

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 40 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Proposed street closure on Saturday, September 16, 2006, Vesey Street  
between West Street and North End Avenue by Battery Park City  
Neighbor's Association for a block party

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street activity permit  
submitted by the BPC Neighbor's Association to close Vesey Street  
between West Street and North End Avenue on September 16, 2006  
during the hours of 8 AM - 7 PM.

06resjune20

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 40 Wall Street, liquor license application for Mangia Wall LLC, d/b/a Mangia

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with 60 tables and 100 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 11:00 AM until 11:00 PM Sunday through Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to have music only as appropriate for an establishment located where it is, and to provide adequate sound-proofing, and

WHEREAS: The applicant represented that it will not be seeking a cabaret license or sidewalk café license, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the liquor license application for Mangia Wall LLC located at 40 Wall Street for a period of two years subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 90 John Street, liquor license application for 200 Water Group LLC

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with 30 tables and 186 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 11:00 AM until midnight PM Sunday through Thursday and 11 AM until 1 AM Friday and Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to have background music only as appropriate for an establishment located where it is, and to provide adequate sound-proofing, and

WHEREAS: The applicant represented that it will not be seeking a cabaret license or sidewalk café license, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the liquor license application for 200 Water Group LLC located at 90 John Street for a period of two years subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 123 Washington Street, application for an urban plaza

WHEREAS: 123 Washington Street, LLC is seeking approval of a 5978 s.f. urban plaza in conjunction with their planned construction of a 56 story, 315,732 s.f. mixed use building at 123 Washington Street, and

WHEREAS: Per the Zoning Resolution, this plaza will generate 59,780 s.f. (2.66 FAR) of bonus floor area, and

WHEREAS: The plaza will contain a 1,000 s.f. open air café that will be accessory to a restaurant located within the building, and

WHEREAS: The application also seeks authorization to allow obstructions within 20 feet of a street line, so as to comply with requests from the Department of City Planning regarding the layout of this plaza, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the new urban plaza as proposed for 123 Washington Street.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	5 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 1 and 5 Coenties Slip, liquor license application for JPK Restaurant Corp.,  
d/b/a Zigolini

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with 38 tables and 80 seats,  
and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 7:00 AM until 11 PM  
Sunday - Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant represented that it will not be seeking a cabaret license but  
will be seeking a sidewalk café license, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the liquor license application for JPK Restaurant Corp.  
d/b/a Zigolini located at 1 and 5 Coenties Slip for a period of two years  
subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions  
set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	24 In Favor	12 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 2 Gold Street, application for an outdoor café within an urban plaza

WHEREAS: Bryan Cave LLP seeks approval of an application to modify the requirements of the Zoning Resolution to permit the establishment of an open air café in an existing urban plaza, and

WHEREAS: The proposed café will occupy 907 s.f. within a 6,512 s.f. plaza, and

WHEREAS: The café will have 108 seats and 27 tables and will be managed by an existing restaurant in the adjacent ground floor retail, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the application for a special permit to allow the establishment of the open-air café at 2 Gold Street.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Proposed street closure on Friday July 14, 2006, John Street between  
Broadway and Nassau Street by Elliot Winick Productions

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street activity permit  
submitted by the Elliot Winick Productions to close John Street between  
Broadway and Nassau Street on July 14, 2006 during the hours of 11 AM  
- 9 PM.

06resjune20

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:	9 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Proposed street closure June 27 – July 6, 2006 of John Street / Burling Slip between Front and South Streets by Philip Santantonio / KM Association for America's 400<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Event

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the proposed street activity permit submitted by the Philip Santantonio / KM Association to close John Street between Front and South Streets from June 27 – July 6, 2006.

06resjune20



COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Pier 17, South Street Seaport, beer and wine license application for Salmaan Enterprises Inc., d/b/a Wine and Chill

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to sell beer and wine from a stationary cart in front of their restaurant, Wine and Chill, located on Pier 17 at the South Street Seaport, and

WHEREAS: Selling wine and beer from such a cart will encourage the consumption of these beverages by people walking around the Seaport and vicinity which is illegal and highly undesirable, and

WHEREAS: The Seaport had a very serious problem several years ago with the public, open consumption of alcoholic beverages turning the streets and open areas of the Seaport into virtual bars filled with revelers, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 strongly opposes this license application and urges the NYS Liquor Authority to deny this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:	8 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	36 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 146 Beekman Street, application for an unenclosed sidewalk café for Manhattan Island Group, LLC

WHEREAS: The applicant has applied for a unenclosed sidewalk cafe license for 6 tables and 12 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed hours of operation will be 8 AM until midnight Monday through Thursday, 8 AM until 1:00 AM on Friday and Saturday and noon until midnight on Sunday, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the sidewalk café license for Manhattan Island Group, LLC located at 146 Beekman Street for a period of two years subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 11 In Favor    0 Opposed    1 Abstained    0 Recused  
PUBLIC VOTE:        2 In Favor    0 Opposed    0 Abstained    0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:            TABLED

RE:                    Request for the co-naming of 1 block along Lispenard Street, between Church Street and Broadway, as David Ruggles Way

WHEREAS: David Ruggles was the first African American publisher who actually lived on Lispenard Street and was almost abducted and sold into slavery from that location, and was a major abolitionist who personally gave support to hundreds of runaways, including Frederick Douglas himself, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT:                Community Board #1 supports the co-naming application for Lispenard Street between Church Street and Broadway.

06resjune20

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	12 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	2 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: Proposed electronic billboard for Tribeca Performing Arts Center at BMCC on the northwest corner of Greenwich Street at Chambers Street

WHEREAS: Borough of Manhattan Community College (BMCC) has proposed to install a Light Emitting Diode (LED) Television Screen / Fixed Signage Information Display Panel (IDP) at the N/W corner of Greenwich and Chambers Streets, (see attached rendering), and

WHEREAS: The purpose of the IDP is to increase visibility and promote events for the BMCC Performing Arts Center (also know as Tribeca Performing Arts Center or TPAC), and

WHEREAS: The IDP's overall height would be 114" and the overall width would be 70", and

WHEREAS: The LED television screen would be 69" x 44", and

WHEREAS: Community Board # 1 has had and continues to have a wonderful relationship with BMCC / TPAC, and

WHEREAS: Community Board # 1 is a staunch supporter of our neighbors at the TPAC, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 has several concerns with the appropriateness of the IDP/LED at the N/W corner of Greenwich and Chambers Streets as presented for the following reasons:

- 1) the size of the IDP is much too large.
- 2) the location is on a very busy pedestrian corner and would cause unsafe queuing conditions.
- 3) the LED television screen is too large and illuminating and would be distracting to drivers at a very busy vehicular and pedestrian traffic intersection.
- 4) its proximity to Washington Market Park would block the historic fencing surrounding the park; the restoration of the fence is something the community fought for during the park's renovation.

- 5) the Community Board feels the overall design and appearance of the IDP with LED television screen is not aesthetically appropriate at this location or any other location on the street and does not fit into the character of the neighborhood, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board # 1 recommends that the Department of Transportation (DOT) reject the BMCC application for the installation of a IDP/LED television screen at the N/W corner of Greenwich and Chambers Streets.

06resjune20

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	3 Opposed	2 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	0 In Favor	2 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	25 In Favor	7 Opposed	1 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 361 Greenwich Street, renewal application for an unenclosed sidewalk café for Sunflower Restaurant Assoc. Inc., d/b/a Flor De Sol

WHEREAS: The applicant has applied for a unenclosed sidewalk cafe license for 5 tables and 12 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed hours of operation will be 8 AM until midnight Monday through Thursday, 8 AM until 1:00 AM on Friday and Saturday and noon until midnight on Sunday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant has agreed to close the glass exterior doors whenever they play live music in the restaurant, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not object to the sidewalk café license for Flor De Sol at 361 Greenwich Street between Franklin and Harrison Streets for a period of two years subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	9 In Favor	1 Opposed	2 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	1 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	29 In Favor	4 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 2-8 York Street, application for a hotel liquor license for Barclay Hospitality Services, Inc. and Alliance Hospitality Management, LLC, d/b/a Hilton Garden Inn Tribeca

WHEREAS: This application is only for the hotel's liquor license for a 24 hour gift shop (as presented in the plans) and for room service; another application will be submitted to the Community Board in the future for a separate liquor license for a 2,300 sf restaurant, and

WHEREAS: The maximum hours of operation will be whatever hours are permitted by law for a hotel, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 has no objection to granting this application on the condition that a future application is submitted for any liquor license application for the restaurant.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	14 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	2 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 61 Warren Street, beer and wine license application for The Bigger Place Restaurant Corp.

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with approximately 15 tables and 50 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 9:30 AM until 10:00 PM Sunday through Thursday and 9:30 AM – 4:00 PM on Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant indicated that there would be no music, and

WHEREAS: The applicant will not be seeking a cabaret license or a sidewalk café license, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the license application for The Bigger Place Restaurant Corp. at 61 Warren Street for a period of two years subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.



COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	14 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	2 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 63A Reade Street, beer and wine license application for Agi Japanese Restaurant

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with approximately 4 tables and 16 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 10:00 AM until 10:00 PM Sunday through Thursday and 10:00 AM – 11:00 PM on Friday and Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to have background music only as appropriate for an establishment located where it is, and to provide adequate sound-proofing, and

WHEREAS: The applicant will not be seeking a cabaret license or a sidewalk café license, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the license application for Agi Japanese Restaurant located at 63A Reade Street for a period of two years subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

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

RE: 325 Broadway, beer and wine license application for ADI Japanese Restaurant Inc.

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a restaurant with approximately 15 tables and 60 seats, and

WHEREAS: The proposed maximum hours of operation will be 10:00 AM until 10:00 PM Sunday through Thursday and 10:00 AM – 11:00 PM on Friday and Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to have background music only as appropriate for an establishment located where it is, and to provide adequate sound-proofing, and

WHEREAS: The applicant will not be seeking a cabaret license or a sidewalk café license, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the license application for ADI Japanese Restaurant Inc. located at 325 Broadway for a period of two years subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WTC REDEVELOPMENT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 13 In Favor    0 Opposed    0 Abstained    0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:        35 In Favor    0 Opposed    0 Abstained    0 Recused

RE:                Congressional bill to create the Office of 9/11 Health

WHEREAS: Many first responders, Federal employees and residents and workers in Lower Manhattan suffer from health problems caused by exposure to toxins at or near the World Trade Center site, including asbestos, lead, mercury, pulverized glass and other toxic substances, and

WHEREAS: Residents, office workers, students and staff in Lower Manhattan do not currently have access to free post-September 11 medical monitoring or proper medical treatment, which can result in some people being undiagnosed or receiving inadequate medical care, and

WHEREAS: Environmental medicine specialists have stressed that early intervention in such situations can prevent or significantly lessen the severity of related chronic disease, and

WHEREAS: Congresswoman Carolyn Maloney of New York has proposed an amendment to H.R. 5316, which would establish an independently funded “Office of 9/11 Health” to ensure the medical monitoring of any person exposed to the toxins at or near the World Trade Center site and provide medical treatment to any person who is sick or injured as a direct result of such exposure, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 supports adoption of the Amendment to H.R. 5316 offered by Congresswoman Maloney, which would establish an independently funded “Office of 9/11 Health” to ensure the medical monitoring of any person exposed to the toxins at the World Trade Center site and provide medical treatment to any person who is sick or injured as a direct result of such exposure.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WTC REDEVELOPMENT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 13 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:      35 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused

RE:                      Fiterman Hall (30 West Broadway)

WHEREAS: Fiterman Hall remains heavily contaminated with dioxin, lead, asbestos, “WTC dust” and other toxic substances known to have been released in the collapse and combustion of the World Trade Center, and

WHEREAS: Fiterman Hall is located in a densely populated neighborhood with nursery, elementary and middle schools nearby and many residents and office workers in the immediate vicinity, and

WHEREAS: The nature and extent of the contamination and the procedures by which City University of New York (CUNY) and Dormitory Authority of the State of New York (DASNY) propose to decontaminate and dismantle the building are matters of serious public concern, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 supports the immediate and safe demolition of Fiterman Hall, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 urges CUNY and DASNY to make sure that the demolition of Fiterman Hall is completed in a full and transparent public process that includes posting all current and historical sampling results and demolition plans that have been submitted by CUNY/DASNY and its contractors to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other relevant agencies for review and any corresponding comments by the relevant agencies on the website for the Borough of Manhattan Community College, the EPA website and on Lowermanhattan.info and to continue to keep the community informed by holding public meetings in Lower Manhattan at which study results and demolition plans are presented to the public.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WTC REDEVELOPMENT

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

RE:                    Restoration of Slashed Anti-Terror Funds

WHEREAS: According to Police Commissioner Raymond Kelly, the federal government's decision to slash the New York City's anti-terror funds by 40 percent to \$124.5 million from \$207.5 million last year has jeopardized the New York Police Department's plan to bolster security in the Financial District and will impede the Lower Manhattan Security Initiative, and

WHEREAS: The Homeland Security Department's decision to allow such a large reduction in the amount of New York City's anti-terror funds is wrong on its face and sends the wrong political and economic message – the wrong message to those that have invested or continue to invest in rebuilding Lower Manhattan, the wrong message to the residents and workers of Lower Manhattan who lived through the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001 and the ensuing clean up, which is still not complete, and the wrong message to all New Yorkers who have been a target before and live in a city that continues to be one of the prime targets for future attack, and

WHEREAS: America can afford protection, and we urge Washington to put aside pork barrel politics as usual and to allocate sufficient funds to New York City to pay for protection where the threat is greatest, and

WHEREAS: Mayor Bloomberg, Manhattan Borough President Stringer, Police Commissioner Kelly, both of our United States Senators, as well as the CEO's of many of Wall Street's leading financial firms have called on the Homeland Security Department to restore funding to New York to help protect our neighborhood and the entire City of New York from future terrorist attacks, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 strongly supports the efforts of all our elected officials and joins with business leaders in calling for the Homeland Security Department to restore lost funding to New York to help protect our neighborhood and the entire City of New York from future terrorist attacks.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:      29 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused

RE:              141 Duane Street, application for modifications to a storefront

WHEREAS: This application seeks to modify the application considered by the Committee in its resolution of July 26, 2005, and

WHEREAS: The work was done illegally, without LPC approval or DOB permit, and

WHEREAS: The applicant's architect assured the Committee this illegal behavior will not re-occur, and

WHEREAS: The Committee reaffirmed the matters of exactly matching the building next door ("Le Zinc") to ensure the pair were harmonious and contextual, and

WHEREAS: The Committee asked that the proposal be changed to ensure the doors would exactly match those of "Le Zinc" next door, which the applicant agreed to do, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT:              Community Board #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application, with the noted modifications.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:      29 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused

RE:                    399 Greenwich Street, a/k/a 59 Beach Street, application for alterations to awnings and the replacement of windows

WHEREAS: The applicant failed to attend the meeting, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:                Community Board #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission hold over this application until CB#1 is able to review the application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 In Favor    0 Opposed    0 Abstained    0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:        29 In Favor    0 Opposed    0 Abstained    0 Recused

RE:                44 Laight Street, application for replacement of cobblestone walk /  
sidewalk with concrete

WHEREAS: The application requests the replacement of historic cobblestone pavers in front of the Grabler Building -- on the north side of Laight Street, between Hudson and Varick Streets, in the Tribeca North Historic District -- with a concrete sidewalk, and

WHEREAS: Although it is recognized that the entire block front has variegated pavers, with no curbed separation between roadway and pedestrian walkway, and

WHEREAS: It is nevertheless completely unacceptable to remove the existing cobblestones, and

WHEREAS: It may be of some use for representatives of all the buildings along the block to attempt a unified solution to any pedestrian issue, a solution that utilizes these cobblestones, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT:             Community Board #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission reject this application.



COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:        29 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused

RE:                    245 Water Street, application for modifications to a storefront

WHEREAS: This application seeks to make one change to a previously approved application to restore the building, and

WHEREAS: The Committee noted the work to date is of the high quality which the applicant had committed to with all work being in accordance with CB#1 and LPC's approvals, and

WHEREAS: The modification is to move the center cast iron columns by 2-3" to put them where they were originally located before the building was modified for commercial work in the Seaport, and

WHEREAS: The Committee noted the letter of support from the Consulting Engineering firm of Robert Silman which stated the work is not only historically and structurally accurate but will also secure and strengthen the building, and

WHEREAS: The Committee liked the repairs to be done to the broken granite lintel and damaged cast iron, and

WHEREAS: The Committee liked the fact that the modification will mean the building will match #247 next door, and

WHEREAS: The Committee noted the potential benefit to the applicant of possibly allowing the 4"- 6" wider entrance to become a garage entrance for small fuel efficient hybrid technology cars, but felt this side effect was justifiable given the historic facts and quality of work, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT:                Community Board #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor    2 Opposed    2 Abstained    0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:        29 In Favor    0 Opposed    0 Abstained    0 Recused

RE:                100 Hudson Street, application for modifications to windows

WHEREAS: This application requests the modification of windows in one apartment recently combined from two in the Tribeca West Historic District, for the installation of through-the-wall (-window) air conditioners, and

WHEREAS: The windows' exposures are from the second floor onto Leonard Street, east of Hudson Street, and

WHEREAS: Two of the windows, of a casement type, will be relocated, and two will be modified so that the lower sashes can be made to hold the air conditioning units, and

WHEREAS: The altered windows will otherwise match the building's existing windows in size, shape and color, and are appropriate and contextual, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT:            Community Board #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application.

06resjune20

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:      29 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused

RE:                    49 White Street, Synagogue for the Arts, application to build an aluminum and glass wall to enclose a portion of a plaza space

WHEREAS: This magnificently designed building has gone through changes in uses over the years as well as water damage problems but is a marvelous example of the varied nature of architecture in Tribeca, and

WHEREAS: The application seeks to enclose 28' of the presently floating, open ceiling on the flat portion of the first floor to provide more space for cultural uses, and

WHEREAS: The applicant is also seeking to increase the security of the building, although the Committee felt this was a very secondary and low priority issue compared with ensuring the modification does not detract from the wonderful design, and

WHEREAS: The Committee felt the design, using strong aluminum mullions was overly complicated and detracted from the current floating feel of the front wall, and

WHEREAS: The Committee felt that a more appropriate – light, open and floating design could be made, particularly if the security issues – forcing the use of strong aluminum mullions and shatter proof glass was reconsidered, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to do more work on the design taking the Committee's comments into account, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to return to the Committee in due course with a revised design and show clear renderings and visualizations of the design, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to request that LPC remove this item from the scheduled hearing in July as they accepted that they were not ready to present to the LPC, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission remove this application from the scheduled hearing in July, giving the applicant the opportunity to further develop the proposal and allow CB#1 the opportunity to review the final revised application.

06resjune20

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:      34 In Favor      0 Opposed      0 Abstained      0 Recused

RE:                      Engine 7 / Ladder 1 Firehouse, Duane Street between Church Street and Broadway, removal of original wooden doors

WHEREAS: It had been noted by the Duane Street Block Association that one of the three original wooden doors was removed without permit from this landmark building, and

WHEREAS: There is a contract in place to remove the other two original wooden doors to replace them with ugly, inappropriate metal doors, and

WHEREAS: The original wooden doors are apparently strong, functional, in perfect condition and good working order, and

WHEREAS: The Committee requests that the due and legal process be followed for modification to this wonderful landmark building, and

WHEREAS: The Committee has been in touch with LPC and requested that a stop work order be issued until the due and legal process be followed, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT:                      Community Board #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission and Department of Buildings work with the relevant agencies to ensure the proper legal process be followed in considering modifications to New York City landmark designated buildings, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT:                      CB #1 urges that the NYFD and LPC consider that any new replacement doors, if deemed necessary, be made to replicate the existing historic doors.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

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

RE: 273 Church Street, liquor license renewal application for South's  
RE: 120 West Broadway, liquor license renewal application for Bouley  
Restaurant  
RE: 31 N. Moore Street, beer and wine license renewal application for Bar  
Panini

COMMITTEE VOTE:	12 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained	0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE:	2 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: 190-A Duane Street, liquor license renewal application for Nonna  
Restaurant Corp., d/b/a Roc Restaurant

WHEREAS: These four applications are renewal applications with no history of  
community complaints and no one from the public came to comment, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 has no objection to these renewals.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH & EDUCATION

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0	Opposed	0	Abstained	0	Recused
PUBLIC MEMBER VOTE:	2 In Favor	0	Opposed	0	Abstained	0	Recused
BOARD VOTE:	30 In Favor	3	Opposed	3	Abstained	0	Recused

RE: Public School Cell Phone Ban

WHEREAS: In April 2006, Mayor Bloomberg and Schools Chancellor Klein announced a program whereby, on a random, roving basis, metal detection teams would be employed in schools throughout the City, the stated goal of which was “to ensure that dangerous weapons are not brought into schools,” according to the April 13, 2006 press release that announced the program, and

WHEREAS: Although directed at the detection of weapons, the random scanning program also provides that any other “contraband” found during a scan will be confiscated, and

WHEREAS: For many years, the Department of Education has apparently defined cell phones as “contraband,” even though there has generally been little or no enforcement of any prohibition against the presence of cell phones in schools, and, indeed, many parents and students were unaware that cell phones were classified in this manner until the new random scanning program was announced, and

WHEREAS: At least some of the schools attended by students who reside in the CB#1 District have informed parents that, contrary to the desires and policies of those schools, these schools will be forced to confiscate cell phones, if these schools are ever targeted for a random scan, and

WHEREAS: A survey of parents, teachers, school administrators and students has shown that the schools attended by CB#1 students do not have a reported cell phone misuse problem, and that the practice in these schools has long been to permit cell phones in the schools, but to require that they be powered off during class, and

WHEREAS: New York City middle and high school students commonly travel many miles from their homes to their schools, using public transportation, and

- WHEREAS: The cell phone has come to be accepted as a critical safety device, carried by both adults and teenage and pre-teen children, that permits calls for help and assistance, whether to friends and family or to 911, and
- WHEREAS: As public pay telephones have been removed from many areas of the City, the cell phone is often the sole means to call for assistance in an emergency or other urgent situation, and
- WHEREAS: In the event of a major emergency, such as this community witnessed on September 11, and as other schools around the country have witnessed from time to time, the cell phone may be the only means by which students will be able to contact parents, and
- WHEREAS: The cell phone has also come to be accepted as a critical parenting tool that permits parents to interact with their children at the end of the school day for such purposes as checking on homework status, arranging doctor and dental appointments, giving permission (or not) for social engagements, etc., and
- WHEREAS: It appears that the majority of middle and high school age children in our District have carried cell phones to school for many years, and
- WHEREAS: The rationales asserted by the Mayor and the Department of Education management in support of enforcing a cell phone ban – fear that cell phones will be used for cheating, planning fights or taking unwanted photographs – appear to be after-the-fact justifications for a misguided policy, rather than a rational basis upon which to deprive children of a long-accepted safety tool, and
- WHEREAS: Similarly, the Mayor and the Department of Education management have generally misstated parents’ arguments in favor of cell phones as being limited to the parents’ desire to be able to contact their children in school, which is *not* a significant issue for most parents, for, among other reasons, the parents generally expect that their children’s cell phones will not be powered on during class, and
- WHEREAS: Parents have spoken out loudly and nearly uniformed against a cell phone ban in school, as have many school teachers, principals and other administrators, including the District Two Presidents Council, and
- WHEREAS: City Council Legislation (Intro 351) has been introduced that would amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York to permit school children to carry cell phones in school, and a City Council Resolution (Resolution 342) has been introduced calling on the Department of Education to place a moratorium on the confiscation of students’ cell



phones, and to immediately convene public hearings in every community school district to discuss the cell phone issues, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 opposes any blanket ban on cell phones in the New York public schools and urges the Mayor and the Department of Education to permit the principals of individual schools to fashion their own policies regarding cell phones, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 calls on the New York City Council to pass Intro 351 and Resolution 342.

06resjune20

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 4 Opposed 3 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Public Amenity for Battery Park City Site 2B

WHEREAS: At some point in 2000 or earlier, Governor Pataki identified Site 2B as the site for a Women's Museum, a project headed by Lynn Rollins, the Governor's senior advisor on women's issues, and

WHEREAS: Battery Park City Authority planning documents identify Site 2B as the location of a public amenity that could be built within an envelope of approximately 135,000 square feet, and

WHEREAS: Ms. Rollins gave a presentation regarding the Women's Museum project at the May 2006 Battery Park City Committee, and

WHEREAS: Although, as described by Ms. Rollins, the proposed Women's Museum appears to be a worthy project, she reported, however, that approximately six years after Governor Pataki first identified Site 2B for the museum, the Women's Museum has raised no funds beyond a small amount secured near the inception of the project, which has been spent on conceptual design and planning work, and Ms. Rollins was unable to project when, if ever, the project would raise enough funding to permit the Museum to be built and operated, and

WHEREAS: CB #1, without suggesting that the proposed Women's Museum would not be a welcome addition to our community, is nonetheless concerned that an apparent decision was made by the Governor for a 135,000 square foot public amenity in our District without any consultation with or input from the local community or this Board, and

WHEREAS: As the residential population of this District continues to increase at a very rapid pace, public amenities within our District, and their impact on the community, take on ever-increasing importance, and

WHEREAS: In these circumstances, this Board does not believe that it is wise to let Site 2B remain fallow, when it could be the home for a much-needed public amenity, such as a school or other facility of up to approximately 135,000 square feet, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 urges the Battery Park City Authority to avoid taking any action that would make its dedication of Site 2B to the Women's Museum legally binding, in the absence of substantial outside funds having been raised within the next three months from major donors and dedicated to the project, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 urges the Battery Park City Authority to work with all deliberate speed to identify, in close consultation with the local community and this Board, appropriate public amenity uses for Site 2B, other than the Women's Museum project, with the objective of beginning construction of a public amenity on that site as soon as practicable.

06resjune20

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 In Favor    0 Opposed    2 Abstained    0 Recused  
BOARD VOTE:        34 In Favor    3 Opposed    3 Abstained    0 Recused

RE:                CB #1 Sponsorship of Fundraising Street Fairs in 2007

WHEREAS: In 2005, CB #1 received an opinion from the General Counsel of the City of New York Conflicts of Interest Board (the “COIB Opinion”) that CB #1 would not violate the City Charter by raising funds through sponsorship of “street fairs” and using those funds for non-personnel operating expenses of CB #1, subject to certain specific constraints, and

WHEREAS: In January 2006, CB #1 voted to establish a formal process (the “Process”) to assure compliance with the terms of the COIB Opinion in connection with its use of street fairs to raise funds to meet its operating expenses, and

WHEREAS: The initial required step in the Process each year is a vote by the Board of CB #1 supporting the use of street fairs to raise funds during the following year, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 believes that it will be necessary and desirable to continue to raise funds through the sponsorship of street fairs in 2007 in order to support and maintain its current level of operations, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT:             Community Board #1 hereby authorizes this organization to sponsor up to 10 street fairs in calendar year 2007 for the purpose of raising funds to support the non-personnel operating expenses of the organization.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN  
RESOLUTION

DATE: JUNE 20, 2006

COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: YOUTH & EDUCATION  
BATTERY PARK CITY

YOUTH COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BPC COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Recused
BOARD VOTE:	34 In Favor	4 Opposed	2 Abstained	0 Recused

RE: New Playing Surface for BPC Ballfields

WHEREAS: The Battery Park City Ballfields are a critical recreational amenity serving the youth residing within the CB#1 District, and

WHEREAS: The current primary uses of the Ballfields are: during the months of April through June, Downtown Little League play; during the months of July and August, Manhattan Youth Downtown Day Camp, and other summer youth services play; and during the months of September through November, Downtown Soccer League play, and

WHEREAS: The youth population of the CB#1 District continues to grow at a rapid pace, as witnessed by the currently overcrowded elementary schools, and the projections for increased overcrowding in the future, and

WHEREAS: The Ballfields are currently closed for all purposes from Thanksgiving until approximately April 8, during which period all other grass potential playing surfaces in Battery Park City parks and in Washington Market Park are also closed to all play, and

WHEREAS: During the months of the year that the fields are open, in all but the month of June, the Ballfields are closed for grass maintenance on Mondays, and

WHEREAS: Although the Battery Park City Authority is open to possibly extending the Monday open days to May and perhaps April, it is unlikely that the Ballfields will be able to forgo Monday grass maintenance during soccer season, and

WHEREAS: The IS 89 Principal has stated that her school would like to be able to use the Ballfields during the school day, for 15 hours per week throughout the school year, and

WHEREAS: Replacement of the current grass playing surface with a modern artificial turf surface would permit the Ballfields to remain open throughout the year, including during the months of December through March, when the fields are currently closed, and to remain open seven days a week for more hours per day than the current grass surface permits, and

WHEREAS: Without taking into account the increased IS 89 usage of the Ballfields, if artificial turf were installed, such installation would permit approximately 470 more play hours per year, an increase of 44 percent compared with current usage, and

WHEREAS: When the additional projected IS 89 school usage is added in, the total increase playing hours would be 1,365, an increase of 129 percent compared with current usage, and

WHEREAS: The cost of installation of artificial turf would be offset by significantly reduced maintenance expenses, such that cost is unlikely to be a factor in determining whether to replace the existing grass playing surface, and

WHEREAS: Although CB#1 commends the Battery Park City Authority for its commitment to “green” development, CB#1 recognizes that certain public amenity uses may not be practically able to meet the same degree of “greenness” as other uses – basketball courts cannot have grass surfaces; the BPC dog runs do not have grass surfaces, for example – and that the Ballfields likewise need to be addressed in the context of their intended use: as an athletic playing surface, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 urges the Battery Park City Authority to replace the current grass surface in the BPC Ballfields with a modern artificial turf playing surface, and to assure the BPC Parks Conservancy sufficient operating funding such that the Ballfields may remain open throughout the year, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: The resurfacing of the Ballfields should be scheduled in such a manner as to assure, to the greatest degree practicable, that neither the Downtown Little League, the Downtown Soccer League seasons nor the summer programs such as Downtown Day Camp will be disrupted by the resurfacing construction project.