

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: AUGUST 24, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 5 In Favor 2 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE: 1 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 22 Barclay Street, application for modifications to construct a barrier-free access lift with air conditioning

WHEREAS: This application is to add an ADA access lift buy using the ceremonial gates on Barclay Street, and

WHEREAS: The design would enhance the view of the Baptistry at the end of the path, and

WHEREAS: The glass and aluminum elevator would be concealed in a small limestone and granite clad classical designed temple, and

WHEREAS: The Committee felt that the use of granite was overly complicated and recommended using limestone through out the temple – which was accepted by the applicant, and

WHEREAS: Two members of the Committee felt the addition retracted from the main building, and

WHEREAS: AC would be added to the main sanctuary which would be concealed in the wooden ceiling, portico and attic with metal stamped vents and linear diffusers the whole length of the church, using the existing two 10-ton compressors, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application, with the noted modification.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: AUGUST 24, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 8 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE: 1 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 78 Leonard Street application to install a new storefront

WHEREAS: The applicant failed to attend the meeting after having agreed with the District Manager and the Committee Chair to attend the meeting, and

WHEREAS: The District Manager, Board Office and Committee Chair had each spoken with LPC as to why they would not ask the applicant to present to the Community before the application was considered by the Commission, and approved on August 8, there was no clear reason for not following this long established procedure – other than the applicant had expressed concern over any delay in the project, and

WHEREAS: The District Manager and Committee Chair had spoken with the architect from Richard Meier’s office and been told that they did not want a delay as an opening party had been booked for the new store, it was explained to the applicant that this was not a sufficient good reason to not follow procedures and get community input, and

WHEREAS: The Committee reviewed the faxed plans – noting the use of full height clear glass and thin aluminum transoms between the cast iron columns – which the Committee thought was awful and totally out of context with the Historic District, and

WHEREAS: The Committee would hold final judgment until the applicant made his presentation to the September meeting, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 urges that the Landmarks Preservation Commission follow the usual, customary and expected procedures allowing the Community Board to comment on applications before they are presented to the Commission.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: AUGUST 24, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE: 1 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 105 Franklin Street, application for a penthouse rooftop addition

WHEREAS: This application seeks to amend an already approved application the committee approved on December 20, 2005 which was supported by LPC, and

WHEREAS: The amendment now is to provide an internal add a single storey roof top addition and raise the approved bulkhead by 2'3" and straighten the original sloping parapit wall to accommodate the addition, and

WHEREAS: The roof top addition would be set back 20' and minimally visible from West Broadway and Church Street and the rear from White and Church Street, and

WHEREAS: The addition would be made of stucco and aluminum and clear glass windows and increases the FAR from 4.57 to 4.92, and

WHEREAS: The parapit wall would be made of red bricks to match the existing, and

WHEREAS: The font elevation of the building would be restored, and

WHEREAS: The Committee asked if the recommendation it made in its December 2005 resolution to remove the external lights had been incorporated – the applicant confirmed it had been followed, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD #1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: AUGUST 24, 2006

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS

COMMITTEE VOTE: 7 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused
PUBLIC VOTE: 1 In Favor 0 Opposed 0 Abstained 0 Recused

RE: 300 Canal Street, application to replace windows on the Canal Street
façade, re-stucco and re-paint façade, replace a storefront on Canal Street
and replace a storefront on Lispenard Street

WHEREAS: This cast-iron building in the Tribeca East Historic District is between
Church Street and Broadway, and runs through the block to Lispenard
Street, with façades on both Canal and Lispenard Streets, and

WHEREAS: The applicant's representatives – an architect and contractor – discussed
issues regarding window replacement, stuccoing and storefront
modifications, but were unable to articulate whether their presentation was
to legalize work done previously or to request approval for future work,
and what the exact nature this work is or will be, and

WHEREAS: The applicant's representatives agreed to have this matter held over until
they could return to the Community Board with a complete and coherent
description of the proposal, now

THEREFORE
BE IT
RESOLVED

THAT: Community Board #1 asks the Landmarks Preservation Commission to
hold over this application.