

## **FULL BOARD MINUTES**

**DATE:** June 21, 2001  
**TIME:** 7:00 P.M.  
**PLACE:** St. Vincent's Hospital, 170 W. 12<sup>th</sup> Street  
Cronin Auditorium, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ann Arlen, Steve Ashkinazy, Glenn Bristow, Helene Burgess, Charle-John Cafiero, Keith Crandell, Doris Diether, Noam Dworman, Carol Feinman, Alan Jay Gerson, Elizabeth Gilmore, Edward Gold, Arnold L. Goren, Jo Hamilton, Anne Hearn, Brad Hoylman, Lisa LaFrieda, Don Lee, Aubrey Lees, Edward Ma, Don MacPherson, Rosemary McGrath, Doris Nash, T. Marc Newell, David Reck, Carol Reichman, Robert Rinaolo, Debra Sandler, Rocio Sanz, Arthur Z. Schwartz, Ruth Sherlip, John Short, Melissa Sklarz, James Smith, Chair, Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.); Sean Sweeney, Lora Tenenbaum, Martin Tessler, Wilbur Weder, Jeanne Wilcke Betty Williams, Suzanne Williamson, Carol Yankay.

**BOARD MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Anthony Dapolito, Harriet Fields, Honi Klein, Ann Robinson, Shirley Secunda, Verna Small.

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:** Tobi Bergman, Rev. Keith Fennessy.

**BOARD STAFF PRESENT:** Arthur Strickler, District Manager

**GUESTS:** Daryl Cochrane, Congressman Jerrold Nadler's office; Scott Melvin, Senator Tom Duane's office; Meg Reed, Senator Martin Connor's office; Yvonne Morrow, Assembly Speaker Sheldon Silver's office; Debbie Roth, Assemblymember Deborah Glick's office; Tom Castele, Councilmember Kathryn Freed's office; Andree Tenemas, Councilmember Margarita Lopez' office; Maura Keaney, Councilmember Christne Quinn's office, Blane Roberts, Man. Borough President C. Virginia Field's office; Philip Baird, Steven Pagnotta, Donato Savoie, Joe Bastianich, Margaret Braun, Laurie Woolenger, Ellen Peterson-Lewis, Scott Constantine, Sylia Uhzig, Donna Mendell, Jean Krampner, Kathleen M. Faccini, Jana Haimsohn, M.K. Doris, Angel Ayon, Brad Calcaterra, Angelo Cosentini, Alex Compagna, David Gruber, Jim Bond, Jose Caraballo, Thomas Lynch, Margery Perlmutter, Alfredo Ruiz, Fred Morris, Nuri Akgul, Zack Winestine, Margaret Wimmins, Sandro La Ferla, Sylvia Carter, Robert Palermo, Eli Haausknecht, Molly Goodrich, Cynthia E. Smith, Conrad Vogel, Carole De Saram, Blake Middleton, Steven Ciambuschini, Rudolph Frizzi, Thomas Shoemith, Richard Barrett, Robert V. Ferrari, Eleonore Henrich, Victoria Faust, Betsy Mickel, Giorgio De Luca, Joanne Henricks, Jay Segal, Jack Zyman, Donna Atkins, Joan Humphreys, George Bliss, Lawrence White, John Raine, Angelo Cosentini.

### **MEETING SUMMARY**

Meeting Date: June 21, 2001  
Board Members Present – 41  
Board Members Excused– 6  
Board Members Absent - 2

## **I. SUMMARY AND INDEX**

ATTENDANCE	1
MEETING SUMMARY	1
SUMMARY AND INDEX	2
PUBLIC SESSION	2
ADOPTION OF AGENDA	3
ELECTED OFFICIALS' REPORTS	3
ADOPTION OF MINUTES	3
EXECUTIVE SESSION	3
STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS	4
ZONING AND HOUSING	4
LANDMARKS	7
BUSINESS	12
NEW BUSINESS	18
ROLL CALL	19

## **II. PUBLIC SESSION**

### **Non-Agenda Items**

SoHo Park Plan-Bob Bolles/Broome St. Triangle  
Lawrence White and George Bliss spoke against the proposed park plan.

Housing Subcommittee  
Glenn Bristow spoke re the upcoming Housing Subcommittee meeting.

### **Landmarks & Public Aesthetics Items**

23-25 Greene St. Application is to request that the LPC to issue report to CPC pursuant to Sec. 74-712 re request for Modification of Use.

Angel Ayon and Margery Perlmutter, representing the applicant, spoke in favor of the application.

72-76 Greene St. Application is to request that the LPC request issue report to CPC pursuant to Sec. 74-712 re request for Modification of Use.

Angel Ayon and Margery Perlmutter, representing the applicant, spoke in favor of the application.

106 Spring St./93 Mercer St. Application is to request that the LPC issue report to CPC pursuant to Sec. 74-712 re request for Modification of Use.

Joan Humphreys spoke in favor of the application.

629-637 Hudson St. Application is to construct new 5-story building.

John Raine, spoke in favor of the application. Alex Compagno, representing the applicant, and Angelo Cosentini, the applicant, spoke in favor of the application.

### **Zoning and Housing Items**

499 Greenwich Street / 35 Renwick - BSA #162-01-BZ. Variance application to the BSA to construct a 14 story residential building in an M1-6 zone.

Jay Segal, representing the applicant, spoke in favor of the proposed variance application. Steven Ciambuschini, Blake Middleton, and Rudolph Frizzi, spoke in favor of the proposed variance application.

Eli Hausknecht, Carole De Saram, Thomas Shoesmith, Richard Barrett, Zack Winestine, David Gruber, Victoria Faust, Ellen Peterson-Lewis, and Joanne Hendricks, spoke against the proposed variance application. Eleonore Hendrich, Betsy Mickel, and Giorgio De Luca signed up but did not speak against the application.

### **Business Items**

Babbo, 110 Waverly Place  
Molly Goodrich, Donna Atkins, and Sylvia Carter spoke in favor of the renewal. Joe Bastianich, applicant, Robert V. Ferrari, representing the applicant, spoke in favor of the renewal application.

Thomas Lynch, Sylka Uhzig, Brad Calcaterra, Robert Palermo, Nuri Akgul, and Jack Zyman spoke against the renewal of the liquor license.

Vladimir Ponorovsky, 8 Little W. 12<sup>th</sup> St.

Philip Baird spoke against the beer and wine license application. Steven Pagnotta spoke regarding the application.

### **III. Adoption of Agenda**

### **IV. Elected Officials Present and Reporting**

Daryl Cochrane, of Congressman Jerrold Nadler's office

Scott Melvin, Senator Tom Duane's office

Yvonne Morrow, of Assembly Speaker Sheldon Silver's office

Debbie Roth, of Assemblymember Deborah Glick's office

Tom Castele, of Councilmember Kathryn Freed's office.

Andree Tenemas, Councilmember Margarita Lopez' office,

Maura Keaney, of Councilmember Christine Quinn's office

Blane Roberts, of Man. Borough President C. Virginia Fields's office

### **V. Adoption of Minutes**

Adoption of May minutes.                      Distribution of May minutes.

### **VI. Executive Session**

1. **Chair's Report** Jim Smith reported
2. **District Manager's Report** Arthur Strickler reported.
3. **New Community Neighborhood Names**

**WHEREAS** Community Board #2, Manhattan (CB#2, Man.) takes note of the proliferation of new neighborhood names that have been made up for marketing purposes, for instance, NOLITA for the area North of Little Italy; and

**WHEREAS** CB#2, Man. notes emphatically that these acronyms have nothing to do with the longstanding historic neighborhood names such as Little Italy; and

**WHEREAS** CB#2, Man. has received feedback from residents of Little Italy, and particularly those who live on Mulberry, Prince, Mott and Elizabeth Streets, including parishioners of Old St. Patrick's Cathedral, whose history and heritage originate and are rooted in Little Italy, and who find such made-up names as NOLITA insulting and contrived solely for commercialism; and

**WHEREAS** CB#2, Man. strongly opposes the Balkanization of its geographic area of jurisdiction as exemplified by these manufactured names whose sole purpose is for marketing real estate;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that CB#2, Man. calls upon those organizations such as the *New York Times Editorial and Classified and Advertising Departments*, the Real Estate Board of New York, to cease publishing ads referring to these fictitious geographic names which have no community roots or history; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. calls upon its elected representatives to denounce this trend toward trivialization of our neighborhoods identity and to act to protect our cherished traditional neighborhood names from sacrifice to today's fast buck profiteers.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

### **STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

## **ZONING AND HOUSING**

### **1. 499 Greenwich Street / 35 Renwick - BSA #162-01-BZ Variance Application To The BSA To Construct A 14 Story Residential Building In An M1-6 Zone.**

**WHEREAS** the community is very concerned about large residential projects being built through zoning variances and there is an urgent need for an overall plan that addresses residential uses in manufacturing and live/work neighborhoods and how it impacts the manufacturers, artists, services, sewage and water systems and transportation; and

**WHEREAS** the community had strong objections about adding residential uses into this area, the large scale of this building and the large number of units; and

**WHEREAS** the finding of uniqueness is questionable and we are seeing a constant stream of applications that claim that the conditions are unique, yet these conditions are common through the whole downtown area; and

**WHEREAS** for the findings of the “Reasonable Rate of Return” –

- the Economic Report, Schedule C, seems to indicate that there were no vacant land sales in the M1-6 District, yet 328 Spring and 491 Greenwich are comprised of partially vacant land, 59<sup>th</sup> Street is only an “asking” price, properties in the West Village (100 Morton St./ 600 Washington St.) and those in SoHo obviously bring a higher asking price and 60 Thompson was bought for conforming use;
- 345 Hudson, 250 Hudson and 325 Hudson listed in Schedule D are marked M1-5 and they should be M1-6, and the first two are much smaller than this site but no adjustment was made for size;
- Schedule E lists retail rents and the only one real comparable, 307 Spring St., does not list the use, and #1 is in CB3, #3 is in Tribeca, 9 Jones St. is in an R6 District in the central Village, and 405 Hudson, much larger, in an M1-5 District near Clarkson St., and all of these have only minor adjustments for location and none for zoning; and

**WHEREAS** although the applicant claims that this variance is in the character of the neighborhood and that residential use is already prevalent in the area, it is interesting that none of the comparables for residential rents are in the Hudson Square area and 4 of 5 residential rentals are in Tribeca or CB1, and another is Jane St., at the corner of Washington St., a C6-2A District and little adjustment was made for location; and

**WHEREAS** there are serious environmental concerns as there is a possibility that a spill occurred on the site, and there are strong indications that asbestos and other hazardous waste were handled on the site illegally during the 1980’s, raising serious questions and we request that this information be taken into consideration;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends denial of the variance for 499 Greenwich Street, in order to protect the surrounding community from the harmful effects of these residues in the soil and groundwater, a Health and Safety Plan must be required by the Board of Standards and Appeals, to be approved by representatives of the affected community together with the Community Board, prior to any further demolition, excavation and construction, and that the plan include:

- Containment and suppression of fine dust during excavation, demolition and construction to insure that particles of dangerous substances do not migrate into surrounding communities where they would pose a health hazard to young children and others;
- Shrouding and wetting down among the methods to be employed;
- Ongoing testing of groundwater for petroleum contaminants, with appropriate containment and diversion where contamination is found;
- Establishment of a community advisory panel to meet regularly with the developers if and as the work goes forward; and

**FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED** that it is becoming more and more inappropriate to be considering any variances for large-scale residential use until an overall plan is in place and variances were never intended to rezone entire neighborhoods, but the cumulative effect of these variances will have that effect; and

**FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED** that we are greatly concerned about the possible spills on the site and hazardous substances that were handled on the site, probably illegally, and we ask that the BSA ensure that these issues are addressed to the fullest extent.

Vote: with 23 Board members in favor, and 14 in opposition.

**2. 525 BROOME STREET Board of Standards and Appeals Special Permit Application 192-01-BZ Special Permit Application To Legalize The Cellar And 1<sup>st</sup> Floor For Use As An Eating And Drinking Establishment.**

**WHEREAS** this club has been operating for 3 years without a valid Certificate of Occupancy or Public Assembly Permit, although they did secure a liquor license (which CB#2, Man. voted against) despite an ABC law section that requires proof of appropriate Certificate of Incorporation; and

**WHEREAS** the owner of this property, Paul Stallings, did not know or advise the club owners that the zoning did not permit an eating and drinking establishment, yet he was the sponsor of the condominium plan for this building, the developer and is also a joint applicant with the club owner, and it is surprising that this information was not known by these parties; and

**WHEREAS** the club has been a source of complaints for a number of years and the club owners are even now in litigation with the condo owner in the unit directly overhead; and

**WHEREAS** a number of local residents, including some from the building, appeared at our hearing to protest this application; and

**WHEREAS** we request that the BSA clarify whether the applicant should be filing for Use Group 6C, as they are, which implies that the club has entertainment with set show times and cover charges, which they do not, or whether they should be filing for Use Group 6 A, which is for an eating and drinking establishment with “accessory music for which there is no cover charge and no specified show time”; and

**WHEREAS** the filing under Use Group 6C is at the BSA while the filing under Use Group 6A may be at City Planning, and where the applicant is filing needs to be clarified; and

**WHEREAS** there are no 6-C uses in the M1-5A or M1-5B zoning districts; and

**WHEREAS** although the claim was made that this is a restaurant, on a site visit on a Saturday night at 8:30 p.m., an employee informed us that the place did not open until 9 p.m., which is unusual for a restaurant, and, in fact, the owner informed us that his chef had resigned six months ago and they had not yet found another; and

**WHEREAS** the plans presented to us do not show a separation of residential and commercial use – the club has an entrance into the elevator lobby used by the residential tenants, and in fact, this lobby appears, from the plans, to be used by club patrons to reach the rest rooms on the floor; and

**WHEREAS** several condo owners complained about no access to mechanicals and exorbitant water bills since the club began operation; and

**WHEREAS** their acoustical engineer in 1997 recorded 70 decibels in the unit above the club, equaling a motorcycle in your kitchen, and although the club owners have soundproofed since that time, they have stated that they intend to do more, which leads us to believe a significant problem still exists (as noted in a June 2000 NY POST article) and points to why former manufacturing buildings put to such use are not compatible with artist living quarters and require zoning approval; and

**WHEREAS** the whole front of the premises, first floor and skylight over the common area is glass, which is very difficult to soundproof, and the building itself has many areas difficult to soundproof; and

**WHEREAS** this establishment was fined \$800 in November 2000 and received another violation in April 2001; and

**WHEREAS** at the same time the applicant had filed with BSA, he also applied to the State Liquor Authority for a renewal of his existing liquor license;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. strongly recommends denial of this application, not only because of the longstanding complaints in the building and surrounding area, but because we also believe the application may be incorrectly filed as Use Group 6C, not Use Group 6A, possibly to make it easier to get approval; and

**FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED** that we are very concerned that the noise level is beyond what can be remotely considered acceptable and that this problem has existed for years which is unconscionable; and

**FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED** that we do not agree with the argument that the developer/sponsor and the club owners did not know of the illegality of the use and this is not a valid excuse from sophisticated parties.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**3. 387 West Broadway- City Planning Special Permit Application ULURP 01011BZSM Special Permit Application To Permit Six Joint Living/Work Quarters For Artists On The 2-4<sup>th</sup> Floor And Retail On The 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Of Existing 4 Story Building In An M1-5a Zone.**

**WHEREAS** no additional bulk is being requested; and

**WHEREAS** although this is a through lot, a center court of 38'x35' is being created to assure adequate light and air to the units and the design of the connecting corridor does not cover the lot line windows of neighboring buildings; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant volunteered that they would accept the condition of no eating and drinking establishments on the ground floor; and

**WHEREAS** the "sunrooms" to be erected on the roof will take the place of former mechanical housing and do not significantly alter the building; and

**WHEREAS** the HVAC units appear to be evenly distributed and do not appear to be disruptive to the neighboring buildings; and

**WHEREAS** we request that the condominium plan be very clear that the units are joint living/work quarters for artists and not residential units; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant agreed to keep neighboring buildings advised of the construction as it occurs;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** CB#2, Man. recommends the approval of the special permit to allow six joint living working quarters for artists on the 2-4<sup>th</sup> floors and retail on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor with the condition of no eating and drinking establishments on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor and we request that the condominium plan clearly state that the units are joint living/work quarters for artists.

Vote: Passed, with 40 Board members in favor, and 1 in opposition.

**4. 88-90 Jane St. Board Of Standards And Appeals #149-01-Bz Bulk Variance To Convert The Community Facility Area In The Cellar And 1<sup>st</sup> Floor (Currently Restricted To Doctor's Offices) To Residential Use.**

**WHEREAS** when a condominium building is allowed to have additional bulk because a portion will be community facilities and then later there is a request to eliminate the community facilities, it raises questions about the precedent that will be set; and

**WHEREAS** the current proposed plans for conversion to residential appear very similar to an application filed in 1980 that was turned down by both the Community Board and the BSA; and

**WHEREAS** the 1980 CB#2, Man. resolution could again be applied to the new proposal since it said "proposed building contains cellar recreation rooms, two of them connected to no-bedroom apartments" (which could lead them to be used for bedrooms illegally), and the original plans had a building with much greater floor area and a smaller inner court than permitted by zoning, and the new proposal appears to create the same objections; and

**WHEREAS** the Board of Standards and Appeals turned down the 1980 application and the developer went forward with an "as-of-right" building, but received greater floor area because it contained the new addition of community facility bonuses, yet the new application gets us right back to a building very similar to what was formally disapproved; and

**WHEREAS** there is no support for finding (d) of Self Created Hardship, which states that "the practical difficulties or unnecessary hardship claimed as ground for a variance have not been created by the owner or by a predecessor in title; however where all other required findings are made, the purchase of a zoning lot subject to the restrictions sought to be varied shall not in itself constitute a self-created hardship", yet absolutely a predecessor in title created what is now being called a hardship and the purchaser bought the units with the restrictions; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant states in the “Findings” that the community facility in the cellar and 1<sup>st</sup> floor met the needs of the sole practitioner when constructed 15 years ago, yet does not explain how this single unit became 6 separate units, bought separately, and if it met the needs in 1985, why it was never rented; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant claims \$144,000 in hard costs to make the space usable for conforming medical offices, yet if the space was actually built for such use, much of the plumbing, electrical and mechanical work should have been done at that time, or would be done by the doctor/tenant of the space, and in any case, we doubt the numbers as it is fairly common for a doctor to do his or her own build-out of a space; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant states that the building was constructed “as-of-right”, yet it appears from the application that the present building is non-complying –

1. Permitted FAR is 2.027, existing is 2.96,
2. A letter from Gene Kaufman, Architect, to applicant dated May 30, 2001 states “However, the existing apartments on the upper floors do not meet with the MDL light and air requirements either.”
3. The Department of Buildings Objection Sheet, #4, states “proposed conversion of first floor to residential increases non-compliance of rear yard equivalent per Zoning Regulation 23-533 and light and air requirements of MDL.” and

**WHEREAS** the applicant states that the building is not handicapped-accessible, yet many older buildings with one or two steps to the entrance have installed ramps which are less expensive than the figure the applicant shows to convert the existing space to residential use; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant’s financial advisor used as comparables Vacant Land Sales, rather than the acquisition cost for the two floors in an existing building, and none of the vacant land sales are in an R-6 District, all of them being in M1-5 Districts, and all of them substantially larger than the subject site; and

**WHEREAS** in Schedule D, Comparable Office Rents, no zoning is given for the comparables, and only 354 Hudson St. is near the size of this space, and, without the zoning, we cannot show justification for the lack of adjustments made to the figures due to zoning; and

**WHEREAS** in preparing the comparables for Schedule D, two other medical facilities come to mind – 31 Washington St. West, by variance from the Board of Standard & Appeals, containing a number of individual and small suites of doctor’s offices, and 36 Seventh Ave., connected loosely with St. Vincent’s Hospital, but the individual offices are rented out to one or two doctors each;

**WHEREAS** in the May 21<sup>st</sup> Economic letter, Section 2.10, Value of the Property “as is”, again reference is to “vacant land sales” and it sounds like the applicant is allocating the total land acquisition cost to the six 1<sup>st</sup> floor and cellar units, whereas the land costs are shared by all the units in the building; and

**WHEREAS** on the Quality Housing analysis, Sections 28-31 and 28-32 are not addressed because the addition to the building is less than 9 new dwelling units, but the total number of units in the building is higher than 9;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. does not approve this variance to convert the community facility use in the cellar and 1<sup>st</sup> floor to residential use and the application looks very similar to what the original developer had wanted to build in 1980, but was turned down by both the BSA and CB#2, Man.; and

**FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED** that the non-compliance of the building in regards to light, air and the rear yard would increase if the application is granted; and

**FURTHER AND MOST STRONGLY BE IT RESOLVED** that building with community facility use to gain greater bulk than would be allowed under zoning and then seeking a variance to change the community facility use to what the original desired use was sets a very dangerous precedent and is the misuse of both the bonuses that are derived from community facilities and the variances to change use.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

#### **LANDMARKS AND PUBLIC AESTHETICS**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING: LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION June 26,2001**

1. **SPECIAL ITEM:** Proposal to adopt the Historic District Council’s preservation platform to be presented to the Mayoral candidates.

**WHEREAS**, the preservation platform is:

- Commitment to tax incentives to building owners for restoration work on historic properties
- Preservation, restoration, and maintenance of public buildings, especially historic school buildings
- Increased funding and staffing for timely consideration and designation of historic properties, and efficient enforcement of the Landmarks Law
- Commitment to zoning reform that reinforces and complements historic neighborhoods, for example: rezoning to match the existing fabric within historic districts, and sympathetically scaled zoning around historic districts

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. supports the above stated initiative.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**2. LPC Item: 6 – 595 Broadway (Houston) A factory and workshop built in 1866. Application is to replace the storefront on the Broadway façade and install a new stair on the Mercer Street façade.**

**WHEREAS**, the size of the proposed display window on Broadway is considerably larger than historic display windows in the cast-iron Historic District, this partly a result of the significant lowering of the storefront's bulkhead from historic scale; but

**WHEREAS**, this proposed work will not remove any original fabric; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed gooseneck lighting and proposed sign band of white painted aluminum letters is characteristic of the district; and

**WHEREAS**, at 4'8" by 2'6", the single black vinyl banner is only 11.65 square feet, which is in scale with the building and Broadway; and

**WHEREAS**, the gray, black and white color scheme is harmonious; but

**WHEREAS**, the Mercer Street portion of the application unfortunately proposes to remove an old multi-pane double door which is characteristic of the Cast-Iron District, and replace it with a single-panel solid wood door; and

**WHEREAS**, on Mercer Street, the proposed banner, 2'6" x 8'7", 21.5 sq. ft., is double the size of the banner proposed for Broadway, a very wide thoroughfare, unlike narrow Mercer Street where a large banner would definitely obscure the architecture;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application with caveats on the Broadway storefront bulkhead's height and the oversized banner on Mercer Street.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**3. LPC Item: 7 – 597 Broadway A store and warehouse built in 1867. Application is to replace the storefront.**

**WHEREAS**, the height of this storefront bulkhead is characteristic of the historic district; and

**WHEREAS**, the lettering and lighting on the storefront is attractive; and

**WHEREAS**, the steps will be diamond-plate metal; and

**WHEREAS**, the wooden pilasters installed in the 1990's will remain, but encased in metal, which maintains the geometry of the 1990's construction;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**4. LPC Item: 8 – 62 Crosby Street**

**WHEREAS** the Landmarks Preservation Commission's publication *The Certificate of Appropriateness Public Hearing: Information for Applicants* states that "applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Community Board to arrange for review of the proposal before the public hearing"; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant did not contact the Community Board or appear before the Landmarks Committee to present this application; now



**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends denial of this application in the absence of this important step in the review process.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**5. LPC Item: 9 – 23-25 Greene Street (Canal)**

**A French Renaissance-style storehouse built in 1872. Application is to request the LPC to issue a report to the CPC pursuant to ZR 74-711 relating to a request for a modification of use. Zoned M1-5B**

**WHEREAS**, for a change of use, the CPC must issue a report stating that the scope of work provides adequate preservation purpose, as well as providing a maintenance plan to maintain the façade at an historic level to be inspected every five years by a preservation architect approved by the LPC; and

**WHEREAS**, this proposal calls for the restoration of the sheet metal and cast iron, repair of the fire escape, caulking the windows, and painting; and

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that approval of the Landmarks portion of the Sec. 74-711 application shall not be construed as approval of the zoning/change of use portion, which will be reviewed at a public hearing held by CB#2, Man.'s Zoning and Housing Committee

Vote: Passed, with 39 Board members in favor, and 2 in opposition.

**6. LPC Item: 10 – 72-76 Greene Street**

**A French Second Empire-style warehouse built in 1872 by I. F. Duckworth. Application is to request that the LPC issue a report to the CPC pursuant to ZR 74-711 relating to a request for a modification of use. Zoned M1-5B**

**WHEREAS**, for a change of use, the CPC must issue a report stating that the scope of work provides adequate preservation purpose as well as providing a maintenance plan to maintain the façade at an historic level, to be inspected every five years by a preservation architect approved by the LPC; and

**WHEREAS**, this proposal calls for the removal of brick infill and replacement with 2 over 2 windows, repair of corroding fire escapes, extensive repair of metal elements and extensive structural stabilization;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that approval of the Landmarks portion of the Sec. 74-711 application shall not be construed as approval of the zoning/change of use portion, which will be reviewed at a public hearing held by CB#2, Man.'s Zoning and Housing Committee.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**7. LPC Item: 11 – 93 Mercer Street (106 Spring St)      A Classical revival –style building built in 1900. Application is to request the LPC to issue a report to the CPC pursuant to ZR 74-711 relating to a request for a modification of use. Zoned M1-5B**

**WHEREAS**, for a change of use, the CPC must issue a report stating that the scope of work provides an adequate preservation purpose as well as providing a maintenance plan to maintain the façade at an historic level, to be inspected every five years by a preservation architect approved by the LPC; and

**WHEREAS**, this proposal calls for a blade sign on Mercer, restorative work on the brick, caulking the windows, replacing a 1930's historic door, cleaning the building, repair of the metal grill work, painting and repairing;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that approval of the Landmarks portion of the Sec. 74-711 application shall not be construed as approval of the zoning/change of use portion, which will be reviewed at a public hearing held by CB#2, Man.'s Zoning and Housing Committee.

Vote: Passed, with 39 Board members in favor, and 2 in opposition.

**8. LPC Item: 12 - 106 Spring Street, a/k/a 93 Mercer Street A Renaissance Revival store and loft building built in 1895. Application is to request the LPC to issue a report to the CPC pursuant to ZR 74-711 relating to a request for a modification of use. Zoned M1-5B**

**WHEREAS**, for a change of use, the CPC must issue a report stating that the scope of work provides an adequate preservation purpose as well as providing a maintenance plan to maintain the façade at an historic level, to be inspected every five years by a preservation architect approved by the LPC; and

**WHEREAS**, this proposal calls for a blade sign on Mercer, restorative work on the brick, caulking the windows, replacing a 1930's historic door, cleaning the building, repair of the metal grill work, painting and repairing;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that approval of the Landmarks portion of the Sec. 74-711 application shall not be construed as approval of the zoning/change of use portion, which will be reviewed at a public hearing held by CB#2, Man.'s Zoning and Housing Committee.

Vote: Passed, with 39 Board members in favor, and 2 in opposition.

**9. LPC Item: 13 - 103 Prince Street (N.E. Greene St corner) It meets guidelines for staff approval and is to be approved at staff level.**

**10. LPC Item: 14 – 23 King Street**

**WHEREAS** the Landmarks Preservation Commission's publication *The Certificate of Appropriateness Public Hearing: Information for Applicants* states that "applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Community Board to arrange for review of the proposal before the public hearing"; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant did not contact the Community Board or appear before the Landmarks Committee to present this application; now

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends denial of this application in the absence of this important step in the review process.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**11. LPC Item: 15 – 625 Broadway (Houston/Bleecker) A Renaissance Revival-style storefront and loft building built in 1896. Application is to construct a rooftop addition.**

**WHEREAS**, there will be a new bulkhead built for the roof stairs and elevator; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed extended sides of the existing rooftop bulkhead will only be slightly visible on the north and south elevations, and the proposed brickwork will match existing masonry; and

**WHEREAS**, there will be a glimpse of the glass fenestrated east façade visible from a distance on Houston Street;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application.

Vote: Passed, with 37 Board members in favor, and 4 in opposition.

**12. LPC Item: 16 – 8 St. Luke's Place An Italianate-style row house built in 1852. Application is to construct a rooftop bulkhead.**

**WHEREAS**, we applaud the renovation and painting as part of the application, but

**WHEREAS**, we do note that the new solid wood door proposed to replace a door with glass panes and approved at staff level replicates similar doors on the row of houses numbered #4-7; however, the group of houses to which #8 belongs, #8-17, have different doors; and

**WHEREAS**, the proposed rooftop structure at 17' 9" by 10' 7" (188 square feet) and 9' high seems extraordinarily large for a rooftop stair bulkhead; and

**WHEREAS**, the exposed metal finish will be fairly visible from the street and, facing south, could reflect sunlight;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends denial of this application.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**13. LPC Item: 17 – 70 Barrow –Held Over.**

**14. LPC Item: 18 – 100 Greenwich Avenue (Jane St.) A Greek Revival-style rowhouse built in 1836. Application is to legalize the construction of a rooftop stair bulkhead without LPC permits.**

**WHEREAS**, because the bulkhead has been re-designed to take into consideration our previous objections and now is only barely visible —18” at 265 feet away.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application.

Vote: Passed, with 40 Board members in favor, and 1 in opposition.

**15. LPC Item: 19 - 185 West 4<sup>th</sup> Street (Sheridan Sq.) A neo-Federal–style stable built in 1897 and altered in 1919. Application is to install a rooftop railing.**

**WHEREAS**, the HVAC unit on the roof is visible and unattractive, and this proposed structure will help conceal it, as well as providing safety for service personnel;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**16. LPC Item: 20 - 36 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue, a.k.a. 203 West 12<sup>th</sup> Street (St. Vincent’s annex) An institutional building constructed in 1962. Application is to install fences and a sign.**

**WHEREAS**, a group of violent people have colonized the front landscaped areas of the building and there was a murder this year as well as violent assaults against security guards, intimidation of citizens, and extremely unsanitary and unhealthy conditions; and

**WHEREAS**, despite myriad attempts by St. Vincent’s, the NYPD, D.A. Robert Morgenthau, elected officials Tom Duane and Christine Quinn, the Community Board, and community associations to clean up the problem, the mess continues; and

**WHEREAS**, a fence to cordon the area is a last resort to an intractable problem; and

**WHEREAS**, the 8’ fence supported on the existing masonry parapet is attractive and characteristic in style and scale to other fences for institutional buildings in the historic district; and

**WHEREAS**, this initiative is extremely costly to St. Vincent’s;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application; and

**FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. greatly appreciates the efforts that St. Vincent’s has undertaken to alleviate the problem.

Vote: Passed, with 37 Board members in favor, and 4 in opposition.

**17. LPC Item: 21 – 637 Hudson Street, a.k.a. 43 Horatio Street A vacant lot. Application is to construct a new five-story building.**

**WHEREAS**, this is one of the more sensitive proposals for new construction we have recently; and

**WHEREAS**, the building proposed maintains the streetwall continuity, and the massing and rhythm of a 19<sup>th</sup> century building; and

**WHEREAS**, the materials and palette are generally characteristic of the historic district, and the sanded finish of the bricks supplies depth and texture; and

**WHEREAS**, the stucco rooftop stair bulkhead is not part of the formal architectural composition, and

**WHEREAS**, the sloped roof of the penthouse with skylight provides an atelier look; and

**WHEREAS**, the sign band is harmonious with the building; but

**WHEREAS**, the balconies on the west wall are not characteristic of a building of this style in Greenwich Village; and

**WHEREAS**, the riveted I-beam cornice is a bit industrial looking and eventually could cause streaking of the facade; and

**WHEREAS**, the cast-stone lintels meant to be similar to traditional blue stone lintels have, in fact, an olive tone, which is unusual;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends approval of this application, but urges the applicant to reconsider the cornice, the balconies and the olive tone for the cast-stone lintels;

Vote: Passed, with 40 Board members in favor, and 1 in opposition.

## **BUSINESS**

### **Red Lion, 151-153 Bleecker St.**

**WHEREAS**, when the Red Lion owner was called in December 2000 because of outstanding violations, he submitted a letter from his architect stating that they expected the problems to be resolved within not more than 4 weeks, and then a valid Certificate of Occupancy and Public Assembly Permit would be secured, and

**WHEREAS**, at this month's meeting, the owner again appeared and stated that the violations still exist, but "they should be cleared up very shortly" and that he had hired a new architect and expediter, and

**WHEREAS** the December resolution of the Board was to give the applicant six months to cure the problems, but it appears the owner is attempting to secure the necessary approvals, at this time,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. will extend the time for compliance, and will call the applicant in again in 3 months to see what progress is being made to secure the necessary papers.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

### **192 Bleecker St. - 192 Bleecker St. Trattoria**

**WHEREAS** the present restaurant has operated at this site for 19 years without problems, and

**WHEREAS** the new owner intends to follow his predecessor's manner of doing business, and

**WHEREAS** the restaurant seats 50 people, with hours from 11 AM to midnight, and

**WHEREAS** the new owner intends to apply for a sidewalk cafe, which the previous owner also had, but there is no plan for use of any rear yard,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man has no objection to the transfer of the beer and wine license from its current owner to the new owner of 192 Bleecker St. Trattoria at 192 Bleecker St.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

### **192 Bleecker St. - 192 Bleecker St. Trattoria**

**WHEREAS** the present restaurant has operated at this site for 19 years without problems, and

**WHEREAS** the new owner intends to follow his predecessor's manner of doing business, and

**WHEREAS** the restaurant seats 50 people, with hours from 11 AM to midnight, and

**WHEREAS** the new owner intends to apply for a sidewalk cafe, which the previous owner also had, but there is no plan for use of any rear yard,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man has no objection to the transfer of the beer and wine license from its current owner to the new owner of 192 Bleecker St. Trattoria at 192 Bleecker St.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

### **525 Broome St. - Bear Restaurant Group d/b/a Veruka**

**WHEREAS** an eating & drinking establishment in the M1-5B area requires a Special Permit from the Board of Standards & Appeals, and

**WHEREAS** Veruka has been operating at this location since at least early 1999, and

**WHEREAS** over the period of time the club was given a number of violations, and

**WHEREAS** there were noise and other complaints about the operation, and

**WHEREAS** residents from the building appeared at the Public Hearing to protest the renewal of this license, and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has finally filed with the Board of Standards & Appeals for the required Special Permit, an application which is on the Zoning Committee Calendar this month, and

**WHEREAS** as early as February 1999 the owner was advised that the use was not permitted by the zoning, and the same applied to the dancing, and

**WHEREAS**, at the same time that the applicant made application to the Board of Standards & Appeals to legalize the use, he also applied to the State Liquor Authority for renewal of his existing liquor license, and

**WHEREAS** the Community Board would like some explanation from the SLA of how this premises secured a liquor license without a valid Certificate of Occupancy for such a use, and also why the Dept. of Buildings permitted this applicant to continue in business for 2 years,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man strongly opposes the renewal of this liquor license for Bear Restaurant Group d/b/a Veruka at 525 Broome St. and asks that the license be revoked immediately.

See Attachments

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**393 Canal St./8 Thompson St. - BINY Enterprises, Inc.**

**WHEREAS** this is a second floor establishment transferring a license that has been at this site since 1998, and

**WHEREAS** there are 70 seats with another 6 at the sushi bar, and

**WHEREAS** the hours of operation are 11:30 AM to 10 PM Mon. to Thurs., to 11 PM Fri., and 1:30 PM to 11 PM Sat., with music on tapes, and

**WHEREAS** there are no plans for a sidewalk cafe or use of the backyard,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man has no objection to the transfer of this liquor license to BINY Enterprises, Inc. at 393 Canal St./8 Thompson St.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**91 Charles St./368 Bleecker St.**

**WHEREAS** this application was considered by CB#2, Man in November 2000, and

**WHEREAS** at that time, because of the size of the proposed establishment and the extensive work being done, we questioned whether this was indeed a transfer and should not be considered as a new application, and

**WHEREAS**, because of the size of the establishment, 7,000 sq. ft., under 4 and 5-story residential buildings with 1<sup>st</sup> floor commercial, CB#2, Man voted to oppose the application, and

**WHEREAS** there are currently violations on the property for work without a valid permit and no approved plans on site, and

**WHEREAS**, on a visit within the month the premises was still closed and under construction, as it had been on our visit in November, and the workman informed us they would not be opening until October, and

**WHEREAS**, with this extensive alteration it would appear that the floor plan and occupancy will be altered from what is covered by the present license,

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man recommends that the current license be revoked and the applicant files a new application with corrected plans, etc. when he is nearer to actual opening for August Restaurants, Inc. d/b/a Maurin, 91 Charles St./368 Bleecker St.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**60 Greenwich Ave. - Sandwich Shoppe of N.Y.**

**WHEREAS** this shop has been in existence for 14 years at this site, and

**WHEREAS** this is an application for a wine license, and

**WHEREAS** the premises seats 16 people at 8 tables, with hours of operation from 7 AM to 9 PM, and

**WHEREAS** there are no plans for a sidewalk cafe or rear yard use,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man recommends approval of the wine license for Sandwich Shoppe of NY, at 60 Greenwich Ave.

Vote: Passed, with 40 Board members in favor, and 1 in opposition

**51-53 Grove St. - Grove Restaurant Corp.**

**WHEREAS** this is an application for a beer & wine license, and

**WHEREAS** the restaurant seats 75-90 persons with hours from 11 AM to midnight, and

**WHEREAS** there are no plans for a sidewalk cafe or backyard use, and

**WHEREAS** this location on Grove St. facing 7th Ave. would seem to create no problems;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man recommends approval of a beer & wine license for Grove Restaurant Corp. at 51-53 Grove St

Vote: Passed, with 40 Board members in favor, and 1 in opposition.

**636 Hudson St. - Hudson Bar & Books**

**WHEREAS**, when this applicant came up for renewal of his liquor license last December there were two Landmarks violations; and

**WHEREAS** there were complaints that the applicant put tables & chairs out on the sidewalk without a sidewalk cafe permit and that the doors were left open so that the noise and music bothered residents, and

**WHEREAS** the applicant was asked to come back this month to answer these complaints, but did not receive the notice of the meeting until the day after the meeting, and

**WHEREAS** the applicant sent a letter immediately outlining steps that had been taken -they have communicated with the Landmarks Preservation Commission re the violations and pushed for the building owner to comply, tables were removed from the sidewalk and will not be placed there until and unless they obtain a valid permit for them, and they have discontinued live music and improved the soundproofing inside the establishment, reinstated.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. has no objection to the regular license being reinstated.

Vote: Passed, with 40 Board members in favor, and 1 in opposition.

**224 Lafayette St. - Home Style Cafe, Inc.**

**WHEREAS** this name change was inadvertently filed as a new application for a beer license and

**WHEREAS** the present restaurant has been at this location for 20 years, and

**WHEREAS**, although the restaurant has open French doors in front, the street is wide, and mostly commercial, so there is no real problem with the French doors at this location; and

**WHEREAS** the restaurant seats 61 with hours of 7 AM to 5 PM, Mon. through Sat., closed Sun., and

**WHEREAS** there is no plans for either a sidewalk cafe or rear yard use,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man has not objection to the proposed name change for Home Style Cafe, Inc., at 224 Lafayette St.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**8 Little West 12 St. - Vadim Ponorovsky**

**WHEREAS** this will be a small establishment for only 26-30 people, and hours of operation will be 11 AM to midnight weekdays, to 2 AM Sat., and to 11 PM Sunday, and

**WHEREAS** this is a license for only a wine & beer license, and

**WHEREAS** there are no plans for either a sidewalk cafe or rear yard use,

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** CB #2 has no objection to a new beer & wine license for Vadim Ponorovsky at 8 Little West 12 St.

**LAID OVER TO JULY COMMITTEE**

**56-58 Macdougall St. - Stella 58, Inc.**

**WHEREAS** this is an application for a beer & wine license and

**WHEREAS** the seating is for 45 people, with 6 seats at a counter, and

**WHEREAS** hours of operation are Tues.-Fri., 6 PM to midnight, Sat., 1 PM to midnight, & Sun., 1 PM to 5 PM. and

**WHEREAS** there are no plans for a sidewalk cafe or rear yard use, and

**WHEREAS** this site is adjacent to St. Anthony's School, but for a beer & wine license this is not a problem,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man has no objection to a beer & wine license for Stella 58, Inc., at 56-58 Macdougall St.

Vote: Passed, with 40 Board members in favor, and 1 recusal (R. Sanz).

**110 Mulberry St. -La Bella Ferrera**

**WHEREAS** this is an application for a wine & beer license for a small shop on the Mulberry St. Mall, and

**WHEREAS** the establishment has been in business for 28 years, and

**WHEREAS** the restaurant seats 70 at 16 tables, with hours of operation from 9 AM to midnight; and

**WHEREAS** the establishment has a sidewalk cafe permit with hours also from 9 AM to midnight, but no intention of using a rear yard, and

**WHEREAS** it is surrounded by other establishments selling beer, wine & liquor on the Mall,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man has no objection to a beer and wine license for La Bella Ferrera (A.C.A. Mulberry, Inc.) at 110 Mulberry St.

Vote: Unanimous, with 41 Board members in favor.

**110 University Pl. - Bowlmor Lanes**

**WHEREAS** this is an application from Bowlmor Lanes to reinstate an expired license for a small bar on the third floor of the establishment, and

**WHEREAS** the license lapsed due to a misunderstanding by the applicant of the renewal date, but it has been in existence and was formerly licensed, and

**WHEREAS** the applicant informed the Committee that he had complied with the terms of the resolution adopted by CB #2 last September (attached),

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man does not object to this small alteration in the current licenses for Bowlmor Lanes at 110 University Pl.

Vote: Passed, with 40 Board members in favor, and 1 in opposition.

### **110 Waverly Pl. - Babbo Restaurant**

**WHEREAS** there were 2 violations for no Place of Assembly license still noted on the ECB records, although the applicant submitted a print-out indicating that the application for the license had been filed on August 21, 2000, and approved on December 1, 2000, and

**WHEREAS** a violation dated July 12, 2000, also shows on the ECB records for "Work does not conform to approved plans" specifically noting the 3rd and 4th floors, and it is not clear whether the applicants print-out re Change of Egress is related to this violation, and

**WHEREAS** the applicant has received a "Permit for Minor Work" from the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) dated May 24, 2000, dealing with their outstanding violation for installation of lighting fixtures without permit, and

**WHEREAS** the LPC notified CB#2, Man. on May 29, 2001, that they would be issuing a Warning Letter to the restaurant for window replacement at the 2nd floor facade, and

**WHEREAS**, during the Public Hearing a number of residents from the area voiced complaints about conditions mostly at the rear of the restaurant which were affecting them - cooking smells day and night, noise from the new ventilation system installed on the roof of the 1-story extension of the restaurant, roof structures on this extension interfering with the use of the adjacent properties yards and patios, and

**WHEREAS**, during the discussion the lawyer was asked about the use of the two former residential floors, and stated that they were to remain vacant, but then added that they might be used for storage by the restaurant which would be a commercial use; and

**WHEREAS** the questions was again raised about the lack of a variance for this restaurant since the former restaurant had been closed for about 5 years before Babbo opened, and

**WHEREAS**, in February 1998 when CB#2, Man first heard the application for a liquor license for this space, the resolution stated that there was no neighbor opposition, but stated: "**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man. recommends that the applicant have the building's owner apply to the NYC Board of Standards & Appeals for a zoning variance to allow for a restaurant, and "**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that CB#2-Man recommends that the SLA postpone any action on this matter until such time as a variance from the NYC Board of Standards and Appeals has been obtained," and

**WHEREAS**, at the meeting, the applicant stated that he would supply the Committee with copies of the material submitted to the Dept. of Buildings and the SLA to prove that there had been no interruption in the operation of the restaurant, and

**WHEREAS**, the day after the meeting, the applicant's attorney submitted a letter to Chairman Jim Smith dealing with the neighbor's complaints, and further stated "With respect to this issue, Babbo has long since passed muster before the New York City Department of Buildings, the State Liquor Authority and all other City and State agencies with regulatory authority regarding its existence and operation, Babbo will no longer subject itself to addressing an issue which was determined in 1998 as to its right to operate at 110 Waverly Place," and

**WHEREAS**, besides recollections from many members of the community, there also appears to be numerous newspaper articles which refute the argument that the restaurant use at 110 Waverly Pl. never ceased operation, (see attached);

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that CB#2, Man opposes the renewal of the liquor license for 110 Waverly Pl., Babbo, based on the various complaints from neighbors and documentation and Recollections from community residents that the restaurant use was discontinued for more than two years and no variance was secured to reinstate this use.



**(This was the resolution adopted in February 1998).**

**Babbo, LLC, 110 Waverly Place, NYC 10011 (bet. Macdougall St. & 6th Ave.)**

**WHEREAS** the applicant is proposing to reestablish a restaurant in the premises of the former Coach House Restaurant; and

**WHEREAS** the applicant is an operator of other establishments generally known to the public as bona-fide restaurants with no adverse community impact; and

**WHEREAS** premises is zoned residential and has been vacant as a restaurant for more than 2 years and therefore constitutes a non-conforming use from a zoning and land use standpoint; and

**WHEREAS** there was no neighborhood opposition except for the non-conforming use issue;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that CB#2-Man. recommends that the applicant have the building's owner apply to the NYC Board of Standards & Appeals for a zoning variance to allow for a restaurant; and**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that CB#2-Man. recommends that the SLA postpone any action on this matter until such time as a variance from the NYC Board of Standards and Appeals has been obtained.**

Vote: Unanimous, with 33 Board members in favor.

### **Documentation on Babbo & Coach House**

N.Y. Times, Dec. 24, 1993 - "Diner's Journal" by Florence Fabricant "No More Coach House"

The Coach House, at 110 Waverly Place in Greenwich Village, has closed. The restaurant, long a landmark and once considered the best American restaurant in New York City, closed in the summer for vacation and never reopened. It has now been permanently closed by the owner, Leon Lianides, who is 76 years old and has not been in good health. The restaurant and building are for sale at an asking price of about \$3.5 million.

N.Y. Times, Jan. 2, 1994 - "Neighborhood Report: Greenwich Village - an Appreciation. "After 44 years and 4 proud stars, dinner is over at the Coach House." by Bryan Miller

"When the 44-year-old Coach House, at 110 Waverly Place, closed officially just before Christmas, the Village, indeed the city, lost a culinary icon ....."

"The 76-year-old Mr. Lianides, who has been in failing health in recent years, never reopened the restaurant after closing for vacation last summer."

Stribling, Wells & Gay, 340 West 23 St.

EXCLUSIVE - 110 Waverly Pl. between Sixth Ave. & Macdougall St. Description: 4 story decontrolled brick walk-up with The Coach House Restaurant on street level and three apartments above leased on a month-to-month lease. Remarks: Building can be delivered vacant.  
Faxes out to prospective buyer Feb. 17, 1997

N.Y. Times, ???1998 - A New Restaurant replaces a Village Landmark by Florence Fabricant "The Coach House, which was founded nearly 50 years ago, has stood silent and shuttered on Waverly Place just off Washington Square since 1993 ....."

"By the time the Coach House closed for summer vacation in 1993, never to be opened by Mr. Lianides, whose health was failing, its status has slipped from the four stars it enjoyed in the 1970s and 80's to a single, somewhat bedraggled atar,

"After the restaurant closed, Mr. Lianides hoped to sell the building. The asking price was \$3.5 million.

N.Y. Times - June 3, 1998 - Obituary

Leon Lianides, 81: Opened Fine Restaurants to U.S. Cuisine

"Leon Lianides, the demanding owner of the Coach House restaurant in Greenwich Village, died Monday at his home in Riverdale, the Bronx. He was 81 ....."

"In the summer of 1993, the Coach House closed for the summer, and in December 1993 it was put up for sale. In January, it was announced that a new Mediterranean restaurant, Grillo, would open there."

The Villager, June 10, 1998 - Obituary

Leon Lianides, Coach House restaurant owner, died at 81

"Leon Lianides, who founded the Coach House, one of the city's premier restaurants, in the Village in 1949 and ran it until it closed in the summer of 1993, died June 1<sup>st</sup> at the age of 81 ....."

"The location, which has been vacant since Lianides put the place up for sale in 1993, has been remodeled and a new restaurant, Babbo, appears ready to open soon."

***At this point, Glenn Bristow called for a quorum. Due to lack of a quorum, the meeting was adjourned. All Committee reports not read were laid over to July 2001.***

**NEW BUSINESS**

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Yankay, 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair  
Community Board #2, Manhattan