

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: YOUTH**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Downtown Soccer League**

WHEREAS: The Downtown Soccer League (DSL) has grown tremendously since its inception, and

WHEREAS: The league is going through a transition with the departure of two of its most active leaders, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

The Youth Committee of CB #1 strongly urges the DSL to operate in the following manner which is consistent with their existing by-laws:

- 1) The DSL is and will remain a recreational league.
- 2) DSL will serve the children of CB #1 and require that children live within the CB #1 borders in order to register. All children living outside the neighborhood and siblings of children who are currently enrolled will be "grandfathered in".
- 3) The board of directors shall consist of a minimum of seven members each with one vote. The president shall have the right to break any tie votes that occur.
- 4) All major DSL decisions will require a board vote.
- 5) Each board member will be in charge of at least one league function.  
The main functions are
  1. Registration
  2. Scheduling
  3. Sponsors/Yearbook
  4. Team roster
  5. Equipment (includes trophies)
  6. Photo day
  7. Referees
  8. Clinics
- 6) The league will have a volunteer accountant to oversee finances and do tax returns.
- 7) The board will form a sub-committee to govern coaches.\*

- 8) The board will suspend any coach who behaves inappropriately.\*
- 9) Coaches who have been suspended can reapply after a full year. They must get a majority vote to be reinstated.\*
- 10) The DSL will not merge with any other league.
- 11) The DSL may explore starting a traveling team or a senior team after the 2000 season.
- 12) The DSL will use the CB #1 Youth Committee for support and advice, and will come to the Youth Committee to mediate any disputes that the board cannot settle.

\* Items 7-9 are very important, as they are there to protect the very children that this league serves. Inappropriate behavior among other things is being verbally abusive to players, coaches, referees, or parents. Any complaint from a referee or a parent must be brought to the coaches committee. Any coach that has been previously banned from the DSL can apply to be reinstated for the 2001 season.

res.april.00

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 18 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **World Trade Center Ring Road**

WHEREAS: The Port Authority has recently eliminated the public parking lot which occupied a portion of the World Trade Center Ring Road for the past several years, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 has long been on record as believing that parking was an inappropriate use of this space, and

WHEREAS: We commend the Port Authority for removing this parking and for the new planters, benches and other amenities added to this area, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board believes that this area should be turned into a more attractive entrance to this world-renowned complex, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: Community Board #1 strongly urges the Port Authority to develop a plan to convert this space into a landscaped, park-like border thus creating an attractive and appealing entry-way to the World Trade Center, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 recommends that the Greenmarket be relocated to its previous location on Church Street between Fulton and Vesey.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **85 West Street, Marriott Hotel, application for a sidewalk cafe**

WHEREAS: The Marriott Hotel at 85 West Street has applied for a sidewalk cafe license with 25 tables and 50 seats to be operated behind the Hotel on Albany and Washington Streets, and

WHEREAS: The Committee felt that the proposed café would a pleasant amenity to this area, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 supports this application.

res.april.00

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 18 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **134 West Broadway, Jada Restaurant, application for a sidewalk cafe**

WHEREAS: CB #1 has received an application from Jada Restaurant (Petite Abeille) to operate a sidewalk cafe for 8 tables with 16 chairs, and

WHEREAS: The committee and the residents living above the cafe, after reviewing the plans, felt that there should be a 10 foot clearance from the curb and that the passage to the residential entry of the building must be kept clear and be delineated by planters as indicated on the plans, and

WHEREAS: The applicant has agreed to these conditions, now  
THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 approves the application by Jada Restaurant for a sidewalk café with 7 tables and 14 seats with service limited to 11 PM on weeknights and midnight on weekends.

res.april.00

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 18 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **222 West Broadway, Franklin Station Cafe, renewal  
application for a sidewalk cafe**

WHEREAS: The Franklin Station Cafe at 222 West Broadway has applied for a  
sidewalk cafe license renewal for 8 tables and 20 chairs, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 supports this application for 8 tables and 20 chairs, with  
service limited to 11 PM on weeknights and midnight on  
weekends.

res.april.00

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 18 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **361 Greenwich Street, Flor De Sol Restaurant, renewal application for a sidewalk cafe**

WHEREAS: The Flor De Sol Restaurant at 361 Greenwich Street has applied for a sidewalk cafe license renewal for 5 tables and 12 chairs, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 supports this application for 5 tables and 12 chairs, with service limited to 11 PM on weeknights and midnight on weekends.

res.april.00

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **429-435 Greenwich Street, liquor license application for LKS Concepts**

WHEREAS: LKS has requested a transfer of a liquor license, and

WHEREAS: The owner of the residential unit on the floor above the bar and restaurant has complained of excessive noise caused by loud recorded music, and

WHEREAS: The restaurant owner represents that he will be responsive to the complaint of the resident, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 does not oppose the application on the condition that the noise problem is resolved.

res.april.00

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **145 Hudson Street, ULURP application for residential conversion of upper floors**

WHEREAS: 145 Hudson Street Associates have submitted an application for a special permit to allow the residential conversion of the 11<sup>th</sup> through 14<sup>th</sup> floors and a penthouse addition and to allow portions of the building to penetrate the sky exposure plane, and

WHEREAS: The design has previously been approved by CB #1 and the Landmarks Preservation Commission, and

WHEREAS: Commitments have been made that commercial tenants will not be harassed or removed and that they will be able to receive continuous uninterrupted services and have been assured of the peaceful enjoyment of their space throughout the life of their lease, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 supports this application.

res.april.00

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HUDSON RIVER PARK**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Pier 40 proposal by Pier, Park and Playground Inc.**

WHEREAS: Pier 40, the largest pier within Hudson River Park, is slated for redevelopment into a mixed-use public facility containing not less than 50% of the pier footprint for passive and active recreation space, and

WHEREAS: Although Pier 40 is located just outside the boundaries of CB #1, it is used and will continue to be used as a destination recreation area by many residents of CB #1 and other residents of the City, and

WHEREAS: CB #2-M has strongly supported a detailed plan presented by Pier, Park and Playground Inc., a community based organization, to design and convert Pier 40 by fostering a mix of active and passive recreational uses and the generation of income by a novel plan to retain parking on the pier, as permitted under the park legislation, in an unobtrusive manner, and

WHEREAS: This proposal also has been approved by the Hudson River Trust Advisory Council, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 supports the plan proposed by Pier, Park and Playground, Inc., for the redesign of Pier 40, which appears to provide our community with desperately needed active and passive recreation space, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 desires to be included in the process by which the final design of Pier 40 will be chosen.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 18 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **Text amendment to the special Battery Park City district to allow landscape easement along River Terrace frontage**
- WHEREAS: The Battery Park City Authority (BPCA) has requested a resolution from the Community Board to allow for a zoning change to modify the regulations of section 84-132 of the special BPC district, and
- WHEREAS: This zoning change would allow the front walls of buildings along River Terrace to be set back 1.5 feet from the street line in order to accommodate planting beds recommended by BPCA design guidelines, and
- WHEREAS: The amendment allows the provision of 1.5 feet of landscaped planting area in front of the buildings along River Terrace which will add 1.5 feet to the planting bed incorporated in the current design to be provided in the public sidewalk thereby achieving the full recommended foot width, and
- WHEREAS: This amendment will take some space from the proposed Tear Drop Park but only a minimum amount, and
- WHEREAS: The BPCA has guaranteed that no further space will be taken from Tear Drop Park, now
- THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 supports the zoning amendment as put forth by the BPCA.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HUDSON RIVER PARK**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Special Events on Pier 25**

WHEREAS: Pier 25 is the only Hudson River pier in our community presently dedicated to passive and active recreational uses, and

WHEREAS: In past years many special events have been approved or scheduled by the Hudson River Park Trust for Pier 25 without any consultation with the pier lessee or the Community Board, and

WHEREAS: There is legitimate concern about the number, planning, and size of such special events and the impact they have on community access to the waterfront, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board is pleased that HRPT intends to discuss special events planning with this Board's Hudson River Park Committee at its next meeting, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Pending discussion and approval of procedures for planning and scheduling of special events, HRPT should not approve any special events for this coming season without Community Board #1's approval.

res.april.00

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRANSPORTATION**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 16 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

- RE: **Hanover Square Pedestrian Improvements**
- WHEREAS: In November 1997 the Departments of City Planning and Transportation issued the Lower Manhattan Pedestrianization Study which included hundreds of potential improvements to benefit pedestrians in our district, and
- WHEREAS: In March 1998 a shorter list of potential implementation items was put forth by DCP and DOT, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1, in response to the original study and implementation list, recommended the relocation of certain newsstands, implementation of don't block the box regulations and pedestrian improvements on Fulton Street, Chambers Street and Broadway, and
- WHEREAS: DCP and DOT, in conjunction with the Lower Manhattan Pedestrianization Study, have now submitted to the Community Board a proposal for pedestrian improvements for Hanover Square estimated to cost \$500,000, and
- WHEREAS: Both the Alliance for Downtown NYC as well as Goldman-Sachs, whose offices are located at Hanover Square, oppose this proposal, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 is distressed that we received no response to our stated pedestrian priorities which we consider to be far more pressing than the proposed Hanover Square project, and
- WHEREAS: There is very limited funding available for implementation of any pedestrian improvements in Lower Manhattan, now
- THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 opposes the proposed pedestrian improvements at Hanover Square as proposed by DOT and DCP, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 again strongly urges DCP and DOT to consider the recommendations of this Community Board in allocating the rather meager resources available for Lower Manhattan pedestrian improvements.

res.april.00

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRANSPORTATION**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 17 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED

RE: **Tribeca Resurfacing**

WHEREAS: CB #1 continues to be on record in favor of retaining our predominantly cobblestone streets in historic districts, and

WHEREAS: Many of the streets of our Community Board district are in very poor condition and in urgent need of resurfacing, and

WHEREAS: Due to major capital construction projects underway or scheduled in much of the Financial District and Seaport, those areas are not being scheduled for resurfacing (only pothole repair) at this time, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board has arranged for the resurfacing of several Tribeca streets and DOT is also willing to resurface Leonard Street between Lafayette and Broadway and N. Moore Street between West Broadway and Hudson St. with Community Board authorization, and

WHEREAS: DOT is requesting our approval since these two streets are approximately 30-40% cobblestone, and

WHEREAS: These two streets are not on the list of cobblestone protected streets submitted to DOT in 1992 by CB #1 (see attached) and are in poor condition, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 approves the immediate resurfacing of Leonard St. from Lafayette St. to Broadway and N. Moore St. from West Broadway to Hudson St.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **59-63 N. Moore Street, application to install a new storefront, construct a two-story rooftop addition and rear yard additional, install new marquee and alter loading dock**
- WHEREAS: The committee found the penthouse too dominant and requests that the height and bulk be diminished, that there be less use of glass, the bulkhead be setback, and recommends that the roof railing be continuous across the front of the building, and
- WHEREAS: The committee felt that the brise-soleil on the penthouse was not in keeping with the character of the Historic District and there was no precedent on any other building in the district, and
- WHEREAS: The committee found the “marquee” (loading dock overhang) reduction in depth from 12 feet to 7 feet as proposed to the original depth and the elimination of the small side loading dock stairs typical of the characteristics of Tribeca loading docks not in keeping with the character of the Historic District, and
- WHEREAS: The committee found the vertical loading dock railings too busy, inappropriate and recommends that it be simplified and less intrusive, now
- THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC not approve the application as presented and requests a hold over.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 1 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **355 Greenwich Street, application to construct a two-story**

WHEREAS: The committee was pleased with the removal of the inappropriate existing penthouse, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the new proposed penthouse had too many angles that architecturally was not approved to the original design of the building and should be reduced to eliminate noticeability, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the excessive use of glass and the height brought too much attention to the penthouse, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC not approve the application presented and requests a hold over because of the above concerns.

res.april.00

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **405 Greenwich Street, application to enlarge window openings, install a new storefront and cornice, raise parapet and install new windows**

WHEREAS: The committee would like to see the elevator be moved back from the front of the building in order that the bulkhead not be seen from the street and that the in-fill windows on the front facade be restored, and

WHEREAS: The committee approved the parapet and higher wall, and

WHEREAS: The committee recommended that the stucco materials removed from the side wall and the bricks be restored and if possible that the painted sign on the wall be retained, and

WHEREAS: The committee approves the storefront and the use of oak doors and the setback lights that are appropriate to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC approve the application as presented.

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **105 Chambers Street, application to construct rooftop addition and restore facades**

WHEREAS: The committee found the restoration of the Chambers St. façade and entrance and the Reade St. side entrance appropriate based on the historic information available, and

WHEREAS: The committee recommends that LPC be involved in the process of the approval of the restoration firm and the duration of the restoration work being preformed, and

WHEREAS: The committee requests that a master plan be developed so that the windows on the Church Street side be more uniform from the fourth floor to the second floor, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the replacement of the windows with wooden windows appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the signage on the Chambers St. side appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the addition of the penthouse on an individual landmark building not in keeping with the historic characteristics of the Historic District, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 applauds the sensitively of the restoration plan, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC approve the restoration of the building, but disapprove the penthouse on an important historic building and prominent location and recommends that LPC disapprove this portion of the application and requests a hold over on the penthouse portion of the application.

res.april.00

**COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN**  
**RESOLUTION**

DATE: APRIL 18, 2000

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY**

BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

**RE: Granite sidewalk at Embassy Suites Hotel**

BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

Community Board #1 supports the use of Texas pink granite for the sidewalk outside the entrance of the Embassy Suites Hotel, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED:

CB #1 opposes the use of cobblestone at this location for safety reasons.

res.april.00

