active recreation, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves this conceptual design for the South Promenade with the three plazas used for community oriented activities and that the use of the green space between 3rd Place and West Thames be the decision of the community. This will be done as the next portion between West Thames Street and Albany Street are redesigned, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 calls on NYSDOT, Battery Park City Authority and Hudson River Park Trust to work together on the issues of maintenance and upkeep, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 requires that NYSDOT work with the Community Board task force and present the final design for our approval, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: The existing active uses between West Thames and Albany Streets must be preserved in any design by NYSDOT, BPCA or HRPT and the newly created green space just below West Thames will be used for active recreation such as a dog run, community gardens, playground, basketball, tennis, etc.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 35 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 4 World Financial Center, liquor license application for PJ Clarkes on the Hudson LLC

WHEREAS: Owners of P.J. Clarke's have signed a lease to operate a new restaurant at 4 World Financial Center at the site where Moran's was, and

WHEREAS: This site has been lifeless for almost four years, and

WHEREAS: Both the experience and reputation of this owner are well known and this is a commitment to bring more business and pedestrian traffic to Lower Manhattan, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves this application for a liquor license.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 36 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 400 Chambers Street, beer and wine license application for Pan Latin Cafe

WHEREAS: The owner of Pan Latin Café has applied for a wine and beer license for the existing business, and

WHEREAS: This cafe has been operated successfully at that location, and

WHEREAS: This cafe has been involved in the renewal of this community, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves this application for a beer and wine license.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 4 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 34 In Favor 2 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposal to co-name Chambers Street between West Street and River Terrace, "Frederick Douglass Landing"

WHEREAS: It is proposed that Chambers Street from West Street to River Terrace be co-named Frederick Douglass Landing, and

WHEREAS: That location was, for most of the 19th century, a ferry landing from points west and south, and

WHEREAS: The Chambers Street ferry landing also became a vital link in the Underground Railroad, and

WHEREAS: Frederick Douglass first came to New York City through this landing and got married nearby at 36 Lispenard Street, and

WHEREAS: This co-naming would both respect the contribution of Mr. Douglass toward the abolition of slavery in America and remind us of the linkage of this area to that part of our history, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 supports the co-naming of Chambers Street from West Street to River Terrace as Frederick Douglass Landing, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 requests that a plaque be installed at this location to explain the historic significance of the site, the Underground Railroad, and Mr. Douglass.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	9 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	37 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 53 Murray Street, application to alter storefront and legalize existing windows

WHEREAS: The applicant installed good quality, appropriately profiled wood windows painted black which function as casement windows and as such are not allowed by LPC guidelines, and

WHEREAS: The Committee felt it would be unreasonable to ask the applicant to replace windows with double hung function made with the same profile as the ones installed, and

WHEREAS: The application to alter the storefront could not be properly considered as there were no tax photos, section plans or material boards prepared for the meeting, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 has no objection to legalizing the windows but requests that the Landmarks Preservation Commission hold-over this matter until CB #1 has the opportunity to fully consider the application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	9 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	37 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 85 Leonard St., application to legalize transoms above the door

WHEREAS: The application could not be considered as there were no pictures detailing the illegal installation, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission hold-over the application until CB #1 has the opportunity to fully consider the application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	37 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 245 Water Street, application to alter storefront

WHEREAS: The application is to install a historically appropriate storefront to this residential building, and

WHEREAS: The original granite columns will be cleaned with the poor infill being removed, and

WHEREAS: The new storefront will match the historic tax photo and consist of painted wood, in historically appropriate colors, with clear glass panels and transom, and

WHEREAS: The only signage will be the building number which the applicant agreed would follow LPC guidelines, and

WHEREAS: The Committee liked the alterations, which would be a great improvement, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approved.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 35 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 130 Duane Street, application to install canopies, signage and new storefront treatment, not previously approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission

WHEREAS: Among other new features not approved previously, this application requests the addition to the new hotel being built in the Tribeca South Historic District of metal canopies on both Church and Duane Streets -- which are to include clear and frosted glass tops and pin-mounted stainless-steel lettering -- as well as a redesign of the Church Street streetfront facade utilizing frosted glass with etched banding, and

WHEREAS: A representative of New York City Council Member Alan J. Gerson appeared at the Landmarks Committee hearing of Community Board #1 Manhattan, urging the Board to reject all consideration of this application until Hersha, the hotel's developer/builder, and Gene Kauffman, the project architect, respond to the frequent and ongoing concerns of Council Member Gerson, the Community Board, and many neighborhood residents, and

WHEREAS: The community and representative agencies, especially sensitized to the building in question by the matter of 320 Pearl Street -- designed by the same architect with the involvement of the same developer -- the construction of which was so totally without regard to the approved Landmarks Preservation Commission plans that the L.P.C. took the rare, extreme action of denying Mr. Kauffman and Hersha the means to legalize virtually any element of what has been erected, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board refers the Landmarks Preservation Commission to the Board's resolution of November 18, 2003, and

WHEREAS: It is both Landmarks Preservation Commission and Community Board #1 policy to reject applications for the attachment of canopies on the block of Duane Street between Church Street and West Broadway, as none exists currently, and, indeed, the last such application, for a canopy addition to what is now City Hall Restaurant, was rejected by both bodies, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 Manhattan recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission reject the request for a canopy addition on Duane Street, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 Manhattan cannot and will not recommend approval of any other of this plan's elements until the developer/builder and architect honor their commitments to our community to make a full presentation of building plans.

05res.feb.15

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	2 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	37 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 276 Water Street, application to construct a new 6 story residential building

WHEREAS: This proposed new residential building is to be located near the corner of Water and Dover Streets, opposite an anchorage of the Brooklyn Bridge, and situated adjacent to a park, a sliver of which occupies the corner itself, and

WHEREAS: The building's primary material would be carefully hewn brick, with some stone accents, as well as metal for some trim pieces and roofs, and

WHEREAS: The program includes the installation of photovoltaic solar cells, which partly explains the structure's irregularly-shaped roofs, and

WHEREAS: The overall proposal is quite an eyeful, and difficult to describe without visuals, and

WHEREAS: The design might best be said to have post-Modern massing -- especially on the Dover Street side and looking east from the park -- with a relatively contextual form, especially as regards the Water Street cornice line and window penetrations, and

WHEREAS: On Water Street, 64 feet of the six-story height will be visible, not a remarkable elevation for the block, and

WHEREAS: Most of Water Street's ground-floor would be occupied by a garage, faced with translucent glass and broken by a corner column, and the front windows would be of the "tilt-and-turn" variety, and

WHEREAS: Possibly because of the existing site's extremely difficult relationship to its surroundings, and the lot's irregular shape, the architects have attempted a free hand in shaping the structure's Dover Street and rear elevations; the result is a risky, overblown failure, albeit with what appears to be the best of intentions, and

WHEREAS: Because the architect is so respectful of the neighborhood, what is disrespectful about the planned design is glaring, and

WHEREAS: In summary,
- the fenestration is off, and the "tilt-and-turn" option is ill-advised on one of the oldest blocks in New York City;
- the garage door architecture would be out of context on, again, one of the oldest blocks in New York City, and
- the Dover Street and rear facades are too, too, well, too much of everything, and

WHEREAS: It should be noted that the architect's presentation was wonderful and thorough, and Community Board #1 Manhattan believes that the architect intends to be and ultimately will be a good shepherd for the neighborhood, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 Manhattan must nevertheless recommend that the Landmarks Preservation Commission reject this application in its present state.

05res.feb.15

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	9 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	37 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 141 Duane Street, application to alter storefront

WHEREAS: While the facade of this structure, in the Tribeca South Historic District, was heavily modified in 1934-35 in a then-contemporary style, it was a tasteful and unusual modification, and

WHEREAS: This proposal calls for changing the front door for one of wood and glass and, more importantly, replacing the first-floor glass-paneled entablature with wire simulacra covering full-width vent louvers, and

WHEREAS: These seemingly minor alterations are consequential, especially since the adjoining easterly building has a matching, restored and intact entablature, and

WHEREAS: The applicant did not provide materials samples and color samples, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 Manhattan urges the Landmarks Preservation Commission to hold over this application until the applicant returns to the Community Board with the required items for a full presentation.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 37 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 45 White Street, application for a one story penthouse addition, new windows and storefront alteration

WHEREAS: The application to install new wooden double hung windows with clear glass was considered appropriate for this 1820's mid block building, and

WHEREAS: The original storefront had been altered in the 1840's with the original cast iron columns being built over, and

WHEREAS: The new storefront will expose the original columns with a set back stained clear wood and clear glass infill appropriate to the Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The Committee felt the detailing on the base of the storefront was overly complicated and should be removed and left plain, and that the color of the stone transom would be more appropriate if painted cream rather than green as presented, and

WHEREAS: The roof addition made of stucco, wood and clear glass was only visible from the south west because of the low synagogue building next door, and

WHEREAS: The addition brings the height of the building to 94 feet with the addition of 12 feet for the penthouse which is well below the maximum height allowed of 120 feet, and

WHEREAS: The set back is 21 feet with a structure of 48 feet by 49 feet and is well below the FAR of 6.02, and

WHEREAS: The railing and mechanicals will not be visible, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves of the alterations to the windows and storefront with the noted amendments and has no objection to the one story addition and recommends that LPC approve the application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 2 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
BOARD VOTE: 37 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 21-23 South William Street, application for a rooftop addition

WHEREAS: This application is identical to one Community Board #1 Manhattan recommended for approval previously, except for the elimination here of one of the two stories proposed originally for a rooftop addition, and

WHEREAS: The Landmarks Preservation Commission has suggested that this plan would be approved after the removal of that extra story, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: The Community Board has no objections to the Landmarks Preservation Commission's suggestions -- to which the applicants represent they have complied -- and recommends approval.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 37 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 25 Peck Slip, application for a one story addition, storefront restoration and removal of existing fire escape

WHEREAS: The bulkhead will be removed, the setback of the penthouse will be 15' and will align with the adjoining hotel, and

WHEREAS: The storefront will be constructed from wood and glass matching the design of the neighboring restored building next door, and

WHEREAS: The facade will be cleaned and pointed with the drain pipe and fire escape removed, and

WHEREAS: The architect, Arpad Baksa, was amenable to adding detail to both the cap of the penthouse and the cornice and window penetrations of the storefront, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approves this application for a one story addition, storefront restoration and removal of existing fire escape.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 31 In Favor 3 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: City Hall Park Kiosk

WHEREAS: The NYC Economic Development Corporation and the Department of Parks and Recreation have proposed the installation of a new information kiosk to be built on the east side of Broadway just north of Barclay Street outside of City Hall Park, and

WHEREAS: This kiosk is to replace a smaller temporary kiosk at roughly this same spot which is staffed by the Alliance for Downtown NY and to distribute materials and information to visitors to the area, and

WHEREAS: The information kiosk provides an important service and is located on a wide sidewalk in an area heavily trafficked by visitors, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 supports the installation of the proposed replacement information kiosk at City Hall Park on the eastside of Broadway north of Barclay Street provided that:

- 1) The kiosk clearly emphasizes and celebrates Lower Manhattan both visually and by promoting local attractions and businesses
- 2) No commercial advertising space is to provided other than an acknowledgement of the sponsor. Any subsequent changes of the design will be brought back to the Community Board for review

COMMUNITY BOARD 1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: FEBRUARY 15, 2005

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

BY LAW SUB-COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
EXECUTIVE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
BOARD VOTE: TABLED

RE: Code of Conduct for Community Board Members

WHEREAS: Community Board members have a wide range of backgrounds, personalities and points of view and each contributes in his or her individual way to the general welfare of the community. Community Board 1 and the Lower Manhattan community benefit from this diversity even as members may “agree to disagree” on contentious issues, and

WHEREAS: A free and open exchange of ideas and different points of view are laudable elements of democracy in action and should be encouraged. Such debate should be conducted in a civil manner and should not include personal comments about individuals or their motives, and

WHEREAS: Article IX of the By-laws of Community Board 1 provides that the Board may establish additional rules as are not specifically covered by the language of the By-laws or the New York City Charter and are not in contravention of the By-laws or the New York City Charter, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 hereby amends its By-laws by deleting Section 1-C 2 and adding a new Section I-D to include a Code of Conduct governing the public statements and conduct of members of Community Board 1, as follows:

“Section I-D. Code of Conduct

- (a) Conduct of Members.
 - (i) Members shall refrain from making personal, derogatory, defamatory or slanderous comments about other members or members of the staff of Community Board 1 and shall not attack or question their motives whether at a meeting or elsewhere.
 - (ii) While it is acceptable to publicly disagree about pending issues, members shall be civil and carry on debate in an orderly manner. At meetings of Community Board 1,

members shall conduct themselves in accordance with §43 of Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised), including but not limited to the following:

- a. Confining remarks to the merits of the pending question;
 - b. Refraining from disturbing meetings, e.g., by having private conversations or using cell phones in the meeting room; and
 - c. Respecting the directives of the presiding officer of the meeting.
- (iii) Making the public feel welcome at meetings of Community Board 1 is an important part of the democratic process. At meetings, members shall not exhibit signs of prejudice or disrespect toward the public or other participants in the meeting. Every effort should be made to be fair and impartial in listening and responding to public testimony.
- (iv) Unless expressly designated to do so by the Board Chair, any member appearing before a government body or otherwise making a public statement shall not appear or speak in his or her capacity as a member of the Board. However, without express authorization, if the member states that he or she is a member of the Board, the member must also state that he or she is doing so for identification purposes only and any public comments made by a Board member should be clearly made as an individual opinion and not a representation of the feeling of the entire Community Board.
- (v) Nothing contained in this Code of Conduct shall prevent a member from speaking to the press or third parties about issues affecting the community or about Community Board 1 meetings attended by that member. Any member speaking to the press or third parties about such issues shall state that he or she is doing so in an individual capacity and not on behalf of Community Board 1 or any other member.
- (vi) Members shall at all times abide by this Code of Conduct. Failure to do so may result in enforcement action.
- (b) Enforcement Procedures.
- (i) Any violation of this Code of Conduct shall be addressed in accordance with §61 of Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised), the By-laws of Community Board 1 and the New York City Charter.