

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

COMMITTEE VOTE: 9 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 1 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE: 2 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
BOARD VOTE: 34 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Independence Plaza

WHEREAS: Independence Plaza North (IPN) is a mixed income, racially and ethnically integrated affordable housing complex that includes three high-rise buildings and approximately 4000 tenants, and

WHEREAS: Most tenants are neighborhood pioneers and have lived in IPN for 20 years or more, and

WHEREAS: Many IPN children have attended or are attending the neighborhood schools, and

WHEREAS: IPN is an important, vibrant and contributing part of the community, and

WHEREAS: IPN residents are now threatened with removal from the rent protections afforded them under the Mitchell-Lama program, and

WHEREAS: IPN is virtually the only affordable housing that remains in Tribeca and without rent protections, many of IPN's moderate and low income residents are at risk of having to leave their homes, and

WHEREAS: There is a current shortage of affordable housing in Lower Manhattan, and

WHEREAS: Mayor Bloomberg has proposed a vision which has a significant housing component including affordable housing in Lower Manhattan, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 strongly urges the city, state and federal governments, which are stakeholders in IPN, to preserve IPN as affordable housing for the benefit of current and future generations of Tribecans, and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: City, State and Federal officials are urged to actively intervene in this matter and forge a fair and equitable resolution for the tenants and owners of IPN.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: TRIBECA

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

PUBLIC VOTE: 2 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

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

RE: Board of Standards and Appeals application for a special permit to allow a school at 53/55 Beach Street

WHEREAS: Wegweiser and Erlich, LLP, have filed an application with the NYC Board of Standards and Appeals for a special permit to allow a private school at 53/55 Beach Street, which is in an MI zoning district, and

WHEREAS: The proposed preschool would adhere to Montessori methods, serve up to 60 students between the ages of two and six, and will have thirteen staff members, and

WHEREAS: The proposed preschool is located within approximately 150 feet of a C6-4 district in which such schools are allowed, and

WHEREAS: This proposed new school would be an asset to the local community's rapidly growing youth population, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 supports the BSA application for a special permit for a private school at 53/55 Beach Street.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: SEAPORT/CIVIC CENTER

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

BOARD VOTE: 28 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: Property disposition of Block 97 to Yarrow LLC

WHEREAS: Community Board #1 has had a long and active involvement in the City's efforts to restore 11 abandoned buildings and 3 vacant lots on Block 97 in the South Street Seaport Historic District, and

WHEREAS: After several disappointing and unfruitful designations, the City has recently selected Yarrow LLC to redevelop these run down historic sites, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board is very encouraged by this selection since the development team is led by Frank Sciamè who has successfully restored a number of properties in the Seaport and their preliminary design plan appears to be very sensitive to the scale and character of the historic district, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 strongly supports the disposition of Block 97 to Yarrow LLC and applauds the Economic Development Corp. for selecting both this development team and their plan for the restoration of these 14 historic sites.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

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

BOARD VOTE: 29 In Favor 0 Opposed 1 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 380-382 Broadway, application to request that LPC issue a report to the City Planning Commission for a modification of use to allow residential and mixed commercial use above the first floor

WHEREAS: This application requests the Landmarks Preservation Commission to recommend that the City Planning Commission allow residential use of this property above the first floor, which current regulations do not permit, and

WHEREAS: The owner would then restore the *circa* 1859 property, including

- replacement of wood window sashes with correct new wood sashes;
- restoration of window frames;
- repair or replacement of existing white marble masonry and cast iron elements, and
- restoration of the building's beautiful shutters on Cortlandt Alley, and

WHEREAS: The Board wishes that the add-on flagpole be removed, and

WHEREAS: The Board questions whether the "Blues" sign hanging from the storefront ever received L.P.C. approval, and

WHEREAS: The applicant assured the Landmarks Committee that no current residents – some of whom may be protected by I.M.D. status – would be evicted, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: The Community Board recommends that the L.P.C. approve this application after checking the legal status of the "Blues" sign, and with the assurance that the owner will remove the flagpole and will not displace any existing residents.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

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

BOARD VOTE: 30 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 458 Greenwich Street, application to install a flagpole at the ground floor

WHEREAS: The tenant wishes to mount permanently a 4-foot by 3-foot American flag on a flagpole to be installed 12 feet 2 inches off the ground, and

WHEREAS: The flag would not be lowered at night, as is legal and customary, and

WHEREAS: A neighborhood resident expressed concern about pedestrian clearance below the flag, and

WHEREAS: The Board wishes to make clear that it has concerns not about the display of the American flag, but about the flagpole and its mounting bracket, neither of which are in keeping with the Tribeca North Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The Board has no issue if the applicant wishes to display the flag within the store's window while conforming with Landmarks regulations, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: The Community Board recommends that the L.P.C. reject this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

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

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

RE: 372 Broadway, application to construct a 5 story roof top addition

WHEREAS: The applicant is planning to erect a stepped-back five-story residential rooftop addition on this through-block loft building, running from the east side of Broadway to the west side of Cortlandt Alley, and

WHEREAS: The applicant claims that the unusually deep 150-foot lot size would make the addition invisible from all street sightlines, and

WHEREAS: The applicant states that he would erect a mock-up to prove this point to the Landmarks Preservation Commission, and

WHEREAS: Local residents assert that the property is fraught with structural problems, not least of which is that it is torn from its foundations, apparently, and is being supported solely by the relatively new high-rise to its immediate north, against which it is leaning, assertions which the presenter did not contradict, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: The Community Board requests that the Landmarks Preservation Commission direct the applicant to return to the Landmarks Committee after the visibility question is answered by the L.P.C.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

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

BOARD VOTE: 30 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 114-116 Hudson Street, application to build a new seven-story building at 114 Hudson Street and to construct a rooftop addition on 116 Hudson Street

WHEREAS: This is a complicated program to combine two adjoining lots, involving the modification of an existing building and the construction of a new one, along with the joining of three contiguous ground floors into one retail space, on a prominent block of the Tribeca West Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The proposal for the existing building, 116 Hudson Street, includes the removal of its purportedly non-historic fire escapes, restoration of its upper façade, replacement of its non-historic storefront (and its integration with two adjoining storefronts), and modification and re-facing of its existing rooftop bulkhead in gray metal, and

WHEREAS: The new structure at 114 Hudson Street would fill the void left by the overnight destruction of a Federal-period townhouse 16 years ago, whose pentimento appears on the sides of 112 and 114 Hudson Street, and

WHEREAS: 114 Hudson Street would be a seven-story curtain-wall residential building, whose glass infill would be suspended between masonry, behind which the floor slabs of the apartments within would be visible, each story outlined by a dark silver bris-soleil and each floor consisting of a single apartment spanning the full width of both 114- and 116 Hudson Street, and

WHEREAS: The operable glass panels of the curtain wall would be framed with delicate ¾-inch mullions, matching the bris-soleil material, and

WHEREAS: The storefronts of 112- , 114- , and 116 Hudson Street would be joined into one continuous glass façade, whose metal outer edges are intended to suggest cast iron, and the interiors would comprise one retail space whose dimensions would flirt with the maximum square footage allowed for a combined retail space in the revised C-6/M1-5 special zoning district, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board has no complaint with the program for 116 Hudson Street above the first floor, nor with the overall bulk of 114 Hudson Street, and

WHEREAS: The Community Board applauds the ambition and apparent quality of the overall proposal, and respects the architect/developer team's prior work in Tribeca, but has serious concerns with many facets of the design of both 114 Hudson Street and the combined three-lot storefront, including their color, texture, tone and relationship to the surrounding architectural fabric, and

WHEREAS: While the Board is open to contemporary designs within our historic districts, it finds this proposed new structure different merely for its own sake, and at the same time a timid pastiche in the midst of strong, heavy old buildings, while the storefront scheme is overwhelming in scale and banal in execution, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: The Community Board urges the Landmarks Preservation Commission to reject this application.

03res.jan21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

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

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

RE: 44 White Street, application to install storefront infill

WHEREAS: This application is for the restoration of a compromised storefront in the Tribeca East Historic District, and

WHEREAS: Both the materials, such as the painted mahogany doors, and the trim color, a very dark gray, are contextual and historically appropriate, and

WHEREAS: The property owner is requesting help in selecting exterior light fixtures, and the Landmarks Committee suggested relatively small and minimal fixtures, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: The Community Board urges the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application, and further advise the owner on exterior lighting fixtures.

03res.jan21

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

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

BOARD VOTE: 30 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 170 Duane Street, application to reconstruct the facade

WHEREAS: This project would completely reconstruct and redesign the façade of 170 Duane Street, a twenty-year old faux loft building whose awful architecture and shoddy construction were an impetus for the community movement to create a Tribeca Historic District, and

WHEREAS: 170 Duane Street sorely needs redesign, from an aesthetic and a practical perspective, since, it is weeping water and its mortar is crumbling, and

WHEREAS: While Bohn – Levine Architects is a distinguished landmarks restoration firm, which most recently did what the Community Board considers to be an excellent restoration of the historically significant 171 Duane Street directly across the street, its proposal here appears muddled or unfinished, and

WHEREAS: The details call for huge penetrations filled with tilt-and-turn windows with mahogany frames, with all the fenestration surrounded with ribbed zinc infill, partially to mask the through-the-wall air conditioning louvers, and a new, toothed metal cornice, and

WHEREAS: The zinc infill may be an interesting take on a 1920s or 1930s midtown loft building, but it seems inappropriate in the context of its neighbors on Duane Park, and the toothed cornice is problematic, and

WHEREAS: The window penetrations should be larger vertically than exist presently, but not horizontally, as presented here, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: The Community Board asks the Landmarks Preservation Commission to reject this application, but to continue to work with the architect to find an acceptable solution to the necessary task of reworking this structure.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: QUALITY OF LIFE

COMMITTEE VOTE: 4 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE: 1 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
BOARD VOTE: 31 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 22 Warren St., liquor license application for White Rose Restaurant
Inc./DBA Styles Restaurant

WHEREAS: The applicant will operate a restaurant for 103 people, with 30 tables and
74 seats which will include a bar not to exceed 29 seats, and

WHEREAS: The hours of operation will be 11 AM until midnight, Sunday-Saturday,
and

WHEREAS: The restaurant will have background music only and agrees to add
adequate sound proofing, and

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

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to have an indoor refrigerated garbage area, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to add these conditions to the SLA application, and

WHEREAS: The applicant agreed to install sprinklers, supply the Community Board
with a proper Certificate of Occupancy when obtained, and to have an
ongoing dialogue with the tenants of 22 Warren Street, now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 recommends the SLA approve liquor license for Styles at 22
Warren Street and other concerned neighbors for two years with the above
agreed upon conditions of operation to be included in the application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WTC REDEVELOPMENT

BOARD VOTE: 31 In Favor 1 Opposed 5 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: World Trade Center Concept Site Plans

WHEREAS: The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation and the Port Authority have invited seven world-renowned architectural teams to submit concept site plans for the World Trade Center site and their extraordinary efforts have produced nine wonderfully creative blueprints for rebuilding the World Trade Center site, creating a memorial, and renewing our community, and

WHEREAS: Community Board 1 represents the people who live and work and perished in Lower Manhattan, who pioneered this area as a residential community and as home for the arts and culture, who work and run many small and entrepreneurial businesses in the Financial District, and

WHEREAS: On September 11, 2001, many of us witnessed first hand the devastation and rushed to volunteer to help those in need; we all grieved for those who died and, since that tragic date, we have worked hard to plan for the recovery of the City and Lower Manhattan, and

WHEREAS: We have reviewed the nine concept plans and are deeply grateful to all those involved for their efforts and hard work. We applaud the vision of each of the architectural teams and support the goal of achieving world-class architecture and design through global competitions, and

WHEREAS: Working with the planners and public officials who will turn the concept plans for the WTC site into reality, we are seeking to help craft the City's future. We make the following comments from our hearts, and from our desire to see Lower Manhattan return to its historic place as a center of financial, cultural, and residential development in the 21st Century. In this resolution, and over the many months of public meetings, our purpose is to be constructive and to inform government officials, planners, and visionaries of our experiences as the people who live and work in this area and know it intimately. As representatives of the people of Lower Manhattan, we hope to shape the rebuilding process to make this area the best possible place to live, work and visit as well as a place of remembrance for ourselves and our children and for our fellow citizens around the world, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board 1 recommends that the concept site plan and the master urban development plan ultimately selected for the WTC site address the

principles outlined in CB1's resolution of September 17, 2002, and include and address the following:

I. CONNECTIVITY

- A. Good connections, circulation, and accessibility in all directions (North, South, East, and West) to flow to and connect seamlessly with surrounding neighborhoods.
- B. A managed street plan, based on traffic studies and other reasonable considerations that address circulation (including East-West vehicular connection), parking, emergency vehicle access, environmental issues, and handicapped accessibility.
- C. Fulton and Greenwich Streets should continue through the site, with an East-West electric bus across Fulton Street.
- D. Consideration of a short by-pass of West Street between Liberty and Vesey Streets that links the site to the World Financial Center and ensures adequate pedestrian and vehicular access into and out of Battery Park City.
- E. Pedestrian friendly connections above and belowground throughout the site and with adjacent neighborhoods.

II. TRANSPORTATION AND UNDERGROUND

- A. A major transportation hub that connects all subway and commuter lines and includes a "Grand Central" like space.
- B. Entrances and exits to transit hubs in all directions, including underground connections to Liberty and Fulton Streets.
- C. Increased and improved public transportation links into Lower Manhattan that promote the use of public transportation as the primary means to get in and out of the area and serve the needs of residents, workers, and tourists.
- D. Adequate underground parking for tour and commuter buses and limited parking for private vehicles.
- E. A staging area for taxicabs and livery ("black car") vehicles in an area that will not disrupt other activities.
- F. Adequate provision for deliveries, garbage removal and other loading and unloading.
- G. A bicycle path through the site and parking facilities for bicycles throughout the area.
- H. Installation of a 21st century redundant communication infrastructure that serves both business and residential communities must be an integral part of the process and be integrated into land use planning.

III. SKYLINE AND ARCHITECTURE

- A. World-class architecture with a distinctive vertical skyline element(s).
- B. Endeavor to maintain view corridors and sightlines through the site.
- C. Buildings should be accessible from all sides and not create barriers between the site and the adjacent neighborhoods.

- D. The realized plans should create a streetscape that promotes street life and access to retail and cultural facilities on human scale.
- E. Environmental studies including shadow and wind studies should be done to ensure that any new buildings do not adversely affect the site and adjacent neighborhoods.
- F. Construction should be environmentally friendly and utilize sustainable building materials and modern technologies to reduce pollution and energy consumption.

IV. LAND USE

- A. There should be significant street level retail development as well as underground retail stores and mixed uses that support a 24/7 community.
- B. Substantial open space/green space on the ground level.
- C. Other community facilities that meet the needs of residents and workers as well as visitors, which might include a community center, recreation center, playgrounds, outdoor pavilions, performance spaces other cultural/arts facilities, libraries, schools and educational institutions, food stores and green markets, other supporting services.
- D. The total square footage required by the program should be reduced or redistributed to adjacent areas to maintain a human scale on the site.
- E. Allow the site to develop and grow based on market needs and evolving usage patterns.
- F. Use the latest safety, security, and evacuation standards for buildings.

V. MEMORIAL

- A. The memorial should be balanced with other uses and fit in with the goals of developing a vibrant economy and a livable and dynamic mixed-use community.
- B. The memorial should be inspirational and forward-looking, consistent with the LMDC Memorial Mission Statement and Program, as modified by CBI's separate comments.
- C. Planning should ensure that anticipated crowds do not have an adverse impact on the quality of life of residents and workers.

VI. STAGING

- A. Development should be phased to support local economic vibrancy.
- B. Undeveloped and unfinished spaces should be available for interim uses, including community parks, outdoor performance, public art, greenmarkets, and other amenities that will improve the quality of life of the neighborhood and potentially attract additional development and investment in the area.
- C. Improvements in transportation and communication infrastructure and public amenities should move forward as expeditiously as possible and must be coordinated with land use design and construction of the site.

- D. Space for the memorial should be allocated at the outset so that planning for a well-integrated memorial design can proceed in tandem with redevelopment of other areas on the site.
- E. Permanent components of the plan should be built and completed as soon as designs are completed and required financing is in place, with an emphasis on the memorial, transportation and other infrastructure improvements, and community services and facilities.
- F. Minimize impact of construction as much as possible and stage construction equipment and supplies to avoid disrupting the neighborhood.

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED
THAT:

Community Board 1 prefers the following three proposed design concepts, with modifications that address our concerns and notes the following:

Foster and Partners

- Effectively restores the skyline and creates an attractive and usable space at street level.
- Places too much mass along Church Street.
- Provides for recommended continuation of Greenwich Street but should be modified to also allow Fulton Street to continue through the site.
- Provides recommended parks and other green spaces but a short underground bypass on West Street would be better than an elevated platform.

Studio Daniel Libeskind

- Successfully addresses many of the practical and emotional concerns presented by the project in a thoughtful and effective design.
- Provides the desired continuation of Fulton and Greenwich Streets but should be modified to provide better connections to Battery Park City.
- The exposed bathtub wall is an effective memorial but it creates a barrier to the West of the site. The scale of this element could be reduced without reducing the effectiveness of the statement being made.
- The design does not provide adequate space for parking tour and commuter buses.
- More green space is needed at ground level.
- A short underground by-pass on West Street (Liberty to Vesey) would improve access to Battery Park City and provide additional open space.

THINK: Ban, Schwartz, Smith, Viñoly (Sky Park)

- Provides substantial and usable open space for parks and community facilities, a restored skyline, and reasonable bulk for the proposed towers.
- One or more of the proposed towers should be located farther from the Church Street corridor to distribute bulk more evenly throughout the site.

- The concept of extensive parkland above retail development is attractive but there are concerns about the proposed height and scale of the design and it is questionable whether people will be able to reach or effectively use open spaces on the proposed upper level.
- The design provides for phasing of the development of the site and permits vital park and cultural facilities to be built before commercial office space may be constructed.
- Connections to Battery Park City and Tribeca at grade level or otherwise are inadequate and should be improved. The high walls along Vesey and West Streets inhibit passage and create a dangerous and forbidding atmosphere and should be avoided; this should be redesigned to include direct connection to the street and street-level retail.

BE IT
 FURTHER
 RESOLVED
 THAT:

Community Board #1 believes the six remaining site plans should not be considered as a basis for the master plan for the following reasons:

Meier Eisenman Gwathmey Holl

- Proposed buildings are too bulky and do not belong on the skyline. The structures would have the effect of dividing the neighborhood and would cast large shadows on surrounding areas.
- Proposal to build a portion of the memorial on the Hudson River and to change the design of existing buildings and public spaces in Battery Park City is not attractive or realistic and raises environmental concerns.

Peterson/Littenberg Architecture and Urban Design

- This plan is uninspiring and appears to look backwards instead of into the future.
- Memorial obelisk on West Street and traffic circle are undesirable. The proposed street plan restores part of the grid, which would be a positive development, but adversely affects North-South connections.

SOM Team

- Proposed design is much too massive and is not well integrated into the WTC site or the surrounding areas.
- Location of open space on upper floors is impractical and there are concerns about usefulness and limited public access to these areas.

THINK: Ban, Schwartz, Smith, Viñoly (The World Cultural Center)

- The proposed memorial makes an effective statement and demonstrates that an icon can be created without office space, but it is too large and rings somewhat hollow. The use of the public space seems both impractical and wasteful.

- The proposed site plan blocks off Broadway from the sites and fails to provide for adequate pedestrian circulation through the WTC site or to and from Battery Park City and other adjacent areas.

THINK: Ban, Schwartz, Smith, Viñoly (The Great Room)

- The proposed enclosure feels like a fortress and fails to provide any sense of scale or human intimacy.
- Connections are poor in all directions, particularly towards the West and Battery Park City and the World Financial Center.

United Architects

- Connections are poor and the proposed plan does not provide for adequate circulation or any restoration of the street grid.
- The proposed buildings are much too massive and create a cacophony of forms, which is overwhelming both on the skyline and from the ground below.
- “City in the Sky” concept is unattractive and the location of open space on upper floors is impractical. There are significant concerns about the usefulness of this space and limited public access to these areas, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: There should be ongoing and continued community involvement and input, and LMDC and Port Authority should seek CB1’s review at all stages of planning and development for the WTC site and Lower Manhattan.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 - MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: JANUARY 21, 2003

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: WTC REDEVELOPMENT

BOARD VOTE: 28 In Favor 1 Opposed 6 Abstained 1 Recused

RE: Memorial Mission Statement and Program

WHEREAS: A Draft Memorial Mission Statement and Memorial Program prepared by a diverse group of people including family members, art and architectural professionals, businesspeople, community leaders and local residents was released by the Lower Manhattan Development Corporation for public review, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: CB #1 whole-heartedly supports the Draft Memorial Mission Statement and Memorial Program and makes the following comments:

- Any placement of human remains at the WTC site remains a sensitive one for Lower Manhattan residents, many of whom are themselves survivors of the attacks. If a “final resting-place” for unidentified remains is to be included as part of the memorial, it should be discrete and located in a manner that respects the sensitivities of Lower Manhattan residents and workers while serving the memorial needs of victims’ family members and the public at large. In the spectrum of possible concepts, a “final resting-place” should tend in the symbolic direction of a “tomb of the unknown” and away from the literal sense of a “cemetery.”
- Use the word “sacred” carefully to avoid religious connotations and ensure that any reference is non-denominational, and

BE IT
FURTHER
RESOLVED

THAT: There should be ongoing and continued community involvement and input, and LMDC and the Port Authority should seek CB1’s review at all stages of planning and development for the WTC site and Lower Manhattan.