

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

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

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

RE: **55 Water Street, minor modifications to plaza design**

WHEREAS: The owners of 55 Water Street are seeking to modify their 41,486 s.f. elevated plaza constructed in the early 1970's, and

WHEREAS: The new design, resulting from a competition sponsored by the building owners and the Municipal Arts Society, seeks to make this underutilized large plaza more inviting and attractive to the public, and

WHEREAS: The application specifically requests that the City Planning Commission grant:

- 1) A minor modification of the 1968 special permit for the elevated plaza
- 2) Approval of the plaza redesign
- 3) Authorization to allow the alteration of this privately owned bonusable public plaza, and

WHEREAS: The proposed redesign will feature a great deal of landscaping including a lawn and a hillside leading towards the water's edge, a cantilevered balcony along the river, a beacon light tower, a platform for events, a cafe, a much more visible and open street level entrance on Water Street, and 1200 linear feet of seating (versus 400 linear feet now), and

WHEREAS: The owners are also seeking approval to utilize the plaza for twelve special private events per year, six by private organizations and six by not-for-profits, and also intend to sponsor twelve public special events on the plaza, and

WHEREAS: The plaza is slated to be open 24 hours per day with the escalator in service from 7 AM to 10 PM during the summer months (May 1-September 30) and 8 AM until dusk or 8 PM (whichever occurs later) the rest of the year, and

WHEREAS: The plaza is ADA compliant, and

WHEREAS: The proposed improvements represent a dramatic upgrade for this large plaza space and will provide this portion of our district, which has very little open space, with a most attractive and appealing amenity for local workers, residents and visitors, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends the approval of the application put forth by New Water Street Corporation for plaza improvements at 55 Water Street, and

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 applauds the building owners for undertaking this significant and vitally needed open space improvement.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

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

BOARD VOTE: 37 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **Proposed new South Ferry Terminal Project**

WHEREAS: The MTA is proposing a major upgrade and enlargement of the South Ferry Terminal Station serving the 1 and 9 lines intended to address certain deficiencies including the inability of the rear five cars to load and unload, only one exit, no ADA access, and the sharp curvature which creates undue noise and delays, and

WHEREAS: The MTA is seeking \$400 million in federal transportation funds provided to rebuild Lower Manhattan following the 9/11 attack in order to rebuild the South Ferry Station, and

WHEREAS: The \$4.55 billion in federal funds allocated for transportation improvements is not sufficient to pay for all the desired transportation projects needed in Lower Manhattan, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board does not consider this project to be a high transportation priority, particularly when more vital transportation projects such as creation of a one seat ride to JFK and an improved commuter link to Long Island, improved east-west connections, and a bus storage facility are uncertain to be funded, and

WHEREAS: In two surveys conducted of downtown residents and businesses in recent months, the proposed South Ferry Terminal project was the lowest rated transportation improvement for the area, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board is also concerned that this project could severely impact and disrupt Battery Park which could lose as many as 40 trees during construction and that these issues have yet to be addressed, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 strongly believes that none of \$4.55 billion transportation budget set aside for 9/11 related transportation improvements should be allocated to the South Ferry Terminal project, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: The South Ferry Terminal Station should only be planned and paid for by the MTA through its regular capital improvements budget.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 37 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: **130 Water Street, proposed two person group home for the mentally retarded**

WHEREAS: The Association for the Advancement of Blind and Retarded Inc. (AABR) is seeking approval to utilize a one bedroom apartment at 130 Water Street to establish a community residence for two 24 year old moderately retarded clients, and

WHEREAS: The AABR has housed clients in this building since 1978 without any significant problems, and

WHEREAS: The NYS Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities has asked AABR to take on these two clients who currently reside with their elderly parents, and

WHEREAS: There is a severe shortage of community housing for the mentally retarded throughout the State and CB #1 has not been asked to create such a facility in many years, and

WHEREAS: AABR, which operates 19 similar facilities throughout NYC serving 1000 clients, is one of the highest rated providers of services to the mentally retarded in New York State, and

WHEREAS: The proposed community residence will be staffed 24 hours per day and clients will always be accompanied when entering and leaving the premises, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends the approval of the proposed AABR community residence at 130 Water Street, Apt. 1B.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

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

BOARD VOTE: 39 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **38-44 Laight Street (The Grabler Building Condominium),  
application to the City Planning Commission to allow residential  
conversion of the first and second floors of the building and to permit  
the creation of an attended accessory parking facility in the cellar for  
the exclusive use of building residents and unit owners**

WHEREAS: FY Laight LLC has submitted an application to the City Planning Commission for authorization to allow residential conversion of the first and second floors of the building and to permit the creation of an attended accessory parking facility with 15 parking spaces in the cellar for the exclusive use of building residents and unit owners, and

WHEREAS: The area in which the building is located is currently primarily residential and the proposed residential conversion is not expected to have an adverse impact on manufacturing in the area, and

WHEREAS: The proposed attended accessory parking facility will be for the exclusive use of the building residents and unit owners, and

WHEREAS: The Offering Plan for the sale of condominium units in the building, as filed with the office of the Attorney General of the State of New York, provides that in the event the proposed parking facility is created in the cellar of the building, a parking space may only be sold or leased in conjunction with the sale or lease of a condominium unit to which it is appurtenant or to another existing unit owner in the building, and

WHEREAS, The Offering Plan provides only for the creation of an accessory parking facility for the exclusive use of building residents and unit owners and the applicant has represented that the Offering Plan does not contemplate the creation of a public parking facility and that the condominium by-laws will appropriately limit the transfer of parking spaces in the accessory parking facility and prohibit its use as a public parking facility, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends approval of this application subject to compliance with the limitations and conditions set forth herein, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

Any failure to comply with the foregoing limitations and conditions should be considered *de facto* grounds for terminating or withdrawing the special permit for accessory parking to be granted by the City Planning Commission and should void any other permit or license issued to operate the proposed parking facility, including any license issued by the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs.

03ressept. 16

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 2 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 38 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: **99 Hudson Street, liquor license application for Sal Hudson LLC, d/b/a the Sporting Club**

WHEREAS: Sal Hudson LLC, d/b/a the Sporting Club at 99 Hudson Street, has notified Community Board #1 that it has applied or intends to apply to the State Liquor Authority for a transfer of the existing liquor license from P.I.D. Rest Corp., and

WHEREAS: The prior operator consistently failed to manage this establishment in a reasonable and responsible manner and received repeated complaints from neighbors because drunk and noisy patrons frequently disturbed their sleep and quality of life and behaved in a manner inappropriate for a residential neighborhood, and

WHEREAS: The prior operator retains a minority ownership interest in the entity that owns the establishment but will not have any operational or management control over the future operation of the establishment, and

WHEREAS: The applicants promised to manage this establishment in a reasonable and responsible manner that recognizes the residential nature of the neighborhood and made the following representations about how they would improve operations:

- Closing at midnight every night except when there is a sporting event being broadcast that ends later than that;
- Not making the club available to outside promoters;
- Not having any events without their presence and management;
- Monitoring the outside of the club to ensure that patrons leaving the club or smoking in the street do not make excessive noise or create disturbances;
- Being available and responsive to those who live nearby, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 remains concerned not only because of recent experiences with this establishment but because the applicants were unwilling to commit to providing security outside the club on a regular basis and were evasive about the restrictions they will put on private events booked at the club, and

WHEREAS: The applicants have agreed to work with the community especially 90 Hudson and 100 Hudson to resolve the complaints of the last few months, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

Community Board #1 recommends that the State Liquor Authority hold a 500 foot hearing prior to taking any action on this application and should consider adding specific restrictions to any license issued or transferred to this establishment, including a requirement that it close by midnight and that it hire personnel to monitor the outside perimeter of the establishment while it is open to ensure that patrons do not disturb passersby or those living nearby.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 In Favor 1 Opposed 1 Abstained 2 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 31 In Favor 0 Opposed 2 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: **360 Broadway, liquor license application for Firehouse 360, Bakery and Pizzeria**

WHEREAS: The applicant proposes to operate a bakery and pizzeria restaurant with a maximum occupancy of 54 people, with 12 tables and 42 seats including a bar with 4 tables not to exceed 12 seats, and

WHEREAS: The hours of operation will be 7 AM until 11 PM Monday – Thursday and 11AM until 2AM Friday and Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant has represented that the establishment will have quiet background music only, and

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

WHEREAS: The applicant has represented in its application to Community Board #1 that the proposed establishment will be located in the basement portion of the building with a single entrance on Franklin Street and that the total area to be occupied is approximately 1,300 square feet, and

WHEREAS: There appears to be a significant discrepancy between the written application provided to Community Board #1 and the floor plan also submitted for review, which indicates that the proposed space may be as large as 3,500 to 4,000 square feet in area, and

WHEREAS: Several neighborhood residents spoke out strongly in opposition to this application, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that the State Liquor Authority hold a 500 foot hearing prior to taking any action on this application and should consider adding specific restrictions to any license issued or transferred to this establishment, including a requirement that it close by midnight and that it monitor the outside perimeter of the establishment while it is open to ensure that patrons do not disturb passersby or those living nearby, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Prior to taking any action on this application, the applicant should be required to establish clearly that the area to be occupied by the proposed establishment will not exceed 1,300 square feet in area and that the maximum occupancy will be limited to 54 people license.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

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

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: **136 West Broadway, sidewalk cafe application for Edward's**

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

WHEREAS: The hours of operation will be 9 AM until 12 PM Sunday – Thursday and 9 AM until 1 AM Friday and Saturday, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to post a sign in the window indicating hours of operation, and

WHEREAS: The applicant has agreed to mark the sidewalk with the boundary of the cafe in a clear and appropriate manner and to maintain an eight foot passageway on the sidewalk at all times, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has not received any complaints of loud noise or opposition from the community, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 supports the renewal of the sidewalk café license for Edward's at 136 West Broadway subject to compliance by the applicant with the limitations and conditions set forth above.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

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

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

RE: **Co-naming of N. Moore Street between Varick Street and West Broadway in honor of Lt. Vincent Halloran of Ladder Company #8**

WHEREAS: The officers and members of Ladder Company #8 and the Halloran family have requested the co-naming of N. Moore Street between West Broadway and Varick Street (where Ladder Company #8 is located) in honor of Lieutenant Vincent G. Halloran, and

WHEREAS: Lieutenant Halloran was the only member of Ladder Company #8 who lost his life as a result of the terrorist attacks on September 11<sup>th</sup>, and

WHEREAS: Lieutenant Halloran and his men were first responders to the North Tower of the World Trade Center on September 11<sup>th</sup> where he and his company climbed 31 flights of stairs to evacuate occupants and was instrumental in saving many lives, and

WHEREAS: Lieutenant Halloran served the Tribeca community on a daily basis as a member and leader of Ladder Company #8 and made an important contribution as a public servant to the health, safety and welfare of the entire neighborhood, and

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 would like to recognize and show its gratitude for the many years of service by Ladder Company #8, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends approval of the request to co-name N. Moore Street between Varick and West Broadway in honor of Lieutenant Vincent G. Halloran.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

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

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **N/E/C of John and Water Streets, proposed newsstand**

WHEREAS: The streets of Lower Manhattan are overrun with pedestrians, vendors, and a myriad of street furniture (payphones, mail boxes, street lights, traffic signs, parking meters, hydrants, newsboxes, planters etc.), and

WHEREAS: Lower Manhattan is already well served by existing newsstands and retailers who sell newspapers and magazines, and

WHEREAS: The specific proposed site is adjacent to a large, busy office building as well as the popular South Street Seaport Museum and Marketplace and it is necessary to maintain wide passable sidewalks to accommodate the many pedestrians in this area, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that the Department of Consumer Affairs reject the proposed newsstand at the N/E/C of John and Water Streets.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

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

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

RE: **333 Pearl Street, BSA application for a special permit to construct a 30-foot cellular monopole**

WHEREAS: At the request of Southbridge Towers (SBT), AT & T is seeking an alternative location for the cellular antenna now affixed to the building at 333 Pearl Street, and

WHEREAS: Both SBT and AT &T have agreed to move the cellular antenna to the proposed location off Frankfort and Pearl Streets, and

WHEREAS: The proposed 30' monopole is a narrow structure which will be largely hidden by surrounding trees, and

WHEREAS: AT & T has agreed to subject the antenna to semi-annual emissions monitoring at the request of Southbridge Towers to insure it is in compliance with all FCC and other applicable radio frequency emission standards, and

WHEREAS: The antenna is needed by AT &T to provide upgraded service in this area to their customers, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends approval of the BSA application authorizing the installation of a 30' cellular monopole by AT & T.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

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

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **Landmarking New York City's historic and artistic manhole covers**

WHEREAS: The Committee reviewed Diana Stuart's amazing research of nearly 400 manholes, many in CB #1, and congratulated her on her hard and astonishing work, and

WHEREAS: The Committee heard that damaged and need to-be- replaced covers are presently just thrown away as garbage, and

WHEREAS: It was reported that LPC felt the Landmarks Law could not provide protection for these wonderful pieces of history and art as they are moveable, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 strongly recommends that Landmarks Preservation Commission initiate a change in the present Landmarks Law to urgently provide the means to protect the future loss of this glorious history of cast-iron art.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

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

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **67, 94, 94 ½, and 96 Greenwich Street, proposal to designate these small Federal-era row houses as individual landmarks**

WHEREAS: These magnificent examples of early residential development in New York were noted by Ada Huxtable in her 1964 book Classic New York --- “that the comfortable, charming and historically important small house c1800-30 still exists. It is too well hidden, too efficiently defaced, and – above all – too fast disappearing” ..... and are still standing in 2003 yet remain unprotected, and

WHEREAS: The impressive and thorough research prepared by the New York Landmarks Conservancy was reviewed along with the work on nine other unprotected Federal-era buildings outside CB #1 district, and

WHEREAS: The Committee felt the research was adequate to request immediate individual landmark designation hearings by LPC, and

WHEREAS: The Committee noted that all local elected officials supported the designation, and

WHEREAS: The Committee understands that the owners support designation with the exception of number 67, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 strongly recommends that Landmarks Preservation Commission urgently calendar individual landmark designation hearings for the above referenced buildings.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 In Favor 2 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **32 Laight Street, application to install new storefront infill and a barrier-free access ramp**

WHEREAS: This proposal calls for the substantial alteration of a small building in the Tribeca North Historic District whose features have been pillaged over the decades, and

WHEREAS: The application includes the installation of 2-over-2 recessed Marvin wood windows, to concur with 1930s tax photographs of the property, apparently the earliest historic photos extant, and

WHEREAS: The proposal would leave the existing top floor tilt-and-turn windows intact, to which the Landmarks Committee strongly objects, believing that those windows, too, should be replaced with 2-over-2s to match the lower floors, and

WHEREAS: The building's masonry would be sandblasted back to natural stone, with added charcoal gray and deeper gray trim, and

WHEREAS: Although the application includes the placement of new, minimalist Vegas exterior down lights, the committee urged the applicant to try areaway-mounted up lights only. In any case, while we prefer no applied exterior lighting, if such lighting is the only solution for exterior illumination, we are calling for fixtures more historic in style than the proposed Vegas, and

WHEREAS: The proposed storefront infill, mostly of plate glass, is acceptable, especially since the original ground floor of the structure probably had no enclosure, but was a drive-in loading bay, and

WHEREAS: The applicant's design for a barrier-free access ramp is almost invisible, and one of the most elegant we've seen, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application after the above issues are addressed.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **46-48 and 50 Lispenard Street, application to construct rooftop additions and install new storefront infill and an application for a modification of use**

WHEREAS: This complicated application includes the filing of a so-called "74-711" zoning modification, which requests the Landmarks Preservation to pass on its favorable recommendation to the City Planning Commission for the allowance of considerably more usable square footage than is as of right, in exchange for a much higher standard of restoration, preservation and detailed maintenance than is normally the case, and

WHEREAS: With the approval of such an application, the property owner will restore or replicate virtually all exterior features to original as-built condition, including such elements as side and rear walls, not usually visible from the street and so not usually under the obligation of Landmarks review, and will guarantee a five-year continuing maintenance plan, and

WHEREAS: The two buildings under consideration are on a single tax lot in the Tribeca East Historic District, and will remain separate structures under the proposals, and

WHEREAS: Both are grand edifices erected between 1866 and 1868, with 50 Lispenard Street being 25 feet wide and constructed of Tuckahoe marble with a one-story cast iron colonnaded storefront, and 46-48 Lispenard Street being 50 feet wide and fronted primarily with an ornate Second Empire-style cast-iron facade, as well as wood and masonry trim. Interestingly, this facade is identical to the facade of 315-317 Church Street, and

WHEREAS: Fire escapes will be removed, and the underpinnings will be filled in with original-type construction material, and

WHEREAS: The applicant has gone to great lengths to identify the buildings' original color palette, after stripping away dozens of layers of paint, and

WHEREAS: Much has been done to "hide" the proposed two stories of rooftop additions. Part of the additions will begin half-a-story below the current top floor. Also, the east wall of the new additions has been cleverly designed to be topped by an angled parapet of historically matched brick, which further hides the additions behind it, and

WHEREAS: The additions will be visible from the street only from east of the buildings, looking west, from Broadway to approximately 1/3-block east of Broadway along Lispenard Street, and

WHEREAS: The applicant represents that at the most visible point, only 13 feet of actual new rooftop bulk will be discernible above the aforementioned parapet, and

WHEREAS: The additions themselves will be made of stucco, with aluminum windows, and

WHEREAS: Despite all the minimization, some of this will be visible, as discussed, and it is of concern to the Landmarks Committee, and

WHEREAS: We specifically note that the proposed white stucco penthouse color be toned down; it is too loud, and

WHEREAS: The new aluminum window mullions on the visible additions are too conspicuous, and should be colored to “fade away,” and

WHEREAS: Otherwise, these magnificent derelicts, especially 46-48 Lispenard Street, are of enormous architectural value and are showpiece examples of Tribeca’s historic mercantile preeminence in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, deserved of the kind of restoration projected in this application, even if at the expense of additional bulk, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 urges the Landmarks Preservation Commission to approve this application with the penthouse color modifications specified, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: Upon Further information received after the Landmarks Committee meeting, this resolution is provisional upon the Community Board being able to see an on-site mock-up of the proposed addition.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

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

BOARD VOTE: 33 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **Corbin Building**

WHEREAS: The Corbin Building at 192 Broadway was designed in 1888 by Francis Kimball, one of New York City's leading architects in the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century and a pioneer in the design of the skyscraper and in the use of ornamental terra cotta, and

WHEREAS: The building is architecturally and historically significant as one of Broadway's early skyscrapers and is an important example of a skyscraper erected during the first wave of high-rise office building construction in New York City, and

WHEREAS: The approval of the Corbin Building's application to the State and National Registers would recognize the architectural and cultural importance of the building and promote preservation in America's most important historic downtown, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 strongly urges the Commissioner for the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation to approve the application to add the Corbin Building to the State and National Register.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 2 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 21 In Favor 17 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **Text Amendment to NYC Zoning Resolution for Battery Park City  
District – Studios Apartment Size**

WHEREAS: The Battery Park City Authority has proposed a change to the zoning text,  
and

WHEREAS: This amendment would eliminate the minimum size of a studio apartment  
for new developments throughout Battery Park City, and

WHEREAS: By allowing smaller studio apartments, more two and three bedroom  
apartments could be incorporated, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 approves the text amendment eliminating the  
minimum size of studio apartments for the purpose of creating larger  
family size apartments in Battery Park City and we call upon the Battery  
Park City Authority to require these larger apartments as part of the  
proposal bidding process.

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

DATE: SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: BATTERY PARK CITY

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 2 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

BOARD VOTE: 38 In Favor 1 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: **Text Amendment to NYC Zoning Resolution for Battery Park City District – Building Setbacks**

WHEREAS: The Battery Park City Authority has proposed an amendment to the zoning text for Sites 18B, 19B and 23 which are to be residential developments in the northern part of Battery Park City, and

WHEREAS: The proposed change would allow the buildings to have only one setback instead of the two currently called for. This change is requested since these buildings will have “green” technology and therefore have a much larger bulkhead, and

WHEREAS: This larger bulkhead is needed to accommodate the “green” mechanicals much like the bulkhead on the Solaire. However, no change would be made in the height or the FAR. This will be done for aesthetic reasons, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 supports this text amendment with the clear understanding that neither the building height nor the FAR would be changed by eliminating the second setback for Sites 18B, 19B and 23.