



The City of New York
Manhattan Community Board 1

Tammy Meltzer CHAIRPERSON | **Lucian Reynolds** DISTRICT MANAGER

**Comment on the 250 Water Street Draft Scope of Work
for an Environmental Impact Statement (CEQR No. 21DCP084M)
Monday, January 11, 2021**

250 Seaport District, LLC has proposed to construct an approximately 912,762 gross square foot (GSF) mixed-use building containing market-rate and affordable housing, retail, office, and community facility spaces as well as parking at 250 Water Street in the Historic South Street Seaport within Manhattan Community District 1 (CD1). Through the proposed project, the applicant also seeks to facilitate the restoration, reopening, and potential expansion of the South Street Seaport Museum.

Community Board 1 (CB1) has had a long history of involvement and advocacy in relation to 250 Water Street. After years of unsuccessful efforts by developers to gain approval of a high-rise building at 250 Water Street, CB1 led a successful effort in 2003 to rezone the Historic South Street Seaport to C6-2A with a maximum height of 120 feet. Additionally, CB1 has been managing the independent community environmental consultant in the review and oversight of Brownfield Cleanup Project (BCP) currently taking place at 250 Water Street. Most recently, in December 2020 CB1 adopted two resolutions issuing recommendations on the applications currently before the Landmarks Preservation Commission in relation to this proposed project (see attached).

There is an overarching critical concern that while the environmental review process evaluates impact criteria according to various CEQR requirements and thresholds, these criteria often do not accurately capture and reflect the real, qualitative impacts to the community. As such, CB1 urges that the recommendations as outlined below are taken into consideration during the updating of this scope so that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) may more accurately reflect true community impact. All sources for data included in the DEIS must be provided to the community and only the most recent available data should be used for all review categories. All data should include citations. Finally, it is crucial that all CEQR technical analysis areas be studied for their potential impacts. Finally, the Draft Scope of Work (DSOW) states that three areas do not require further analysis in the DEIS based on the guidance of the CEQR Technical Manual including: community facilities, solid waste and sanitation services, and energy. It is absolutely crucial that all of these areas of study be included in the DEIS. This is a major high-density project and no area of study should be omitted.

Socio Economic Conditions

The DSOW is weak in relation to potential impacts of a 5-year construction plan on the approx. 1,000 children attending schools next to the site. Elementary public school families have no choice but to send their children to zoned schools. There is inherent inequity for those without means who cannot afford to send their children elsewhere.

Land Use, Zoning and Public Policy

Currently in the ULURP process is the Zoning for Coastal Flood Resiliency (ZCFR) citywide zoning text amendment application. As the project area falls within the catchment area for ZCFR, the DEIS must include analysis of a scenario assuming that the ZCFR zoning text amendment is adopted. This should

include additional shadow, light and air impacts from potential increased height or bulk at 250 Water Street as well as how the zoning will impact the urban design.

Open Space

There is minimal but critically needed existing open space on the East side of CD1, particularly given the exponential growth in the residential population of this area in recent years with many new families and children. The project will introduce many new residents and visitors, putting further strain on nearby open spaces which are already in high demand and short supply. Both active and passive open spaces are critical resources in this area and the open space impacts must be closely studied as part of the DEIS. The open space analysis should include the direct and indirect effects during and post construction on all playgrounds and rooftop play yards and playstreets at all neighborhood public and private schools, all public open areas, including Peck Slip plaza, the Brooklyn Bridge Promenade, Titanic Memorial Park, Fishbridge Park Garden, Pier 17 plaza, public spaces at Saint Margaret's House, and neighborhood privately owned public spaces.

Shadows

Shadow assessments must be studied comprehensively as part of the DEIS, including impacts on all open areas noted above (see above Open Space), specifically at the Pearl Street Playground, the tree canopies along Pearl Street, Delury Square Park, Peck Slip School roof playground, Blue School, and impacts on nearby residential low-scale buildings. The impact of shadows on neighborhood schools is critical to assure the wellbeing of the many school aged children who are in schools directly adjacent to the site.

Historic and Cultural Resources

Given the historic nature of the study area, a particularly thorough Historic and Cultural Resources Assessment is needed as part of the DEIS. The community has expressed many concerns about the impacts the massive construction will have on the Historic South Street Seaport including: impacts on the fragile historic buildings immediately abutting the site and beyond, and how the intensity of pile driving will impact nearby historical buildings and their fragile foundations. As the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) has determined there is potential for significant archaeological resources to be located on the development sites, a plan must be provided that indicates how the Brownfield Cleanup Program (BCP) Remedial Investigation work will be done as to not affect the archeological work and potential findings.

Urban Design and Visual Resources

The proposed 912,762 square foot project comprises approximately 10% of the Historic South Street Seaport District. This project will have immense impact on the urban design and visual resources of this area. This historic area is of national importance and this analysis must be carefully scrutinized in the DEIS. Concerns have been raised throughout the community that the proposed development would confuse historic district identity with development that is not contextually appropriate. Further, particular concerns have been raised regarding disruption of views this project would create including, but not limited to, views of the South Street Seaport Historic District, and from the iconic and historically landmarked Brooklyn Bridge. These scenic vistas are a key element of the Historic South Street Seaport.

Natural Resources

DEIS natural resources and water quality assessments should thoroughly assess how the proposed project and its construction would impact the water quality and habitat of the project site and study area, as well as the East River and surrounding area. Concerns include disruption of existing water lots through construction activities; operational impacts of the proposed project including shading of aquatic habitat and any discharge of stormwater from the project site; direct or indirect impacts on terrestrial resources

due to the removal of existing structures and landscaping or introduction of new landscaping features; and the potential effects to birds due to building collisions.

Hazardous Materials

The community is concerned that very little information on the BCP was included in the DSOW. This deserves more attention as 250 Water Street was once the site of a thermometer factor and hazardous substances, such as mercury, have been detected in the soil. This, and the fact that there are many sensitive sites around 250 Water Street, resulted in an unprecedented level of community involvement and oversight in the BCP process. Many from the community have expressed that it feels premature to move forward with the Environmental Review and ULURP processes until more information is available on toxicity of the site and the BCP remediation plan. The DEIS must fully evaluate data and implications from the 250 Water Street BCP. There is a particular risk of potential exposure during excavation and construction while many are confined to their homes during the pandemic.

Water and Sewer Infrastructure

There are concerns that the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) serving this site through the Newtown Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant is over capacity already. There are also concerns that there will be a cumulative impact on infrastructure resources and city services generally with the proposed project, in addition to the impacts posed by the Two Bridges development. Concerns also have been noted about the existing high level of the water table and the redirection of water to surrounding properties at times of flooding and as a natural occurrence due to sea level rise.

There are many concerns over flood risk in this area, especially in the absence of resiliency infrastructure plans. Specifically, questions have been raised over whether the development would cause redirection of water to surrounding properties during flooding. As the applicant is proposing sub-grade parking facilities to accommodate parking for 128 vehicles, the DEIS should study the potential of using this space for stormwater management. The DEIS should address what flood mitigation measures will be taken to protect the site while excavation/construction is in progress.

Transportation

There has been past dialogue and conversation with the applicant about potentially changing traffic patterns around the building based on applications that they may file in the future. The DEIS should study the impact of any future changes to traffic patterns based on future plans or applications (i.e. the closure of Peck Slip which has previously been presented). The DEIS must also clearly demonstrate that the impact of the proposed development's increase in ridership will not result in transportation infrastructure overcrowding and maintenance issues. The DEIS must include an analysis of emergency evacuation measures from the proposed project sites as well as a quantified assessment of vehicular traffic both during construction and after the proposed project is completed.

Air Quality

The impact to air quality should be analyzed for the development during the construction phase as well as for the finished development. Additionally, the impact to air quality should include the impact of the BCP remediation on the site as well as a quantified assessment of vehicular traffic during construction and a quantified assessment of increased vehicular traffic with the proposed development post-construction. All safety thresholds for air quality should be based on the most recently published data that are relevant specifically to sensitive receptors: infants, pregnant women, pre-school and elementary school children, the elderly, who are all part of the surrounding community to 250 Water Street. An analysis also needs to be included in the context of COVID-19 as work may begin before we are fully out of this pandemic. Schools are currently required to have windows open during the school day. The DEIS must include how

air quality on the construction site will impact Peck Slip and Blue Schools when classrooms have open windows and doors.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

The community has stated concerns over the carbon footprint that this development will create. CB1 urges that the DEIS identify the building's specific mechanical, plumbing and electrical systems, and a list of materials that assure the community that the development will in fact incorporate the latest sustainability features and approach carbon neutrality. CB1 also asks that the applicant provides alternatives that indicate how this building could use technologies like Passive House to achieve sustainability on behalf of the community. In a general sense, concerns have been raised that while the proposed project is in an area well-served by public transportation, infrastructure for private car ownership is being incorporated into the 250 Water Street building. Providing such infrastructure is inconsistent with overall sustainability goals.

The 250 Water Street site is in the 1% annual chance flood plain. The DEIS must include a detailed analysis of the resiliency measures, including details and a list of materials that will be used for the ground floor and sub-grade parking, as well as details of the flood prevention system. CB1 urges that the DEIS contemplate changes to the design that will enable the inclusion of a storm water management system in the basement level of the building (where the parking is located.)

Energy

The DEIS must include an energy analysis and, at a minimum, provide the projected amount of energy consumption of the project during long term operation. The EAS notes that "design features and operational measures to reduce energy use... will be discussed and quantified to the extent that information is available." The DEIS must also include all relevant information including a list of all building systems and materials intended to be used.

Noise

All safety thresholds for noise should be based on the most recently published data that are relevant specifically to sensitive receptors: infants, pregnant women, pre-school and elementary school children, the elderly, who are all part of the surrounding community to 250 Water Street. The impact of noise should include the impact of the BCP remediation on the site. The impact of noise should be quantified for the development, during the construction phase, and for the finished development. Finally, an analysis must be performed in the context of COVID-19 as work may begin before we are fully out of this pandemic. Schools are currently required to have windows open during the school day. How will noise on the construction site impact Peck Slip and Blue School when classrooms have open windows and doors?

Public Health

The DEIS must study the particular impact on public health the construction and project itself will have in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic. Most residents are confined to their homes during this time and light, air and open space are desperately needed to remain healthy and provide respite.

Given the proximity of sensitive receptors to this project, the public health study requires a serious, comprehensive, quantitative analysis of the impact this project will have on infants, pregnant women, toddlers, elementary schoolchildren, senior citizens. Any public health assessment should acknowledge that sensitive receptors are more profoundly affected by much smaller amounts of air and noise pollution and that these can have long-term irreversible impacts on their health, both mentally and physically. The DEIS should consider and quantify the potential for children to be displaced from their schools or, at minimum, should measure and quantify the impact to children of major disruptions in their learning

environments, as a result of construction and the behavioral, psychological and social impacts this will have on their health.

Neighborhood Character

There is tremendous concern over this project's impact on neighborhood character, and thus it must be studied carefully as part of the DEIS. Many in the community have expressed concern that the proposed scale, size, mass and volume of the proposed development at 250 Water Street would dominate and overwhelm the neighboring buildings in this low-scale district. Further, that the size of the development would cause an abrupt change in scale within the district, disrupting the district's harmonious, low-scale quality. Finally, the design of the proposed development, which is located at the western boundary of the district, would relate more closely in scale and massing to the buildings outside the historic district rather than to those within, thus visually confusing the clear boundary of the district. These mainly qualitative impacts are difficult to capture in a technical evaluation such as a DEIS, but the environmental review must comprehensively study impact on neighborhood character so that impacts are fully realized and mitigated.

Construction

The DEIS must include and specifically address the project's impact on children and on senior citizens in the immediate area.

Children/schools

Research has shown that noise has negative impacts on children's performance at school (reduced memory, motivation, reading ability, etc.) Children also depend on the open air rooftop spaces to get essential physical activity during school days, as well as open windows for fresh air circulation during the pandemic. Construction may begin during the same time that children finally return to some semblance of normalcy by returning back to school in-person. Many children are already behind and have experienced significant stress and negative impacts during the pandemic. This would only be exacerbated by further disruption and negative impacts. This must be acknowledged as part of the study in the DEIS. Pile driving noise and impact during construction in particular is very impactful and bad for children in school.

There are already instances within our community where extensive measures were taken to mitigate such negative impacts but were not effective. When the Whole Foods building was being built next to PS 234, a wall was built around PS 234. However, it was still very noisy and resulted in the unintended blocking of light, casting the school in darkness. Additionally, the pile driving vibrations shook the whole block. When the 200 West Street Goldman Sachs was being constructed, glass fell on the neighboring ballfields while children were on the field. This resulted in the Goldman Sachs building being boxed off as it was being topped off. Finally, the 8 Spruce Street Gehry Building had panels of glass fall off during construction and left gouges in the ground over space where children would be walking into school. Given these examples, the community has a high level of anxiety related to construction mitigation. Impacts must be studied exhaustively, and mitigation measures must be thoughtfully considered with opportunities to reevaluate if necessary.

Seniors

Saint Margaret's House is nearby 250 Water Street and houses approximately 250 seniors. Southbridge Towers houses many seniors as well. The DEIS must incorporate specific study on the impact of construction and the project itself would have on the health and lives of seniors. For instance, how will seniors navigate around construction and traffic? Studies done related to the Borough Based Jails/Manhattan Detention Complex project have illustrated that the impacts of dust and noise can be life threatening for the vulnerable. Specific mitigation measures for the protection of seniors must be incorporated.

Alternatives

CBI asks that the DEIS evaluate alternative scenarios including technologies which include: the location of a storm water retention tank in the basement of the building; carbon neutral construction and Passive House construction. These technologies would significantly reduce the potential impact of the proposed project on energy consumption and the anticipated impacts of sea level rise and storm flooding at the site.

Solid Waste and Sanitation Services

This analysis has not been included in the DSOW. Solid waste and service demand generated by the project must be disclosed in the DEIS. The proposal's sanitation and recycling plans must be provided in order to proceed with an accurate environmental assessment of this aspect of the project. CD1 has seen many similar high-density developments that result in significant negative impact due to the amount of waste they produce. Garbage and recycling takes over nearby narrow sidewalks, forcing pedestrians to walk in the street and creating a hazard to the public.

Community Facilities and Services

It appears that the EAS does not accurately report potential indirect effects on child care centers, libraries, public schools, health care facilities and fire and police protection. This major development will bring a significant number of new residents and visitors to the area, putting additional strain on these types of facilities. Thus, Community Facilities must be included and thoroughly evaluated in the DEIS.

Additional Comments

With the City facing dire financial straits for years to come, the cost of additional mitigations, inspections or traffic agents, environmental reviews, etc as it relates to this project should be taken on by the applicant and not the City.

COMMUNITY BOARD 1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 22, 2020

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS & PRESERVATION

COMMITTEE VOTE:	7 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Rescued
PUBLIC VOTE:	0 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Rescued
BOARD VOTE:	35 In Favor	0 Opposed	2 Abstained	0 Rescued

RE: 250 Water Street, LPC-21-03235, application to construct a new building on the 250 Water Street parking lot

WHEREAS: Applications have been presented simultaneously for two different properties, but we are addressing separately, and it is our understanding that the Landmarks Preservation Commission is doing so as well; and

WHEREAS: Regarding 250 Water Street, the proposal calls for the construction within the South Street Historic District of two towers, each standing 470 feet high, and each with 37 stories, for a combined total of 757,400 zoning square feet; and

WHEREAS: The South Street Seaport Historic District was designated in 1977, the first in Lower Manhattan. It is a small 11-block district “consisting primarily of small scale brick buildings which contrast dramatically with the soaring skyscrapers nearby” according to the LPC designation report. Many of the structures are dated from the 18th century. The average-sized building in this historic district is 4-5 stories in height; and

WHEREAS: LPC rejected nine proposed buildings over a roughly 25-year period for 250 Water St and used very similar language in these rejections indicating that “the proposed scale, size, mass and volume of the high rise building would dominate and overwhelm the neighboring buildings in this low scale district, thus visually confusing the clear boundary of the district”; and

WHEREAS: LPC’s clear and unambiguous precedent for a quarter of a century regarding this site has remained consistent in directive and language; and

WHEREAS: If the current application is approved in its current form or modified form, then we would ask that LPC be transparent and explain the political considerations that must have occurred for it to reverse decades of its own stated parameters; and

WHEREAS: The National Trust for Historic Preservation listed the South Street Seaport as one of the 11 Most Endangered Historic Places in 2015 due to the threat of inappropriate and out-of-scale development in this modest and deeply historic

New York City neighborhood. The Seaport's restored 19th-century commercial buildings are a unique environment in Manhattan, significant for its continuous relationship to the waterfront and its status as the focal point of the early maritime industry in New York City; and

WHEREAS: It has always been the stated LPC directive to communities that there are no "transitional" blocks, only designated landmarked buildings and non-designated buildings and districts. The Howard Hughes Corporation is asking for 250 Water Street to be considered a "transitional" district, an argument that LPC has rejected here and all over the city, in principle and in law. Anything regarding the appropriateness of this application must be judged in the context of the historic district in which it is located, not in regard to the vast city beyond. For example, in 1986 LPC wrote "that the size of the thirty story tower would cause an abrupt change in scale within the district, disrupting the district's homogeneous, low-scale quality; that the design of the proposed thirty story tower, which is located at the western boundary of the district, would relate more closely in scale and massing to the buildings outside the historic district rather than those within, thus visually confusing the clear boundary of the district"; and

WHEREAS: In 1991 LPC did approve at 250 Water St an eleven-story office building. The developer/owner of the site, Milstein Properties, chose NOT to build this building and continued trying to gain approval for taller buildings rejected by LPC. So it remains a parking lot because the owner refused to abide by the development limits that do come with being in a historic district; and

WHEREAS: After years of these unsuccessful efforts to gain approval of a high-rise building at 250 Water Street, CB1 led a successful effort in 2003 to rezone the Seaport Historic District to C6-2A with a maximum height of 120 feet with unanimous city councilmember support. This rezoning had the support of local elected officials, the Downtown Alliance, the South Street Seaport Museum, the Municipal Arts Society, Seaman's Church Institute and local developers including Frank Sciame who restored 11 buildings on Front Street keeping them well below 120 feet in height; and

WHEREAS: Other developers in the Seaport Historic District and in historic districts throughout CB1 and the City have constructed buildings that comply with LPC guidelines and are economically profitable; and

WHEREAS: CB1 has no particular love for a parking lot. It has consistently said that it welcomes a new building at 250 Water Street that is within LPC and zoning guidelines, longstanding and carefully defined guidelines; and

WHEREAS: Manhattan Community Board 1 has received a petition with over 6,500 signatories and counting opposing the application; and

WHEREAS: If the Howard Hughes Corporation is allowed to transfer air rights to the site and construct a building over 120 feet, it would negate this hard fought and correct action to preserve the unique character of the South Street Seaport Historic District; and

WHEREAS: The proposal before the Community Board and LPC would, in essence, reduce the size of the Seaport Historic District by 10% which is totally unacceptable; and

WHEREAS: The Seaport Historic District development rights zoning transfer mechanism was established specifically so that unused development rights could be transferred to sites *outside* the historic district in order to preserve the area's low-scale character. CB1 and the community strongly urge the City and EDC to work with us to preserve this successful formula and expand the number of "receiving sites" outside of the historic district to sell these air rights. In addition, the funds raised by selling these air rights should be used to help the Seaport Museum, to build additional affordable housing in CB1 and for other needed local amenities; and

WHEREAS: 250 Water Street is currently in use as a parking lot. The applicant suggests that this use does not currently serve a historic district, describing 250 Water Street as an "edge location," "vacant for decades," and a "large full block." The presentation prepared for LPC and the Community Board detailing the proposal includes photos of the surrounding context with views of Beekman Street, Pearl Street/Southbridge Towers, Water Street, and PS 343 Peck Slip. While the Beekman Street and Southbridge Towers views include large towers, these buildings are located *outside* of the Seaport Historic District. The applicant also focuses on both applications as one development proposal, indicating that the development rights transfer and towers at 250 Water Street are necessary to preserve the Seaport Museum; and

WHEREAS: We also need to remind LPC that they are supposed to determine the appropriateness of a proposed new building without considering the amenity package that may accompany such a proposal. CB1 has chosen not to comment substantially on those elements of the HHC 250 Water Street proposal for that reason; and

WHEREAS: It goes without saying that the 1977 designation report included 250 Water Street in the historic district, and also noted the "small-scale brick buildings which contrast dramatically with the soaring skyscrapers nearby." Those nearby skyscrapers were not in the historic district, and for a good, obvious and explicit reason. The proposal to construct a "skyscraper" within the historic district is directly contrary to the designation report, which instead expects development that will complement the "early 19th-century character" of the district; and

WHEREAS: If there were ever a landmarks-busting proposal, it is this one; and

WHEREAS: Its relationship to the South Street Seaport Museum's ever-failing financial straits is irrelevant, and it turns out that there is no legal or otherwise guaranteed stipulation that 250 Water Street would "save" the South Street Seaport Museum, or even the proposed museum addition, presented as a corollary to this application, will ever be built; and

WHEREAS: As an addendum, the Water Street so-called "street wall" podium is actually 105 feet high even though local streetwall averages 76 feet, even though the tallest building in the entire district is only 100 feet. The design is a pastiche of the low historic buildings across the street; and

WHEREAS: The Community Board held a number of public hearings on the proposal, and all meetings were well attended by over 150 people, some for and some against; and

WHEREAS: CB1 is not anti-development - consider our work after 9/11 - but is not for poor development that rides rough-shot through the Landmarks and Zoning Laws; now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Two 470' tall buildings are self-evidently and completely out of scale and inappropriate in the South Street Seaport Historic District and should not be approved by LPC; and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: Given that LPC under four different Chairs rejected nine buildings proposed for this site, all smaller than the one before you now, we strongly believe that LPC must respect its own precedent; and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: There are better ways to help the Seaport Museum without destroying this historic district and the City should fully explore all potential solutions to generate funds for the museum; and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: We reject the implication in the Howard Hughes presentation that 250 Water Street included in this historic district since its designation, is anything but an integral part of the Historic District, as does the LPC historically. The Administrative Code empowers LPC to delineate a historic district boundary that embodies a "distinct section of the city". Reducing the South Street Seaport

Historic district by a de facto 10 percent with these towers is destructive to the fundamental principles of landmarks preservation; and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT:

CB1 urges that the Landmarks Preservation Commission **reject** this application.

COMMUNITY BOARD 1 – MANHATTAN
RESOLUTION

DATE: DECEMBER 22, 2020

COMMITTEE OF ORIGIN: LANDMARKS & PRESERVATION

COMMITTEE VOTE:	6 In Favor	1 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Rescued
PUBLIC VOTE:	0 In Favor	0 Opposed	0 Abstained	0 Rescued
BOARD VOTE:	23 In Favor	6 Opposed	6 Abstained	2 Rescued

RE: 173-69 John Street, LPC-21-04480, application to construct a new building for the South Street Seaport Museum and alterations to the existing Museum Buildings on Block 74

WHEREAS: The application proposes a new building contiguous with and a part of the South Street Seaport Museum, as well as substantial rehabilitation and restorative and functional alterations of the existing museum buildings; and

WHEREAS: The proposed work would be phased, as follows: Phase 1 will include renovation, restoration and reopening of the museum and galleries, followed by a Phase 2 plan which covers the museum expansion. Note that no contractual or legal assurance exists that the new building, at John and South Streets, will ever be built; and

WHEREAS: All of the work appurtenant to the existing buildings is thoughtful and without issue; and

WHEREAS: The John Street building would make a bold, distinctive statement, yet has been designed to work contextually, in a respect similar to the success of the Scholastic Building within the confines of the SoHo Cast Iron Historic District; and

WHEREAS: The architecture certainly succeeds in a way that Georgio Cavagliari's brutalist 1973 proposal and Beyer Blinder Belle's glass-on-glass 1998 proposal did not; and

WHEREAS: The copper cladding, gradually patinating to green, as well as the operable shutters, raised some concern but do coalesce into an exciting composition; and

WHEREAS: The recessed, pale, arched ground floor is jarring, and could use some refinement; and

WHEREAS: The new proposed entrance, something of a hinge feature between the new building and the old adjacent buildings, is meant to appear separate, but is in fact pedestrian, merely anodized metal and plate glass, like any average retail storefront, and needs to be reconsidered; now

THEREFORE

BE IT

RESOLVED

THAT: Manhattan Community Board 1 recommends that the Landmarks Preservation Commission approve the restoration of the existing museum buildings; and

BE IT

FURTHER

RESOLVED

THAT: LPC approve the new building, while working with the applicant to enhance the ground floor and to change the entrance infill.