

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE**

TRIBECA VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
EXECUTIVE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 23 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Hudson River Park Design Guidelines Master Plan (Master Plan)**
- WHEREAS: CB #1 has consistently supported the concept of a continuous public park along the Hudson River Waterfront, including as much land for the park as possible and has worked with the Hudson River Park Conservancy (HRPC) and its predecessors to include the design elements supported by CB #1 and the community it represents into any proposed park plan as set forth in CB #1 resolutions dated 7/25/95, 4/15/97 and 7/29/97, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 has serious concerns regarding the responsiveness of the HRPC to the Board's expressed opinions on the design of this park within its boundaries as documented in letter to James Ortenzio, Chairperson, HRPC, July 30, 1997, and
- WHEREAS: The DEIS includes items that were specifically never requested, needed or wanted by CB #1, including but not limited to:
- 1) The enclosed all season play area on Pier 25.
  - 2) The floating foot bridge between piers 25 and 26.
  - 3) The large mooring area for boats south of Pier 25, and
- WHEREAS: On Pier 26, the estuarium is much larger than what CB #1 has requested and the pier does not contain enough unprogrammed space, according CB #1 requests contained in is April 15, 1997 resolution, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1's specific requests related to the upland areas, the Battery Park City area, and other components of the park have not been addressed in the Master Plan or DEIS, and
- WHEREAS: The lack of inclusion in the Master Plan of any historic boats within the confines of the CB #1 area will, if carried out, permanently remove any historic vessel from being moored in this community, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

The final EIS must include the analysis of the design and use elements that CB #1 has consistently requested in any plan to be implemented within its geographical area as outlined in the attached resolution dated April 15, 1997. These concerns must be considered as design alternatives, addressed in the design plan and their impacts analyzed in the final EIS. This list includes.

- 1) Our absolute insistence that far more active recreation space be incorporated throughout the CB #1 area of the Park.
- 2) The impact of a park design plan without the enclosed all-season play area, without the footbridge between Piers 25 and 26 and without the water-taxi stand. The final EIS should also address and analyze the impact of a much smaller boats mooring area south of Pier 25, a smaller estuarium of Pier 26 and an expanded unprogrammed area on Pier 26.
- 3) The impact of the rest of the land-based park plan that CB #1 has repeatedly requested, and
- 4) The impact of the continuation of the presence of the historic boats in the CB #1 area. This means that whether or not these boats remain at Pier 25, the final EIS must include provision to analyze the impact of historic vessels docked on the north side of Pier 25.

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

This DEIS does NOT adequately consider the impact of several major design and use aspects of the park in the CB #1 area, including:

- 1) The impact of the removal of much of the parking on Pier 40: The DEIS does not state there will be an impact outside of Greenwich Village. Although CB #1 welcomes the new recreational uses proposed for this pier, there will be a very definite parking impact on the CB #1 area, specifically Tribeca. The EIS needs to examine this issue regarding the impact this loss of parking would have on Tribeca.
- 2) The impact of water taxi stand on Pier 25 in terms of public access, noise, congestion, foot traffic etc.
- 3) The impact of a 40 boat mooring area south of Pier 25 indicates the need for either a no-wake zone or speed limits for boats in order to minimize the potential negative effects or a large number of small motorized craft entering and exiting that area. Also, the need for limiting public access to this area as well as addressing possible noise and pollution concerns.

- 4) The impact on the at-grade crossing at Chambers Street and West Streets, since it is a widely used access point to the waterfront promenade and Tribeca piers. All other access points in the CB #1 area should be considered as well. This proposed park plan will certainly add to the existing traffic and safety concerns regarding access to the whole waterfront area. (It should be noted that the elevator at the Tribeca Bridge at Chambers Street has never been operational, forcing people with strollers and wheelchairs to only use the at-grade crossing).
- 5) Public bathrooms, concessions stands and the entrances to the park especially adjacent to Battery Park City, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 strongly opposes the inclusion for consideration in the EIS of the foot bridge between Pier 25 and 26, for the following reasons:

- 1) Contrary to the goals of CB #1, the presence of such a bridge will render the area between Piers 25 and 26 completely inaccessible to any type of vessel, effectively creating a dead water area. According to the United States Code, Title 33, entitled “Navigation and Navigable Waters,” Chapter 11, Section 512: “No bridge shall at any time unreasonably obstruct the free navigation of any navigable waters of the United States.” This proposed bridge will certainly obstruct navigation, since the United States Government and CB #1 considers the area between Piers 25 and 26 to be navigable waters.
- 2) It is unnecessary—Pier 25 and 26 are proposed for very different uses, and there is no need for such an expensive “short cut”.
- 3) It will alter the basic integrity of the waterfront pier area, creating an unnatural design element that is not consistent with the historic configuration of the traditional west side waterfront area.
- 4) Since resources for the new park are scarce, the expense of erecting and maintaining this bridge will certainly take away from other more worthy expenditures on the waterfront.
- 5) The placement of this bridge will effectively eliminate the mooring of any historic boats or similar uses on the north side of Pier 25.
- 6) Safety: Waves, wakes, storms, vandals, etc. have the potential to create an unwise and potentially hazardous situation if this bridge is built, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

That since resources are scarce for this west side waterfront park, and contained in the Master Plan and DEIS are plans for the creation of “public art commissioned by HRPC in each park segment” (DEIS S-4), CB #1 insists that if any “art” is to be commissioned, it should be commissioned and approved by the communities hosting it. Also, CB #1 supports the concept of locally sponsored art in its parks and public areas, whenever possible, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

The potential for increased traffic, noise and pollution in the entire park is inadequately addressed in the DEIS and needs to be further analyzed, as do alternatives for reducing them, such as promoting the use of public transportation, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 adamantly opposes the inclusion within any part of this park any helicopter landing area. CB #1 notes that many cities, including Paris, do not allow helicopters within their boundaries. The concerns regarding noise and safety are too great to justify a heliport in such a heavily populated area. As heliports do not belong in Central Park, neither do they belong in Hudson River Park, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 does not support the contention in the DEIS that some view corridors may be partially obstructed by concession stands. The only view obstruction that CB #1 approves of are boats in the river, partial tree branches or New Jersey, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 strongly urges HRPC to revise and develop the final EIS to reflect the concerns addressed above, analyzing the alternatives described, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 will continue to work with HRPC or any successor entity, but must first see that our concerns and priorities are both heard and addressed in the final EIS, as well as any future design plan for the waterfront park, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

Before we lose more of the valuable and irreplaceable Tribeca piers (Piers 25 & 26) they must immediately begin the restoration process.

98.res.feb.98

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE**

BATTERY PARK CITY VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
EXECUTIVE VOTE: 9 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 21 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 2 ABSTAINED

RE: **Proposed tidegate at Rector Place in Battery Park City**

WHEREAS: The NYC Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), in conjunction with the construction of Route 9A, is preparing to proceed with construction to relocate the 23 tidegates currently located in the bed of West Street from Battery Place to 59<sup>th</sup> St., and

WHEREAS: The community was not informed about this project by the DEP, State Department of Transportation Route 9A officials, (DOT) or the Battery Park City Authority (BPCA) until such construction was imminent preventing the full and proper investigation of alternatives without the specter of delaying progress of the construction of 9A that the community shall already endure for many years, and

WHEREAS: The purpose of such tidegates, which are part of the storm sewer system, and are approximately 30 feet x 25 feet, is to prevent the backing up of salt water into the sewage treatment facilities, and

WHEREAS: Part of the current DEP plan is to consolidate two gates located for the last 30 years in West St. near Albany St. and Rector Pl. respectively, and construct one larger tidegate in the bed of Rector Pl., within the highly populated residential enclave surrounding Rector Park, a public park which is immediately adjacent to several large residential buildings, and

WHEREAS: There are no guarantees by contractual terms imposed upon the contractor that the construction shall be complete within the estimated seven months, and the construction shall be extremely noisy, and

WHEREAS: The construction shall close Rector Pl., preventing regular vehicular access to the front entrances of several large residential complexes some of which do not have rear entrances, and far more seriously, obstruct emergency vehicle accessibility and block

access to a fire hydrant, without having obtained, as of January 30, 1998, approvals from the fire department and in addition that such obstruction would result each time the tidegate was being serviced or repaired, and

WHEREAS: DEP wishes to relocate the gates to a more accessible location than the bed of a highway in order to improve worker safety and prevent traffic congestion when the tidegates are served. Although such argument made more sense when DEP initially informed community representatives that servicing would block three lanes of traffic and occurred weekly but DEP has since agreed that only one lane or at most one and one half lanes is closed for servicing the tidegates, and that such gates are only serviced once per month, and

WHEREAS: While the Community Board is concerned about worker safety, there is no evidence that the existing tidegate locations on West St. present a serious hazard, and there have been no worker injuries relative to the servicing of the 23 gates for 30 years, and in particular the two gates on Albany St. and Rector Pl. are located on the portion of West St. that has light traffic, and

WHEREAS: The servicing of the tidegates currently located in the bed of West St. has not created any disturbance to traffic on West St. that anyone in the community has noted, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board is deeply concerned about the danger of exposing the many thousands of residents, tourists, visitors, and workers to accidental injury as they pass adjacent to the construction site that will be filled with heavy equipment and be an enormous excavation, especially since the construction site is located near the neighborhood playground located between Rector Pl. and West Thames, a nursery school located on Rector Pl., and a school bus drop off also located on Rector Pl., and

WHEREAS: Tidegates frequently emanate noxious odors that could potentially be a health hazard, and would be far less objectionable in the bed of a highway than a neighborhood's front lawn, and

WHEREAS: The existing tidegates on West St. are still functional based on the latest 36 inspections of each, and could be upgraded and the surface immediately above the gates could be designed to facilitate any future gate replacement so as not to disrupt the new road bed, and remain in their current locations where they have been serviced for many years, and

WHEREAS: Leaving the gates in their present location would save the City \$600,000 to \$1,000,000, and

WHEREAS: There is potential enormous negative economic impact on landlords and owners trying to rent or sell their apartments, and

WHEREAS: There are questions about potential structural damage to buildings surrounding the construction site which have not been sufficiently answered, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

The Community Board strongly opposes the relocation of the new tidegate into the bed of Rector Pl., which shall disrupt and endanger the lives of thousands of residents, interfere with the safe enjoyment of a public park in the spring and summer when the park is most heavily utilized, potentially cause damage to the park either directly by construction accident due to the intrusion of large heavy machinery for construction or indirectly by endangering the root system of the newly established trees, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

The Community Board supports leaving the two gates located in West St. adjacent to Battery Park City in place, since there has been no discernible traffic congestion noticed, although 23 of such gates have been serviced from West St. for many years. And that the relocation of other 21 gates shall not disrupt a residential neighborhood and therefore are more reasonably proposed, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

While safety of public workers is always laudable, we believe that other measures can be taken to ensure the safety of workers who service these gates and have been servicing these 23 for many years and could certainly continue to service 2 without great hardship. And that the safety of the thousands of children and residents that could be accidentally injured during construction, servicing or somehow at the manhole, or suffer negative health effects due to noxious odors, right within the security of their own front yard, or be endangered due to obstruction of emergency vehicular traffic during construction of servicing of the gates, poses as serious a risk as any potential safety risk to DEP workmen, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

The Community Board respectfully requests that each local elected official take all possible measures, including appeals to Mayor Giuliani, to prevent the construction at Rector Pl. and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

The Community Board emphatically requests the BPCA be more responsible in the future and notify residents and the Community Board as soon as it has knowledge of proposed projects within Battery Park City and that the Battery Park City Authority fully support this resolution and do everything within its power to stop this construction project, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

All agencies involved in this construction project meet immediately to resolve this problem to the satisfaction of the community.

98.res.feb.98

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 1998

**MOTION FROM THE FLOOR**

BOARD VOTE:      23 IN FAVOR    0 OPPOSED    0 ABSTAINED

RE:                    **32 White Street, BSA application to allow for a new 15 story mixed-use building**

WHEREAS:            The developers of 32 White St., have applied to the Board of Standards and Appeals (BSA) for a variance from zoning requirements which would allow this proposed building to:

- 1)      Exceed the allowable FAR
- 2)      Eliminate the setback at 85'
- 3)      Exceed the 120' height maximum
- 4)      Exceed the maximum recess in the street wall
- 5)      Exceed the maximum 15' distance from the corner to the street wall, and

WHEREAS:            The zoning was recently changed to established a lower FAR more appropriate to the neighborhood, and

WHEREAS:            The variances requested would result in a bulk and height that may block a significant amount of daylight from the area surrounding 32 White St., and

WHEREAS:            There is significant opposition from those living in the immediate neighborhood to this project, and

WHEREAS:            The architect claimed to be sensitive to the contextual aspects of the neighborhood and Tribeca, and

WHEREAS:            This site is prominently located and should be considered a prime site able to command a significant sale or rental income, and

WHEREAS:            If the developers were to build as of right within the zoning, there would be no community input and review; and could also negatively impact the area, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 finds that this proposed building on this recently acquired site should not qualify for the requested zoning variances because:

- 1) Such variances are not merited by financial hardship
- 2) A variance in the FAR would negatively impact the immediate area, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

The developers are welcome to come back with a modified proposal and CB #1 would consider a recommendation for a modest variance in height and setbacks to accommodate a smaller footprint within the allowable FAR.

98.res.feb.98

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 23 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Bodega at 136 West Broadway, application for renewal of sidewalk cafe**

WHEREAS: CB#1 has a renewal application for a sidewalk cafe for the Bodega at 136 West Broadway for 6 tables with 12 seats, and

WHEREAS: There are no complaints on file at the board office and no one spoke in opposition, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends the approval of this application for a period of 5 years.

98.res.feb.98

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 21 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

- RE: **3-9 Hubert St., BSA application for a variance to residential use and a variance for a setback**
- WHEREAS: The developers of 3-9 Hubert St. have applied to the Board of Standards and Appeals for a use variance to allow for a residential building in a M1-5 district and a variance to allow for the encroachment in the required setback, and
- WHEREAS: Much of the housing in the adjacent northern Tribeca community is characterized by live/work units which should be encouraged, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 feels that a live/work building would be most appropriate for this part of Tribeca, now
- THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 opposes the requested entire residential use variance for 3-9 Hubert St. in the M1-5 district within the LMM special district, and
- BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 would not oppose the granting of a use variance at this location which would allow for a new building of the same proposed size which permit extended live/work units above the second floor and no residential uses on the bottom two floors, and
- BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 approves the setback variance requested for 3-9 Hubert St.

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 1998

**COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: ARTS, URBAN PLANNING & DESIGN,  
FINANCIAL DISTRICT AND  
SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 16 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 18 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Floating Theatre**

WHEREAS: Architect Jonathan Kirschenfeld has put forth a proposal for a 500 seat outdoor floating theatre which he wishes to dock for 20 day periods at Battery Park (Gangway #1) and at the South Street Seaport (Pier 17), and

WHEREAS: The barge will offer movies, dancing and theatre performances during the summer months (June through September), and

WHEREAS: This proposal has the support of the Conservancy for Historic Battery Park and Seaport Marketplace Inc., and

WHEREAS: The Community Board went on record supporting an outdoor movie theatre venture by Mr. Kirschenfeld in May of 1996, and

WHEREAS: A series of outdoor movies offered last summer at the Seaport was widely considered to be a welcome addition to the neighborhood, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 supports the proposal by Jonathan Kirschenfeld to dock his outdoor floating theatre barge for 20 day periods at Battery Park and Pier 17.

98.res.feb.98

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 14 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **174 Hudson Street**

Issue to review: New storefront at Vestry and Hudson Streets including new loading dock stairs, railing and lighting.

WHEREAS: The committee found the building to be one which contributes to the architectural character of the Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the previously approved mesh wrapping for the fire escapes should be extended/emulated in the handrails, and

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

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC approve and fully support the application for this work.

98.res.feb.98

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 16 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **21-23 South William Street**

Issue to review: Addition of five floors (45 ft. and 9,000 sq. ft.) to existing seven story commercial structure and conversion to a hotel/residential use.

WHEREAS: The building is located in the small South William historic district at the end of a row of exceptional, intact 5-7 story structures each exhibiting a unique and detailed facade, and

WHEREAS: The building itself has an exceptional and unaltered facade, terminating in a steeply pitched slate roof with dormers. The building, and any rooftop addition, is highly visible from down South William Street, and

WHEREAS: The building has a blank brick side facade facing the Goldman Sacks Plaza, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the addition firstly to be inappropriately scaled, at 5 stories to the existing building and secondly the stepped glass facade proposed for the addition to be inappropriate to the style and character of the existing building which already has, with it's strong slate roof, a very deliberate top, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design, as proposed, to be inappropriate, to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends that LPC not approve the application for the proposed work, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 requests that any modified proposal for this site be referred back to our Landmarks Committee prior to any vote on this matter by the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

98.res.feb.98

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 14 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **53-55 Beach Street**

Issue to review: New storefront on Beach & Collister facade and new awning, loading dock railing and lighting on Beach Street.

WHEREAS: The committee found the arched openings on the ground floor of the building to be especially interesting and unusual for the district and the existing glass block infill to be inappropriate, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that a smaller scale fenestration, possibly set behind the arches, would be more appropriate than the large three section storefront proposed, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that a simple horizontal awning, similar to a marquee in the size and slope, would be more appropriate than the three arched canopies proposed, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that a more industrial, open mesh handrail, or no handrail, would be more appropriate than the handrail proposed, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design, as proposed, to be inappropriate, to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC not approve the application for the proposed work.

98.res.feb.98

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 12 IN FAVOR 3 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **387-397 Greenwich Street**

Issue to review: Restore and rehabilitate facades and storefronts, construct a significant rooftop addition and convert to residential use the group of three buildings fronting on Greenwich, Beach and N. Moore Streets.

WHEREAS: The buildings are currently in vacant and dilapidated condition, and

WHEREAS: The applicants excellent historical research showed the design and historical details of the original buildings, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the intentions presented to carefully restore and rehabilitate facades and storefronts, and to retain the existing marquee, to be highly commendable and fully supports the proposed designs, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that a rooftop extension, the largest and most visible proposed to date for any of the 5-7 story loft buildings, inappropriate in relation to the size of the existing buildings, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the extensions would be highly visible, especially the portion on the Beach/Greenwich Street corner and overwhelm the simple five story building located at that end of the site, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the topmost portion of the extension, which uniformly linked all three buildings together, detracted from the individual scale of the district's buildings and resulted in a larger apparent mass, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the design, specifically of the rooftop addition, as proposed, to be inappropriate to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that LPC not approve the application, specifically of the rooftop addition, as presented, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 is fully in support of the remainder of the proposed work, apart from the rooftop addition, to restore and rehabilitate facades and storefronts.

98.res.feb.98

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

DATE: FEBRUARY 17, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 12 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED  
BOARD VOTE: 1 IN FAVOR 22 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **32 White Street, BSA application to allow for a new 15 story mixed-use building**

WHEREAS: 32 White Street has applied for a variance from zoning requirements, and

WHEREAS: The zoning was recently changed to established an FAR appropriate to the neighborhood, and

WHEREAS: The architect has tried to be sensitive to the contextual aspects of the neighborhood and Tribeca, and

WHEREAS: The variances requested would result in a height that may block a significant amount of daylight from those living near 32 White Street, and

WHEREAS: This is a prime location that will return a significant profit on the developer's recent investment, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 finds that the building should not qualify for the requested variances because a variance in FAR is not merited by financial hardship, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT: The Board of Standards and Appeals should permit a modest variance on height and setback to accommodate a smaller footprint within the allowable FAR.