

AD

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

REVIEW SESSION

JUNE 30, 2003

ATTENDANCE:

CHAIR BURDEN	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER KNUCKLES	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER BATTAGLIA	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER CANTOR	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER CAVALUZZI	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER EADDY	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER GARVIN	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER GOL	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER KUI	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER MEROLO	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER PHILLIPS	PRESENT
CHAIRMAN ROSE	ABSENT
COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS	PRESENT

RE: 2 Columbus Circle-C 030392 PPM

SPEAKER: The last vote on Wednesday is the disposition of 2 Columbus Circle.

CHAIR BURDEN: I want to thank Angela Cavaluzzi for all the comments she had on this (inaudible). Some of the consideration (inaudible) restricted to museum use and (inaudible) we make sure because there will be at least two years, or maybe more years, that it's going to be under construction (inaudible) waiting for the applicant (inaudible) Museum or Arts and Design to raise the funds and so that they will treat in an aesthetic way. It's very important to (inaudible) the Circle.

I think those are the main issues.

SPEAKER: Protection of the --

CHAIR BURDEN: And protection of the (inaudible) so that water damage -- more water damage occur.

SPEAKER: (inaudible) upon or approvals they don't plan to go directly to construction, they need a fund raising --

CHAIR BURDEN: (inaudible) capital campaign, but it was difficult for them to do a capital campaign until the disposition had taken place.

SPEAKER: (inaudible) museum, it's specific to that?

CHAIR BURDEN: Yes.

SPEAKER: To that museum --

CHAIR BURDEN: Well --

SPEAKER: But if they, for any reason, chose not to do it, would it have to come back to us?

CHAIR BURDEN: If it were going to go -- I guess the EDC could dispose to it to another museum.

SPEAKER: Which may or may not chose to alter the exterior in a different manner.

CHAIR BURDEN: Then it would have to come back to us.

SPEAKER: Is that clear?

CHAIR BURDEN: Yes, because (inaudible).

SPEAKER: (inaudible) both the applicant and the aesthetics.

CHAIR BURDEN: Yes. They're supposed to comply with the drawings that were shown.

Then I will say that I know some commissioners, Dolly was concerned and Karen concerned, about whether -- do you want to

express any of your concerns.

SPEAKER: Yes. I think that the question regarding the process by Landmarks to do -- that was to me circumvented because I thought all these people, and I really felt, from what I heard, and I listened to the whole thing and I actually went there yesterday about 6:00 and I went all around the building and I parked across the street and I sat by the (inaudible) and I looked on at the building, and I actually walked around it and I looked at all those beautiful arches and I looked at them on the top, and the concern that the building was in such disrepair, the facade of the (inaudible), didn't really hit me. I just -- I'm not happy with -- I asked Laurie, you know, what happened, why wasn't this building actually slated as a, you know, put before the Commission to be designated as a landmark. And she said it was. Jennifer (inaudible) the commission did that. And it's a little how come we did not get any of the (inaudible) regarding the minutes on that, of that meeting.

You don't know what happened. It seemed like something was (inaudible) and it was -- the due

process did not take place, in my opinion. And I'm a little bit --

CHAIR BURDEN: Here's the thing, I don't know what in Landmarks and why they decided that it isn't qualified as a landmark. Personally, (inaudible) Laurie (inaudible) because I actually love the building, I think it's a great building and I think it's actually (inaudible). However, I actually wanted anybody to go through it (inaudible) gone through it because what's happened is that the facade, all of the fittings that hold it, have rotted so the facade actually has to be taken off. But if you go through the building you'll see that whatever the footprint is, which I forget what it is exactly, but you can only use half of it. It's such a slender -- it's almost impossible to use as a museum and it's unbelievably dark. And going through the building was so -- such a stunning experience for me, it totally transformed what I felt was the right thing to do for the building in this location. So actually that's why I urged Laurie to take anybody through who hasn't seen it because it completely changed my mind about

what should happen to that building. So that's why I urged you to -- all of you to go through it because -- Richard.

COMMISSIONER EADDY: If I understand correctly, nothing we're doing precludes Landmarks from, at any point in the future (inaudible) particularly under further consideration. I understand --

CHAIR BURDEN: I think if it's totally changed, then you can't --

COMMISSIONER EADDY: That's what I'm saying, but I'm saying up until that point, that debate can still go on and they still have the opportunity to hold a hearing and do whatever they feel is required and necessary.

CHAIR BURDEN: That is a totally and --

SPEAKER: Our actions do not preclude --

CHAIR BURDEN: Is that correct (inaudible)?

SPEAKER: Sure, I understand.

SPEAKER: What in effect Landmarks actively decides not to landmark (inaudible).

CHAIR BURDEN: Yes.

SPEAKER: Yes. But it can --

SPEAKER: This wasn't something that slipped through the cracks and they decided in their judgement this was not a landmark building.

CHAIR BURDEN: That's right.

SPEAKER: Right.

CHAIR BURDEN: They did not hold a hearing which is what everybody was --

SPEAKER: Yes.

CHAIR BURDEN: They felt that they should -- not that the hearing would have made that, you know, there was no vote or whatever, but they could have held a hearing, but they didn't. I think it's a step that they have to take in order to hold a hearing that it's -- do you know what it is, Douglas? I don't know. They don't hold a hearing a building they don't think is worthy of landmarking.

SPEAKER: Right. It went to the committee first and the committee recommends buildings it thinks are worthy of landmarking and it didn't get past the committee.

CHAIR BURDEN: So if you don't -- if they don't think something is worthy of

landmarking, they do not hold a hearing.

SPEAKER: Correct.

CHAIR BURDEN: So it has to pass and that's what they decided and that is their expertise. Angela.

COMMISSIONER CAVALUZZI: Well, after reviewing the building too, I think one of the -- the big concerns is the flexibility and the issue is one of the things that makes the building interesting is also one of its problems, it doesn't have any windows. And I think that the fact that they are taking the design and creating some of the same monumental techniques with the wall and, unfortunately, they didn't really show the full design at the hearing, but taking the monolithic white type of wall and then having it penetrated at the bottom and then at the top, is a very similar thing. From a distance it still will have some of the very similar elements that it has now and it's being done in a very artful way. So I think that's one of the things that -- sometimes you're not necessarily landmarking the building as much as landmarking some of the elements. And I think that's one thing the

City has done by, first of all, keeping a building of that shape and height as well as the same materials and the same of elements along the bottom and the top, although I talked to Amanda about looking more at the top because I do feel like one of the things that's missing from the design they have now is a real penetration at the top, that dark loggia feeling is something that's a little missing. But I think that's something that if they work on that, you still get a feeling of the intent of that original building from the new design and I think that's what's important. And I think also that maintaining the building until it goes under construction is very important because there is the possibility that they don't go forward. At some point the Landmarks may see it is worthy, that that could continue and we just make sure that the building doesn't deteriorate to the point of having to be torn down. And I think that's one of the issues right now that we have, you know, it's City-owned, but the City does not have the money to be maintaining this building in its derelict state.

So that's sort of my concern.

SPEAKER: As I was sitting here yesterday, appearing in my mind's eye the new building that was presented to us, (inaudible) the model of the new building, and this building that existed here, and I am listening to Angela and, you know, trying to see how they look -- it's similar, but it's a different building, you know, architecturally and I'm pretty good at looking --

COMMISSIONER CAVALUZZI: Well, I hope for the better, really in terms of the windows and the openings because I think, you know, before people saw it as being torn down, I think a lot of people had issues with the windowless building. We have several windowless buildings related to telephone buildings and other things, and that was the big issue. And I think one of the things that someone said, which also is something to take into account, that building was for paintings and now it's going to be for three-dimensional art and sculpture.

CHAIR BURDEN: Natural light.

COMMISSIONER CAVALUZZI: It's natural

light. And also, I failed to mention, I was just reading this huge article about daylighting and the whole emphasis on daylighting and the trend to go into natural daylight where they've actually discovered with the new materials, that it saves on energy cost to, you know, daylight these building naturally and that more buildings and the whole trend is to go to more clear stories and skylights because they now have the baffling and louvers and material, which building this will have, to actually save on a tremendous amount of energy.

So you'll see many more buildings with curtain walls, with baffles and that kind of thing. So I just think that's the issue with Landmarks, I think it's very, like Amanda says, very nice building, but I think, unfortunately, because it was so specific to be used that it was created for, there isn't a lot of flexibility as it stands.

CHAIR BURDEN: Still worth going through.

SPEAKER: Wednesday, on the 23rd, a lot of agency initiatives, Morrisiana rezoning and Bridge Plaza rezoning and there will be

several actions related to the expansion to the Marriott Hotel in Brooklyn, West Harlem Environment and (inaudible) Center on West 140th Street, a special permit to allow the bank on Fifth Avenue and 37th Street, and the North Corona rezoning:

CHAIR BURDEN: How many actual hearings, five or six?

SPEAKER: Wednesday?

CHAIR BURDEN: Yes.

SPEAKER: People plan for --

SPEAKER: I guess you have four, five items. Columbus Circle five items. Anything with a lot of testimony?

SPEAKER: Four items.

SPEAKER: I think we're anticipating to come back on the Bronx Museum to the (inaudible) building. (inaudible) has a few neighborhood people on the North Corona rebuilding.

CHAIR BURDEN: (inaudible).

SPEAKER: James has indicated --

CHAIR BURDEN: Great Kills.

SPEAKER: And Great Kills we should have several residents, but (inaudible).

CHAIR BURDEN: 1:00. Okay? That's
it. Meeting adjourned.