

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 1996

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	9 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	0 Opposed	3 Abstained

RE: Pier 25, installation of 40' iguana

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 has no objection to the temporary installation of the iguana sculpture on Pier 25 for the 1997 season.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 1996

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Odeon Restaurant, application to review sidewalk cafe

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 has no objection to the renewal of the sidewalk cafe for the Odeon Restaurant.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 1996

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	10 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	24 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained

RE: Site 5B, Revised Exchanges Building

BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Having reviewed the proposed presentation, CB #1 makes the following recommendations:

- 1) That the architectural design be reflective of the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood, rather than the Business/Commercial character of the Financial District.
- 2) That the Warren St. facade contain retail space to ensure greater transparency activity and safety for the streetscape.
- 3) Consider programming west side open space with art and sculpture.
- 4) That traffic signals be installed at the intersection of Murray/Greenwich and Warren/Greenwich.
- 5) Increase of City Services which will reflect the increase in vehicles and pedestrian traffic, including police, sanitation, traffic, parking and crossing guards.
- 6) Construction schedule be planned with attention to causing least disruption to classes and other activities at PS 234 (co-coordinate with officials of PS 234).

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 1996

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE:	1 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	0 Opposed	1 Abstained

RE: Duane Park, review of final design plan

WHEREAS: Duane Park in Tribeca has been in need of more care and upkeep than the Parks Department has been able to provide in recent years, and

WHEREAS: Duane Park is used by many Tribeca residents as well as the people working in the area, who often use it as a lunch spot,

WHEREAS: Friends of Duane Park, a not for profit group formed in 1995, has raised money solely to benefit the park and has paid and will continue to pay for the daily maintenance of the park, which is in the Tribeca Historic District, and

WHEREAS: Council Member Kathryn Freed appropriated money in the Parks Department capital budget to do a redesign of the park, the intent of this redesign being historical renovation of Duane Park to restore it to resemble how it looked when the surrounding buildings were built (1880's). This plan would, where feasible, return the park to its pre-1940 design by providing more planted areas and scaling down the base of the flag pole, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 supports the efforts of Friends of Duane Park in improving and redesigning Duane Park, with the desire to see the work completed as soon as possible, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 appreciates the efforts of the Parks Commissioner in accommodating the wishes of the Duane Park community for an historical renovation of the park and hopes that the Parks Department and Friends of Duane Park continue to work together for this purpose.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 1996

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: 60 Hudson Street

WHEREAS: The Western Union building at 60 Hudson Street, completed in 1930, is an outstanding example of Art Deco architecture, designed by Ralph Walker, one of the most skillful architects of the 1920s era in the U.S., and

WHEREAS: The building's exterior is particularly outstanding, not only for its expert massing but for its sophisticated detailing, which is complemented by a lobby that is one of the finest interior spaces in the city, with its intricately patterned orange brick walls and matching Gaustavino barrel-vaulted tile ceiling, and

WHEREAS: To minimize the building's bulk, Walker specified the use of no fewer than 19 shades of brick, from salmon to deep rose and brown, on the exterior walls, with darker bricks predominant at the base and the mix subtly lighter at higher elevations so that the top of the structure is a virtual symphony of the more delicate colors, and

WHEREAS: To further minimize the building's bulk, Walker emphasized its height and verticality by alternating building-high brick columns with columns of windows or louvers that feature a four-over-four pattern, and

WHEREAS: The Landmarks Preservation Commission has recognized that "Windows are an important and integral part of the design of most buildings. They typically comprise 30% to 40% of the surface area of a building's principal facade. In most historic buildings the window sash, window framing, and the architectural detail surrounding windows were carefully designed as an integral component of the style, scale and character of the building. It is important to retain the configuration, operation, details, material and finish of the original window as well as to maintain the size of openings, sills, decorative moldings, and the sash itself", and

WHEREAS: The NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission Rules relating to the installation of heating, ventilating and air conditioning equipment are based on the following principles [section 2-11 (a)(4)]:

- (i) The distinguishing historical qualities or character of a building's structure or site and its environment should not be destroyed. The removal or alteration of any distinguishing architectural feature should be avoided.
- (ii) The visual integrity of the building's exterior walls should be maintained and list the following criteria for the permanent installation of HVAC equipment, louvers or vents within window openings of landmarked commercial buildings [section 2-11 (c)(2)(i)(B)]:
 - (a) The window is not a special window; and
 - (b) The proposal involves removing the glazing from all or part of the sash, and no other permanent alteration to the window; and
 - (c) The location of the unit forms part of a regular pattern of installations in window bays on the facade; and
 - (d) The louver or vent is mounted flush with the sash or directly behind the sash; and
 - (e) The louver or vent is finished to blend into the fenestration pattern; and
 - (f) No significant architectural feature of the building will be affected, and

WHEREAS: The NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission Rules relating to the installation of heating, ventilating and air conditioning equipment [section 2-11 (f)(1)] further state that "A master plan for the installation of HVAC equipment over a period of time can be approved under a PMW (Permit for Minor Work) if the plan is in conformance with these rules", and

WHEREAS: The NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission Rules relating to proposed construction of rooftop additions [section 2-19 (b)(2)] require that "any rooftop addition to be constructed on a structure which is an Individual Landmark of seven stories or greater in height:
(A) consist solely of mechanical equipment
(B) does not result in damage to, or demolition of, a significant architectural feature of the roof of the structure on which such rooftop addition is to be constructed; and
(C) is either not visible from a public thoroughfare or is only minimally visible from a public thoroughfare", and

WHEREAS: It has come to the attention of CB #1 that LPC has been using a letter dated March 23, 1990 from Robert S. Cook, Jr., to David F. M. Todd, which purports to follow up on a December 18, 1989 meeting concerning 60 Hudson Street, as an "ad hoc master plan," despite the fact that it violates the above mentioned rules, principles and criteria, without community review or public hearings, and without issuing the Certificate of Appropriateness such a master plan would require, and

WHEREAS: LPC has been approving proposals that have a significant impact on the building's design and historical significance at the staff level in the absence of an approved master plan and without community review or public hearings, and

WHEREAS: Such approvals violate LPC rules and threaten the visual integrity of the building's exterior and deserved landmark designation, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: LPC should rectify this situation immediately and process all future proposals related to 60 Hudson Street for review by CB # 1 and appropriate public hearings before issuing any Certificate of Appropriateness, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: All approvals issued since the building was designated for landmark status should be retracted and processed now for community and public review, and that a Notice of Violation be in effect against 60 Hudson Street until such review has taken place and either the necessary Certificates of Appropriateness issued or work that is in violation of LPC rules corrected.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 1996

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	
BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	1 Recused*

RE: 132 Duane St., new storefront and entrance door
176 Duane St., new storefront and entrance door
40 Wall St., new exterior lighting
71 Worth St., new handicapped ramp and entrance door
75 Worth St., new handicapped ramp and entrance door
113 Chambers St., new awning and banner

WHEREAS: The committee unanimously found the designs, as proposed, to be appropriate, to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC approve these applications for the proposed work, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: 113 Chambers St., (Sam's Orbit) did not appear and CB #1 requests that the LPC not act on this application until they do so.

*M. Wils recused herself on 176 Duane St.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 1996

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Proposed designation of the 14 Wall Street Building, Downtown Association Building-60 Pine St. and the 56 Pine Street Building by LPC

WHEREAS: The committee supports the LPC in it's current and future efforts with regards to the landmarks designation of the architecturally significant buildings of Lower Manhattan, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the proposed buildings to be of significant architectural character to warrant such designation, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends and supports that LPC proceed with their designation efforts.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 1996

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: 97-101 Reade Street (Bell and Bates)

Issue for review: Installation of canopy, banners & handicapped ramp on the Reade St. facade.

WHEREAS: The committee found the architectural character and size of the building to be one of Reade Street's more significant, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the exterior handicapped ramp was appropriately located and defer to the LPC with regards to the materials and finish, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the exterior banners mounted on the columns were NOT appropriate to the district, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the exterior awnings mounted between the columns were appropriate but requested that the applicant remove their logo graphic from them, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the applicant should be encouraged to provide signage on the frieze portion of the cast-iron storefront, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC approve the application for this work only if the above revisions to the signage design are made, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 further requests that, due to the scope of this renovation and the length of the storefront, the LPC use it's influence to encourage the applicant to relocate the existing exterior security gates to the interior behind the storefront.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 1996

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	22 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: Belgian block (cobble stone) street surface in the South Street Seaport Historic District

WHEREAS: The Belgian block street surface in the South Street Seaport Historic District (SSSHD) is an integral part of the historic nature and appearance of the District, and

WHEREAS: In the streets in the north part of the SSSHD much excavation has been done, removing the Belgian blocks and resurfacing the excavations with asphalt (see accompanying map), and

WHEREAS: In the case of a large concrete patch in the middle of Peck Slip, Belgian blocks were removed to be used in the completion of Titanic Park in the South Street Seaport, and the resultant hole in Peck Slip was filled with concrete, and

WHEREAS: The NYC Dept. of Environmental Protection recently complete a six-month sewer repair project in which almost all the Belgian blocks on Water Street were removed and replaced by asphalt, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 calls for the re-installation of Belgian blocks on all asphalt and concrete sections of Beekman St., Peck Slip, Water St., Front St., and Dover St. within the boundaries of the SSSHD, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: Since the NYC Dept. of Environmental Protection has indicated that it intends to put back the Belgian blocks on Water St., in the Spring of 1997, that the Manhattan Borough President's office and our Council Member's Office supply or seek funds to put back the Belgian blocks in the other asphalt and concrete areas in the SSSHD at the same time, and regrade the hazardous road depressions, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: A policy be established that any road excavation work in the SSSHD be required to immediately put back any Belgian blocks removed.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: NOVEMBER 19, 1996

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

COMMITTEE VOTE:	4 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained
BOARD VOTE:	22 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained

RE: M-15 Bus Route

WHEREAS: The Transit Authority has proposed to re-route the M-15 bus route from East Broadway to Madison St. in order to avoid traffic congestion on East Broadway and a somewhat difficult turn at Chatham Square, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 and CB #3 sponsored a joint meeting on this proposal since it will impact both neighborhoods, and

WHEREAS: At the joint meeting, representatives of NY Downtown Hospital and local residents strongly opposed this re-routing since many people, including many elderly and infirm, would be greatly inconvenienced by not having access to East Broadway, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 feels there are alternate means of addressing the TA's traffic congestion concerns on East Broadway, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 opposes the proposed re-routing of the M-15 bus and urges the TA not to proceed with this proposal.