

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 2 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 2 ABSTAINED

RE: **Flor De Sol at 361 Greenwich Street, application for sidewalk cafe**

WHEREAS: CB#1 has received an application from Flor De Sol restaurant to operate a sidewalk cafe, and

WHEREAS: The applicant appeared before the committee and all four cooperative owners living in 361 Greenwich Street, and

WHEREAS: There was a history of quality of life complaints related to noise, smoke and other operations of Flor De Sol, and

WHEREAS: Flor De Sol has taken steps to address these problems, to the satisfaction of the building residents as written in the attached letter, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that the Department of Consumer Affairs approves the application by Flor De Sol to operate an unenclosed sidewalk cafe at 361 Greenwich Street with a maximum of 10 seats, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 commends Flor De Sol for beginning to take action to address the concerns of its neighbors and urges management to continue to cooperate with the residents with regard to noise, public safety and sanitation, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 takes note that Flor De Sol and its neighbors have resolved their current issues expeditiously and urges them to continue to work together.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **346 Broadway**

BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB#1 approves application #C980458PPM which will enable the City to sign a long-term lease for continued use of the basement space at 346 Broadway as a public parking lot.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 10 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **2 Lafayette Street**

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB#1 approves the long-term lease between the City of New York and the Municipal Credit Union to enable the credit union to remain at 2 Lafayette Street (ground floor and basement space) where they have been since 1983.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: ARTS, URBAN PLANNING & DESIGN**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 24 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 2 ABSTAINED (for cause)

RE: **Alliance Trash Receptacles and Signage**

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the new Alliance trash receptacles and prefers them in the color black, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the concept of the wayfinding signage but offers the following comments and concerns regarding the wayfinding signage:

- 1) There are too many wayfinding signs. They should not be placed on every corner.
- 2) The photos/images should be clearer and more identifiable. Trinity Church was too detailed. The World Trade Center image wasn't easily identifiable. The Statue of Liberty symbol was much better. Also, not every destination is suitable for a photo/image (e.g. NY Stock Exchange).
- 3) We applaud the inclusion of street address numbers on the signage.
- 4) We dislike the new signage calling Broadway the "Canyon of Heroes".

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: ARTS, URBAN PLANNING & DESIGN**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Battery Park Railing Panels**

BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 approves the appropriate and imaginative conceptual design put forth by artist Wopo Holup and the Conservancy for Historic Battery Park for the Battery Park railing panels under the theme "The River That Flows Two Ways".

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: ARTS, URBAN PLANNING & DESIGN**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Heritage Trail Site Markers**

BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 approves the installation of 13 additional site markers by  
Heritage Trails.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED for cause  
(Capsouto)

RE: **372 Broadway, application for a liquor license**

WHEREAS: The Bowery Room has applied for a liquor license for a large scale club at 372 Broadway, and

WHEREAS: The proposed nightclub, with occupancy of up to 800 people, is adjacent to a large residential building, and

WHEREAS: The location is within 500 feet of the Civic Center Synagogue at 49 White Street, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 opposes a liquor license at this location.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 29 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **Pier 16, application for approval of the seasonal outdoor cafe  
Pier 17, applications for approval of the seasonal stage and  
canopy, seasonal ice rink, permanent ticket booth**
- WHEREAS: The Seaport Marketplace, at the direction of NYC Economic  
Development Corporation, made a presentation for approval of:
- a “seasonal” outdoor cafe on Pier 16 (the Container Cafe) which,  
though proposed to be in operation during warm weather months,  
would continue to be a permanent structure on Pier 16;
- a “seasonal” stage and canopy which, though proposed to be in  
operation during warm weather months, would be replaced by the  
skate rental trailers during the cold weather months if the ice-  
skating rink returns, in effect creating a permanent presence and  
view corridor obstacle between Piers 16 and 17;
- a permanent ticket booth for New York Waterways, which LPC  
approved as a temporary structure to be removed in November  
1997, was not removed and then was used as a ticket booth for the  
ice rink, and
- WHEREAS: The applicant presented only one incomplete map of the affected  
area with no studies, renderings, photographs, materials, view-  
corridors or models, and
- WHEREAS: There are clearly other options by which New York Waterways  
can sell tickets other than erecting another undistinguished  
permanent structure in public open space, and
- WHEREAS: The Landmarks Preservation Commission, in rejecting New York  
Waterways previous application to turn their temporary ticket  
booth into a permanent structure, endorsed CB #1’s December 2,  
1997 resolution calling for the LPC to “review the overall  
proliferation of small undistinguished structures on Piers 16 & 17  
and ...compel the parties to prepare and have approved a joint

Master Plan for the open space on Piers 16 and 17 before any further structures are legalized or erected”, and

WHEREAS:

There is no evidence whatsoever, through this application, that this process has taken place, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB #1 disapproves the application and calls for the LPC to take no action on the above-referenced structures until CB #1 is presented the pertinent information necessary to make an informed decision on any proposals for permanent structures in public open space on Piers 16 & 17.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **412 Broadway, application to install a new storefront**

WHEREAS: The applicant presented plans to restore much of the old storefront to more of an original condition, and

WHEREAS: The Landmarks Preservation Commission encouraged the applicant to install a new cornice above the first floor, but no samples were presented to indicate the cornice color, and

WHEREAS: A four foot high sign will be hung where a row of small windows once were, and

WHEREAS: The Committee was concerned with the ground floor storefront of black anodized aluminum for door and windows, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 approves this application subject to seeing the color, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT: CB #1 would like to see the ground floor facade constructed of hard wood painted an appropriate color in keeping with the fabric of the neighborhood.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEES OF ORIGIN: ARTS, URBAN PLANING & DESIGN  
AND FINANCIAL DISTRICT**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: Draft Request For Proposals for Piers 9, 13 and 14**
- WHEREAS:** The NYC Economic Development Corporation has prepared a draft Request for Proposals (RFP) for Piers 9, 13 and 14 and has submitted it to the Community Board for comment, and
- WHEREAS:** The draft RFP invites such uses as museums, art galleries, golf recreation centers, tennis courts, beach clubs, boat clubs, eating or drinking establishments, retail or service establishments, non-profit institutions, docks or mooring facilities, terminal facilities, studios for art, music, dancing, theatre productions, retail, and motel and boatels, and
- WHEREAS:** The draft RFP specifically excludes office and residential development as well as parking as uses for Pier 9, 13 and 14, and
- WHEREAS:** EDC's intention is to attract developers who would pay for the necessary pier rehabilitation as well as the on-going maintenance of these three piers, and
- WHEREAS:** CB #1 has long stated its desire to create usable community open space on the piers and along the waterfront and in particular is interested in utilizing this valuable property to serve the recreational needs of the fast growing residential community located east of Broadway in Lower Manhattan, and
- WHEREAS:** There are no alternative sites for such recreation space on the eastside of our district, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 conditionally approves of the draft RFP for Piers 9, 13 and 14 but strongly urges that the EDC commit to work closely with the Community Board to achieve the following objectives:

- 1) Creation of the largest amounts of contiguous open, recreation space possible on Piers 9, 13 and 14.
- 2) A strong preference that at least one entire pier be turned into a dedicated “community pier” (like Pier 25 on the westside) which would include a substantial amount of active recreation space. We specifically recommend that the pier include a children’s playground, a mini soccer field, volleyball courts, and a summer water element, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 requests that it be consulted and be allowed to comment on the desirability of various proposals for the piers and in particular be allowed to work with EDC and the developers on the design of the open/recreation spaces, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 recommends that EDC give special consideration to proposals which would allow for a “community pier”.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **112 Duane St., (72 Reade St.) application to modify a rooftop addition**

WHEREAS: This is a highly unusual case in which a certification of no effect was granted for a penthouse addition that can be seen from much of Tribeca, and

WHEREAS: The former architect as well as the developer misrepresented the impact of this addition to the Landmarks Preservation Commission, and

WHEREAS: The proposal here is to scale back the rooftop addition by eliminating 550 square feet of livable space, and

WHEREAS: The existing two story rooftop is completely inappropriate, with 15 foot ceilings on two floors totaling a 30 foot high addition on the roof, creating a 35% increase of height on a 69 foot high building, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

The developer should not be rewarded by asking the LPC as well as our community to help them "fix" a penthouse which is grossly oversized, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 approves only a one story rooftop addition on this building, set back as indicated, and asks that the 7 story addition be removed, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 does not approve any external staircase or railing on top of the rooftop structure.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **79 White St., penthouse addition and new storefront addition**

WHEREAS: The applicant has already met with the Landmarks Preservation Commissioners and staff, completely circumventing the process mandated by the City Charter, and

WHEREAS: The Committee did not receive a complete presentation by the applicants since it lacked complete information on sightlines, photos of the existing storefront, materials to be used for the rooftop addition, or an LPC requested model to indicate rooftop addition impact, if any, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 cannot make any recommendation on this application due to an incomplete presentation, and

BE IT  
FURTHER  
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 adamantly urges the LPC to refrain from entertaining formal presentations from applicants until CB #1 has had a complete and thorough presentation, in accordance with the provisions set forth in the City Charter.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **121–133 Hudson St., application for exterior restoration and rooftop addition**

WHEREAS: The Committee reviewed the information presented regarding this application and found the presentation to be lacking in several key areas, including details on the materials used for the canopy, materials to be used on the rooftop addition, and adequate sightlines to indicate the impact of the rooftop addition, and

WHEREAS: The one story rooftop addition, while conceptually acceptable, cannot be properly evaluated or commented on due to an incomplete presentation in committee, and

WHEREAS: The Committee is opposed with the proposal to install aluminum windows, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 urges the LPC to table this proposal until the Community Board receives a full and complete presentation so that the developer who has been through this process before is not permitted to circumvent the Charter mandated review process.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED  
BOARD VOTE: 27 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **66-70 Leonard Street, application to construct rooftop  
addition, install storefronts and create a curb cut**

WHEREAS: The committee agreed that because the owners, applicants or their representatives did not show up at the committee meeting, that CB #1 recommend that LPC hold over all action on the application until the owner, applicant or their representatives appear before this Board, now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

Community Board #1 recommends that LPC take no actions with regards to this application.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **116-118 Franklin St., application to construct rooftop addition**

WHEREAS: This proposed stucco penthouse will be set back 15 feet from the front of the building, and

WHEREAS: The Committee found the proposal to add a rooftop addition appropriate if three conditions are met in order to make it less visible from the street:

- 1) The 12 feet high ceiling is lowered to 10 feet.
- 2) There is no overhang extending into the proposed 15 foot setback.
- 3) No railing is constructed on the top of the penthouse structure, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT:

Community Board #1 recommends that LPC approve the application if the above changes are implemented.

98.res.june.98

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

DATE: JUNE 16, 1998

**COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SPECIAL HUDSON RIVER PARK EIS**

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Community Board comments on final EIS**

WHEREAS: The amount of space reserved for active recreation continues to be less than what CB #1 advocated for. While this is a programming issue, CB #1 would like to emphasize how important this issue is to the local community and should have been better reflected in the FEIS, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 appreciates the inclusion of historic boats on Pier 25 in the final EIS, a change from the Draft EIS, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 comments on the floating bridge between Piers 25 and 26 remain unchanged in that such a walkway:

- 1) Will impede the navigability of the waters between the piers, despite unsubstantiated assertions in the FEIS that this will not be the case.
- 2) Will create an unnecessary "short cut" accessing Piers 25 and 26, or visa versa.
- 3) Will violate the historic configuration of the Pier's configuration. Despite assertions in the FEIS that the Pier's configuration has not been determined to be "historic," CB #1 refers to the Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (10<sup>th</sup> Edition) definition, which defines "historic" as meaning: "dating from or preserved from a past time or culture." The configuration of these piers meets this definition.
- 4) Will utilize scarce park resources and divert money away from more important park elements important to CB #1, like renovating the piers.
- 5) Will eliminate the docking of boats on the inland portion of the piers, unless the bridge is movable making it even more expensive to build.
- 6) Has the potential to be a safety hazard, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 has respectfully and consistently asked that this bridge be taken out of any design plans, and the bridge magically reappears in all plans as an optional design. It should be deleted from any Park documents, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 is adamant that the elevator at the Chambers Street crossing be made operational immediately. Hudson River Park will make use of the elevator more necessary than ever. Also, the timing of the stop lights at Chambers Street should be changed to allow more time for pedestrians to cross West Street. There currently is not enough time to safely cross the highway and CB #1 is concerned that someone will be injured or killed crossing the street when the new park is built if more time is not given for pedestrians crossing there, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 continues to believe that additional public transportation options should be considered in allowing people to come to the new park. The FEIS does not adequately consider how people will get there, as well as the impact of the increased traffic not only to Hudson River Park but also to Battery Park City north, where a great deal of new construction will result in more people crossing the highway, principally at Chambers Street (see above), and

WHEREAS: CB #1 believes there remains some ambiguity in the FEIS regarding the view corridor issue. We continue to advocate for no blocked view corridors, especially with any concession stands, and we believe the floating walkway will serve as a view corridor blockage (see above), now

THEREFORE  
BE IT  
RESOLVED  
THAT:

CB #1 would like to see the concerns expressed above taken into account in the final document and subsequent planning for the Park.