

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: IN FAVOR OPPOSED ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 23 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Movie and Television filming in Tribeca**

WHEREAS: Tribeca is one of the fastest growing residential communities in the city and as a result has many active construction projects underway throughout the area, and

WHEREAS: In addition to the private construction sites we also currently have the "Greening of Greenwich Street" project and Route 9A construction, creating detours and disruptions in the neighborhood, and

WHEREAS: Tribeca has had far more than its fair share of movie and television shoots throughout the area, and

WHEREAS: The numerous film permits issued by the Mayor's Office of Film, Theater and Broadcasting has added congestion to the neighborhood, causing residents and businesses hardship, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 recognizes that the film industry contributes to the economy of New York City as well as being an important part of the Tribeca community, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board #1 Tribeca Committee has had a productive meeting with Dean McCain, the representative of the Mayor's Office of Film, Theater and Broadcasting where concerns and views were exchanged and a respectful relationship was developed, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 calls for the Mayor's Office of Film, Theater and Broadcasting to implement the following procedures immediately in connection with the issuance of film permits:

- 1) Notice by phone call, fax or in-person meeting must be given to the Community Board office, Phone: 212-442-5050, FAX 212-442-5055, as soon as a permit is issued for all permitted productions. The notice must disclose all material facts regarding the permit and the production. For major productions that involve 10 or more vehicles, set construction, pyrotechnics, or stunts, notice shall be sent as soon as an application is received so that the community can give its input before the permit is issued.

- 2) For every permit, the Mayor's office shall post prominently on streets and buildings affected by the production a Bill of Rights and Responsibilities of film production crews and citizens in the affected areas which shall contain a 24-hour number for the Mayor's Office, the local police precinct phone number, the name and phone number of the police officer responsible for overseeing that production in the department's Film unit, and notices with material facts regarding production schedule and impact on the neighborhood, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 urges the Mayor's office of Film, Theater and Broadcasting to refrain from issuing permits to major feature productions until the Greening of Greenwich Street project is completed. CB #1 asks the Mayor's office to be sensitive to be repetitive use of locations.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 29 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Capital and Expense Budget Requests for Fiscal Year 2002**

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the budget requests for our district
as prioritized on the attached.

res.oct.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 25 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **415 Greenwich Street, application to replace proposed penthouse with mechanical equipment and modifications to ground floor openings**

WHEREAS: The Committee found the proposed addition to the roof to be inappropriate due to visibility, mass and bulk, and

WHEREAS: The committee noted the important work being done to green the street it felt the addition of a large amount of mechanical ventilation equipment which is two feet higher than the previously approved penthouse was not contextual to the residential buildings in the area and could be seen vividly from all of Greenwich Street, and

WHEREAS: The Committee was not able to see material boards for the larger number of ground floor louver doors and storefronts, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC reject this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 25 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **320 Pearl Street, application to construct a new hotel**

WHEREAS: The Committee found the changes to the design by the removal of one story, the introduction of set backs, the removal of balconies and the relocation of air handling equipment a dramatic improvement and felt that the materials proposed to be more appropriate. These changes were not, however, fully reflected in the model or drawings, and

WHEREAS: The committee remained concerned that the building does not reflect the Seaport scale and character, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt it inappropriate that the building will be a full story higher than the adjacent building before the first set back, thus not maintaining the height of dominant existing buildings, and

WHEREAS: The committee was concerned that floors do not align with any adjacent buildings, and

WHEREAS: The committee remained concerned with the appropriateness of the size and bulk of the 10 story hotel (at 98 feet) given the six-story adjacent roofline and the character of the storefront and felt a six-story building, in keeping with 324 Pearl Street, with setbacks, to be more appropriate, particularly given the street slopes down to the south which adds to the sense of oversize mass and bulk, and

WHEREAS: The Committee noted that several members of the public raised concerns about the proposal, and the negative precedent this development would provide for the District, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC reject this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 25 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **133 West Broadway, application to remove and replace a portion of existing storefront, create new residential entrance and construct a stair bulkhead on roof**

WHEREAS: The Committee noted the applicant had waited through a long meeting and that the outline plans for restoration seemed appropriate including the repair to the wood cornice, and

WHEREAS: The Committee felt that the suggestion to include an awning inappropriate and the size of the stair bulkhead seemed large, and

WHEREAS: The Committee was encouraged that the applicant was happy to hold over the application, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC hold over all action on this application until the applicant brings in more detailed plans including floor and elevation and a sample of materials for presentation.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: CANAL STREET TASK FORCE

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

RE: **Verrazano Bridge Rally**

WHEREAS: The Canal Street Task Force Chairman of CB #1 attended the September Traffic Strategies Subcommittee of CB #2-M where there has been ongoing discussions between Community Boards 1, 2 and 3 in Manhattan, affected Boards in Brooklyn, as well as public officials and several community members and organizations to discuss strategies to address the negative impact of traffic resulting from the Verrazano Bridge one-way toll on Canal St. and surrounding neighborhoods, especially from trucks, and

WHEREAS: These discussions resulted in agreement on several suitable strategies to address this problem, including organization of a rally to highlight this pernicious issue and express support for retraction of the one-way toll, and

WHEREAS: The rally is planned for November 2, 2000, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 fully supports the Verrazano Bridge traffic rally.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: CANAL STREET TASK FORCE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 29 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Canal Street Pedestrian and Traffic Study**

WHEREAS: The Canal Street Pedestrian and Traffic Study prepared for the Manhattan Borough President's Office by Sam Schwartz is a worth-while step in the right direction in identifying, calling attention, and improving the pedestrian and traffic problems on Canal Street, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has concerns with the restricted no right turn at Bowery and Canal Street which would force south bound Bowery traffic to cross over Canal Street into Chinatown, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 feels that the number of pedestrian crashes in the Borough President's report at each intersection were not accurate and were under counted, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has the following comments and recommendations concerning the intersections in the Borough President's Report:

- Bowery at Manhattan Bridge
- Baxter Street
- Avenue of the Americas (Sixth Avenue)
- Varick Street
- Varick at Laight Street, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends installation of traffic calming measures at the end of Manhattan bound lanes and off ramp of the Manhattan Bridge, as a early warning system for drivers that they are approaching the Bowery, and

FURTHER
BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends a right turn signal at Bowery and Canal Street, allowing more pedestrian crossing time, and more pedestrian crossing signage, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 has serious concerns regarding the closure of Baxter Street, and the ramifications to local streets by this closing on through traffic on the south side of Canal Street and feels that the green market at Baxter Triangle is a good idea, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that a left turn signal be installed at Sixth Avenue and Canal Street to allow east bound Canal Street traffic to turn north onto Sixth Avenue

- This left turn arrow could be timed with the green signal at Laight Street, which traffic is only east bound.
- There would be no traffic or signal conflict in the intersection
- CB #1 feels this left turn option for east bound Canal Street traffic after vehicles pass Hudson Street would stop New Jersey bound cars and trucks from using the south through traffic lane on Canal Street to wait to get into the Holland Tunnel
- This would free up the gridlock at Washington and Canal Street and Greenwich and Canal Streets intersections, where there have been a numerous number of pedestrian to vehicle and vehicle to vehicle accidents, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that a sidewalk be installed on the south side of Canal Street between Varick and Sixth Avenue, and that a more visible crosswalk be painted in the intersections, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 feels that the option for a left turn onto Laight Street, where there would be a traffic light heading east from the Holland Tunnel does not seem feasible due to the volume of traffic exiting the tunnel, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 would like to see that intersections be textORIZED where feasible, longer pedestrian crossing times where possible, and pedestrian crossing signs throughout Canal Street, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 recommends allocation of traffic signals dedicated to each lane at Hudson Street east and west bound, to clarify traffic movement and avoid unnecessary lane changes and gridlock, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 strongly urges that Hudson Street must be included in the Borough President's report

- CB #1 recommends more visible crosswalks and longer pedestrian crossing times at Hudson and Canal Streets, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 feels the Borough President's report should recommend continuous police and traffic enforcement, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 commends the Borough President's Office for organizing a combined meeting between the various related City, State and Federal agencies as well as the Authorities, and looks forward to an eventual meeting to work with them and the Borough President's Office to address our concerns.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED

RE: **102 North End Ave., liquor license application for Pac Rim**

WHEREAS: CB #1 has received an application for a liquor license, and

WHEREAS: The applicant did not appear before the committee, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 requests that the SLA not grant a liquor license to the applicant until the applicant has appeared before the committee of CB #1.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED

- RE: **110 Chambers Street, liquor license application for Loursin Restaurant**
- WHEREAS: CB #1 has received an application from the applicant to conduct a restaurant at the above premises, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant has agreed to the following hours of operation:
- Sunday - Thursday, serve last meal at 11 PM close at Midnight.
 - Friday – Saturday, serve last meal at midnight close a 1 AM, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant has agreed to the following hours to close the windows facing Chambers Street, Sunday – Thursday 9 PM and Friday – Saturday 10 PM, and
- WHEREAS: The maximum number of persons on the premises will be 90 on the 2nd floor and 35 on the 1st floor, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant will not be seeking a sidewalk cafe permit, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant has agreed to use only background music, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant has agreed to include the above conditions in the SLA liquor license, if approved, now
- THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT: CB #1 recommends the SLA approve the liquor license with the above agreed conditions of operation included in the application and the applicant reappear before CB #1 in one year.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 25 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **188 Church Street, application to construct a new hotel**
- WHEREAS: The applicant is making some progress in toning down the general design of this new proposed building, and
- WHEREAS: The proposal is still seriously flawed, specifically:
- The motif of the Church Street façade, while less wildly out-of-context than earlier schemes, is now a symbolic deconstruction of the genuinely deconstructed surrounding frontages caused when Church Street was widened decades ago;
 - The translucent canopies placed along the Church Street facade have no precedent whatsoever in any Tribeca historic district;
 - The door and window treatments on Duane Street are out of context with the rest of the block;
 - The roof bulkheads are ill-defined and the HVAC headhouse is much too visible;
 - The series of retractable opaque metal screens at street level on Church Street are embarrassing, and
- WHEREAS: While the massing is more palatable than before, the Duane Street floor-to-ceiling heights should more closely match those of buildings immediately to the west, thereby reducing the total number of interior floors, and
- WHEREAS: The attempt to disguise the lower two interior stories with continuous glazing, double-height entry doors and other single-story exterior embellishments is feeble, and
- WHEREAS: This placement of two interior stories - to be used as hotel rooms within a one-story street-level exterior shell necessitates the aforementioned retractable metal prophyllaces on Church Street, to shield the double stack of supine bodies within from passersby (unless, of course, the hotel guests recessed behind those street-level windows are to be considered interior signage, which is exempt from landmarks review), and
- WHEREAS: All these issues beg the question of whether a 66-unit building on a conventional 25-by-100 foot lot with a low F.A.R. ratio on a quintessential Tribeca West Historic District loft block is appropriate in the first place, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB#1 urges the L.P.C. to reject this application.

res.oct.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 25 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **58 Reade Street, application to legalize storefront**

WHEREAS: The applicant did not appear before the committee, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

The Landmarks Preservation Commission holds over this application until the applicant makes its presentation before the Landmarks Committee of Community Board #1 Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED

- RE: **Woolworth Building, 233 Broadway, application to establish a master plan of storefronts, install a canopy, construct rooftop addition and modify windows**
- WHEREAS: The applicant is proposing a programmatic renovation of the Woolworth Building, involving significant alterations, some of them for residential conversion, and
- WHEREAS: Cass Gilbert was one of this country's greatest architects, and the Woolworth Building his most famous creation, and
- WHEREAS: The Woolworth Building is an individual New York City landmark, an iconic national treasure and a universal benchmark of skyscraper design, and
- WHEREAS: The Landmarks Committee believes that the applicant's proposal for streetfront restoration of the building's retail and entrance facades is a sympathetic and sensitive rendering of Gilbert's original design, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant made a convincing presentation of a proposal to enlarge the spire windows and also add discreet skylights there, for which the applicant showed sketches indicating that such skylights were features Cass Gilbert seriously considered during his ideation of the building, and
- WHEREAS: The proposed residential entrance canopy stretching from the lobby's exterior wall to the curb is an element the Landmarks Preservation Commission has rejected consistently on landmark buildings and in landmark districts south of Canal Street and along Broadway, and
- WHEREAS: The proposed addition of two two-story glass penthouses above the 29th floor, and of multistory enclosed glass atrium "brooches" appended to the tower's façade above the penthouses, are highly visible and grotesquely inappropriate, despite the applicant's assertion that the penthouses will in part replace air conditioning equipment which, in any case, appears more visually benign from a distance than the proposal, and

WHEREAS:

The nature of the penthouses and "brooches" were considered so onerous that one committee member called them apostasy, another noted that one of the world's great landmarks was to be significantly altered for the benefit of exactly two residential units and a third said that the tower facade should not be altered in any way for any purpose, except pure restoration, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

Since these proposals were presented as one application, CB#1 recommends that the LPC reject this application based on the penthouse additions, "brooches" and street canopy, while judging favorably the spire window modifications and skylights, as well as the street facade restoration.

res.oct.00

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 23 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **15 Cliff Street parking garage**

WHEREAS: The Rockrose Development Corp. has converted 99 John Street to residential use and is in the process of constructing a new 29 story residential building at an adjacent site, 15 Cliff Street, and

WHEREAS: Rockrose wishes to create one underground parking garage to serve both buildings, and

WHEREAS: The new garage will have a capacity of 156 parking spaces and will replace both an 84 space garage at 99 John Street and a former 74 space parking lot at 15 Cliff Street, and

WHEREAS: Access to the proposed garage would be via an existing curb cut on Cliff Street between John and Fulton Streets, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 approves the granting of a special permit to allow an attended public parking complex with a maximum capacity of 156 spaces at the zoning lots at 99 John Street and 15 Cliff Street.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: OCTOBER 17, 2000

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: Tabled

RE: **Thomas Paine Square**

WHEREAS: Councilmember Kathryn Freed has proposed the renaming of Thomas Paine Park to Thomas Paine Square, and

WHEREAS: Thomas Paine was a Founding Father among the first to call for a Constitutional Convention and a central contributor to the American Revolution and our achievement of independence, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB#1 supports the proposal by Councilmember Kathryn Freed to rename Thomas Paine Park, Thomas Paine Square.