

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Abstract Memories by Bill Barrett**

BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 supports the temporary installation of "Abstract Memories" by Bill Barrett, at the south end of Finn Square, between Varick and West Broadway for a period of 5 years.

99.res.mar.99

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HUDSON RIVER PARK

COMMITTEE VOTE: 6 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 32 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Temporary Art Installation at Pier 34**

WHEREAS: The Public Art Fund has proposed installing a temporary art installation at Pier 34, consisting of small wooden sculptural forms, each affixed by a screw to approximately 75 of the remaining pilings and in addition several of the forms will be placed as to float in the water immediately adjacent to the pilings, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 approves of the installation of this temporary art installation at Pier 34 for this coming season.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: HUDSON RIVER PARK

COMMITTEE VOTE: 2 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED 3 RECUSED
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 9 OPPOSED 3 ABSTAINED

- RE: **Manhattan Yacht Club Floating Barge at Pier 25**
- WHEREAS: Manhattan Yacht Club has proposed expanding the town dock facilities it managed last year on the south side of Pier 25 by linking a 35 by 85 foot floating barge to the existing dock (see schematic [not drawn to scale] attached hereto), and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 has supported the inclusion of a town dock in the Hudson River Park but the term “town dock” has not been defined and the operation and management of the town dock has not been determined, and
- WHEREAS: The barge will contain a one-story, 15 by 45-foot structure with a rooftop deck that will be used by the Club as a reception center, office, and classroom, and
- WHEREAS: CB #1 has consistently opposed the imposition of unnecessary floating structures in the Hudson River Park, and
- WHEREAS: In addition to providing additional and improved facilities for members of Manhattan Yacht Club and for its sponsored programs, including the Manhattan Sailing School, the Project City Kids’ free sailing program for urban children, and the New York Harbor Sailing Foundation’s new free sailing program for teenagers from CB #1, the barge will provide a much more stable and safe town dock, will buffer the existing floating docks from ferry wakes, provide additional space for small power boats accessing the town dock, and in general increase public access to the waterfront, and
- WHEREAS: Manhattan Yacht Club acquired the barge and designed and completed construction of the superstructure thereon before obtaining approval or any input from this Board, leaving CB #1 in the dilemma of not having any town dock for the coming season or having a large floating structure that could set an unwanted precedent for the addition of floating commercial structures in the park, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 is extremely disappointed that Manhattan Yacht Club failed to consult, inform, and obtain the approval of this Board before proceeding to acquire and improve the floating barge and calls upon Manhattan Yacht Club to keep this Board informed of its plans, projects, and programs on and for Pier 25, a major active recreation center for the residents of this community, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 urges Manhattan Yacht Club to consider ways to locate and reuse existing structures or facilities at or near the waterfront (such as the historic ferry Yankee) for its reception center, office, and classroom because the Hudson River Park should not be burdened with any unnecessary new structures, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

Because of the demonstrated need for improved town dock facilities at Pier 25, CB #1 approves of the siting of Manhattan Yacht Club's floating barge at Pier 25, on a temporary basis only, for the coming season, on the following conditions: (1) Manhattan Yacht Club and Manhattan Youth Recreation & Resources, Inc., the holder of the permit for Pier 25, enter into a suitable legally binding written agreement concerning the floating barge including a provision that Manhattan Yacht Club will remove the floating barge from Pier 25 by October 31, 1999, (2) Manhattan Yacht Club agree to allow members of the public access to all facilities on the floating barge including the restrooms, (3) Manhattan Yacht Club adequately promote and fund its community programs this coming season to demonstrate that it has a genuine interest in advancing the interests of the community in addition to those of its members, (4) No alcoholic beverages of any type shall be offered or consumed anywhere on the barge or adjacent dock, and (5) The approval granted herein shall not be construed as granting approval or any right of Manhattan Yacht Club to return the floating barge to Pier 25 after this season, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

No further approvals, understandings or agreements be entered into between lessees and lessors on the piers without informing the Community Board prior to commitments that might materially impact the use or appearance of the Park.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 28 IN FAVOR 1 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **217 Broadway, NY Sports Club**

BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 recommends the approval of the physical culture establishment special permit application put forth by NY Sports Club for their new branch at 217 Broadway.

99.res.mar.99

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: FINANCIAL DISTRICT

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 29 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Limos in Lower Manhattan**

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 continues to receive many complaints from local residents regarding the large number of car service vehicles queuing along local street in Lower Manhattan, and

WHEREAS: These limos frequently disrupt traffic flow and create excessive noise and air pollution from 6 PM until late into the evening, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board has previously gone on record indicating our concerns regarding these limos and has recommended utilizing off street staging areas to remove the limos from most local streets, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 applauds the City's incentives to create more Lower Manhattan residential conversions but feels that the City must also be increasingly sensitive to the quality of life concerns of these residents and continue to work towards better solutions to problems such as the limousines on our streets, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 urges the Department of Transportation and Police Department take additional steps to mitigate the negative impact of limos throughout CB #1 but particularly at the following locations:

66 Pearl Street
105 Broad Street
West Broadway from Vesey St. to Chambers St.
Coenties Slip
Greenwich Street from Hubert to Chambers Street
Murray Street from Church St. to Greenwich Street, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 again strongly urges DOT to create additional off-street staging areas for limos and again recommends the lots beneath the FDR Drive be used for this purpose. Local residents and the South Street Seaport Museum report that the bus layover lot is **not** used by buses after 6 PM and therefore **is** available for limo staging in the evenings.

99.res.mar.99

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **Burrito Bar sidewalk cafe renewal, 305 Church Street**

BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 has no objections to the 5 year renewal of the sidewalk cafe at the Burrito Bar located at 305 Church St.

99.res.mar.99

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **131 Duane St., City Hall Restaurant sidewalk cafe**

WHEREAS: City Hall Restaurant has applied for a 5 year permit for outdoor seating and service, and

WHEREAS: There have been some complaints about noise and traffic resulting from the restaurant without outdoor facilities, and

WHEREAS: Some local residents have praised the management and quality of the establishment, and

WHEREAS: City Hall Restaurant obtained last year but did not exercise a one year outdoor seating permit which would have been a short term test of the impact on the neighborhood, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 recommends a one year permit limited to 10 tables and 20 seats, with a last seating at 9:30 PM on weekday evenings and 10:30 PM on Fridays and Saturday, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 also recommends that a standing committee be formed by representatives of the immediate neighborhood and the management of the restaurant to discuss and resolve nascent irritations before they become major conflicts.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 20 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED

RE: **185 Duane Street, Juniper Cafe, full liquor license**

WHEREAS: An unusual number of residents attested to the benefit to the neighborhood of the restaurant, and

WHEREAS: There have been no major complaints against the establishment, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB #1 supports the application for a full liquor license.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: WITHDRAWN

RE: **235 West Broadway, Liquor Store Bar Sidewalk Cafe**

WHEREAS: The applicant has requested permission to provide outdoor service to 30 patrons sitting at 6 tables in a defined area comprising 97 square feet, and

WHEREAS: There are three other popular alcohol serving establishments within 100 yards of the Liquor Store Bar, and

WHEREAS: Some residents have complained of raucous behavior by restaurant and bar patrons very late at night, and

WHEREAS: 30 persons and 6 tables could not possibly be constrained within the confines of the allotted 97 feet, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 supports a one year trial for outdoor seating for 12 persons at three tables, with the provision that table service conclude at 10PM on weekdays and 11 PM on Fridays and Saturdays.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSED
BOARD VOTE: 19 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Application for Catering Liquor License, 480 Canal Street, Apogee Events**

WHEREAS: Apogee Events has applied to the State Liquor Authority for a Catering Liquor License at 480 Canal Street, and

WHEREAS: This business would have an entrance/waiting area at 2 Desbrosses Street as well as indoor and outdoor space on the top floor and roof for weddings, receptions, dancing and dining, and

WHEREAS: A total of 750 people could use this facility at one time, and its planned hours of operations are, weekdays from 6 to 10 PM and Saturdays from 7 PM to 1 AM, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 is concerned about increased traffic and noise from this facility, and potential negative impact on the people living on Desbrosses Street and other residential blocks, and

WHEREAS: Apogee is using the public streets as a valet parking lot for its patrons, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 is also concerned about the environmental impact from loud music and open rooftop noise, limited parking availability; that Canal Street is an environmental "hot spot"; and idling and double parking cars, now

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

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: EXECUTIVE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 1 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 26 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **Greening of Greenwich Street**

WHEREAS: Con Edison has begun preliminary work necessary for the reconstruction of Greenwich Street from Hubert to Chambers Streets and estimates this work will last for the balance of 1999, and

WHEREAS: This work will involve removal of derelict gas lines and the relocation of "live" gas and electric mains and other work necessitating the opening of trenches in Greenwich Street, and

WHEREAS: The NYCDOT permit for the current phase of the work requires metal plates be placed over the trenches at the end of the work day, and

WHEREAS: Moving plates generates noise and causes up to two hours of delay each work day reducing productivity and prolonging the duration of the project, and further noise is created during evening and nighttime hours by cars and trucks passing over the plates causing additional hardship to the neighborhood, and

WHEREAS: NYCDOT has indicated it intends to require plating for the duration of the project, and

WHEREAS: Con Edison feels a better strategy for Greenwich Street and the community would be to use sheeting instead of plating. This sheeting would extend a minimum of 5 feet above the ground in order to insure public safety, and

WHEREAS: Greenwich Street is wide enough to allow the passage of traffic if the excavations remain open and sheeted, and

WHEREAS: CB #1 desires this project to be completed in a timely manner with as little disruption to the community as possible, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board #1 feels that plating is not the best strategy for Greenwich St. and urges NYCDOT to allow Con Edison to use sheeting in mid-block sections of the Greenwich Street project.

99.res.mar.99

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 18 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **11 Fulton Street – Fulton Market Building South Street Seaport**

Issue to review: The application is for exterior signs for CRUNCH fitness on the Fulton Market building.

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the signs to be attached to the tension cables holding up the marquee were sail like and an acceptable addition to the building. However we think that the bright yellow background color should be replaced with a more nautical white or cream and the logo should be placed horizontally, and

WHEREAS: The committee, understanding the limited visibility from inside the district (mostly visible from the FDR Drive) felt that the light frame and rooftop sign would be appropriate. However we wondered what additional signage may be requested by the GAP, which is soon to occupy the ground floor of the building, and how this would interact with the proposed signage, and

WHEREAS: In addition, the committee felt that the signs to be attached to the windows were excessive and unnecessary, and

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

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB#1 recommends that LPC approve the application for this work, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB#1 recommends that LPC ask the owner to review, in advance, the signage for the GAP and to coordinate it with this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 18 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

- RE: **321A Greenwich Street (derelict building next to Giginos)**
- Issue to review: Addition of a two story roof top extension. Request for additional bulk and reduced rear yard.
- WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension, while not highly visible from the North or South Greenwich Street sidewalks, would be extremely visible from Washington Market Park, and Chambers Street, and
- WHEREAS: The committee felt that the group of buildings on this block, while not individually distinctive, retained their original facades and a good portion of their original fenestration, and
- WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension proposed was inappropriate, confused and lacking any relation to the existing building, and
- WHEREAS: The committee felt that the materials selected, the number and placement of windows and the type of fenestration proposed detracted from the existing building, and
- WHEREAS: On the issue of the rear yard and additional bulk, the committee felt that the additional bulk (85% lot coverage instead of 75%) was not justified by any economic argument. And, contrary to the Architects presentation and representation both graphic and verbal, the rear yard area (upon further investigation) was overlooked by many lot line windows from neighboring buildings on this very densely built up block, and
- WHEREAS: The committee found the as proposed work, to be inappropriate, to the Historic District, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB#1 recommends that LPC NOT APPROVE the application as presented nor grant any additional bulk other than that permitted under the zoning code.

99.res.mar.99

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED
BOARD VOTE: 18 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **65-77 Worth Street (Worth & Church)**

Issue to review: Application is to construct a significant rooftop addition, install new storefronts and convert to residential use.

WHEREAS: The committee found the proposed buildings to be of significant architectural character and important to the Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The committee found the intentions presented to rehabilitate the facades and storefront to be appropriate. However we would prefer the restoration of the cast iron facade on all the buildings, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the two story rooftop extension proposed would, due to the height of the building and the small 7ft setback proposed, be highly visible from many streets in the surrounding area, and

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the rooftop extension proposed was inappropriate in massing and size. The sloped glazing in the first 7ft topped with a handrail was particularly inappropriate as it added a "mansard" effect to this elegant group of buildings seriously detracting from their proportions. We feel that the rooftop addition should be pushed farther back from the facade and scaled down, 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.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: MARCH 16, 1999

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 3 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED 1 RECUSE
BOARD VOTE: 18 IN FAVOR 0 OPPOSED 0 ABSTAINED

RE: **75 Murray Street**

Issue to review: The application is for an exterior trellis to cover approximately 30 lot line windows on the new residential conversion at 71 Murray St. to provide privacy to the penthouse of 75 Murray St. The design of the trellis would permit light and air to pass though.

WHEREAS: The committee felt that the issue of penthouse privacy was a tricky one. However, the presentation did not show enough detail or views to allow us to comment on the appropriateness of the trellis, and

WHEREAS: The committee requested the applicant to provide a more complete presentation before an opinion could be rendered, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED
THAT:

CB#1 recommends that LPC REJECT OR HOLD OVER the application for this work until adequate drawings are prepared and presented to the Board.