

The Real Estate Board of New York, Inc.

REAL ESTATE BOARD BUILDING • 12 EAST 41ST STREET



NEW YORK 17, N. Y. • TELEPHONE LEXINGTON 2-3100

STATEMENT OF THE REAL ESTATE BOARD OF NEW YORK, INC.
PRESENTED BY JOHN R. O'DONOGHUE, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,
OWNERS DIVISION, AT PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE
LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION, DECEMBER 9, 1965

With respect to

Proposed Designation of
Greenwich Village Area
as Historic District
(LP-0100)

The Real Estate Board of New York, Inc., is opposed to the designation as an historic district of the area in Greenwich Village described in the notice of this public hearing.

It is our opinion that the area described is not a proper one for designation under the definition of "historic district" as set forth in Section 207-1.0 h. That provision says that the improvements in the area must "(a) have a special character or special historical or aesthetic interest or value; and (b) represent one or more periods or styles of architecture typical of one or more eras in the history of the city; (c) cause such area, by reason of such factors, to constitute a distinct section of the city; * * * *".

In other words, a mere geographical encirclement of a segment of land, as is shown in the description being considered here, is not in accord with the wording and intent of the Landmarks Preservation Law. In order for the description to be eligible for designation as an historic district, it should be limited to a group of contiguous houses specifically described by number and street location.

Buildings in the very large area here proposed to be designated include all types of structures, both commercial and residential, which, taken together,

XERO COPY XERO COPY XERO COPY

could not by any stretch of the imagination be considered as having a "special character or special historical or aesthetic interest or value."

Approval of this proposal would result in an unreasonable restriction of the right of the property owners involved to dispose of their property and a devastating blow to normal and progressive development of this area. We do not believe that any such intent was present in the minds of the framers of this law and we strongly urge that this proposal be defeated.