CITY	COT	JNCII	_
CITY	OF	NEW	YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----X

May 22, 2012

Start: 10:00 a.m. Recess: 10:50 a.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

MARK S. WEPRIN Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Council Member Leroy G. Comrie, Jr. Council Member Daniel R. Gardodnick Council Member Vincent R. Ignizio Council Member Robert Jackson

Council Member Diana Reyna

Council Member Larry B. Seabrook

Council Member Albert Vann

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Frank Ruchala Associate Urban Planner and Designer Department of City Planning

Michael Semwelly Vice President, Investments (possibly) The Related Companies

Peter Mullan Vice President for Planning and Design Friends of the Highline

Marcie Kesner Urban Planner/Land Use counsel to Taconic Investment Partners Kramer, Levin, Naftalis & Frankel

Victor Santos General Manager/Co-Owner Mamajuana Café

2	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Great. Good
3	morning, everyone. My name is Mark Weprin, I am
4	the Chair of the Subcommittee on Zoning and
5	Franchises of the Land Use Committee. And I'd
6	like to welcome you all here today. I am joined
7	by the following members of the Committee:
8	Vincent Ignizio, Diana Reyna, Dan Garodnick, Al
9	Vannwho was here first, I might addRobert
10	Jackson, and Leroy Comrie.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: [off mic] I
12	was here last.
13	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Larry
14	Seabrook. Actually, Garodnick was here after you.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Oh, okay.
16	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Larry Seabrook
17	is here and in the building and here he comes into
18	the room. So, he is here as well. We're going to
19	start, we're going to skip the café, until later
20	in the agenda, and go right to the Land Use No.
21	604 and 605, which are related items. The Eastern
22	Rail Yards text amendment and the Highline text
23	amendment. And I'd like to have that panel come
24	up to the front of the room. And they're all

going to come together on both items here, I

2	believe. So that would be Michael Samuelin
3	[phonetic], right?, Frank Racalla [phonetic] and
4	Peter Mullan. I got all three, look at that,
5	okay. Gentlemen, if you could please make sure to
6	state your name for the record, I know you're
7	going to take 'em in reverse order, that's fine.
8	Just describe the application and we'll open it up

to questions afterwards. Thank you.

Members. My name is Frank Ruchala, I'm from the Department of City Planning. Today you'll be hearing two--testimony on text amendments for the Eastern Rail Yard, which is part of the special Hudson Yards District. The Hudson Yards District was approved in 2005 by the City Council, and the Eastern Rail Yard is one--[background comments] Really? Oh, okay, let me move it closer.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: And shhh, just keep the, keep the whisperings to a minimum, please.

FRANK RUCHALA: The Eastern Rail

Yard was the centerpiece of the Hudson Yards

proposal, with more than six million square feet

of mixed use development proposed for the site, in

addition to seven acres of public open space.
Since 2005, when Hudson Yards was approved,
thinking for the site plan of the Eastern Rail
Yards has changed significantly for the City.
This has included thoughts of how the Highline
would be integrated into the site plan, and for
related a series of additional other open space
ideas for the site. The two text amendments that
you hear today will deal with those, and look to
facilitate development on the site and improve the
site plan for the Eastern Rail Yard. So, I'm
going to speak about the Highline text amendment,
and then Michael will speak about the related text
amendment. So, just a little background on the
Highline. And you can see from the map. The
Highline today is developed as a public park from
Gansevoort Street all the way up to West 30th
Street, while the portion of the Highline north of
30th remains undeveloped today. And it's
currently owned by the CSX Rail Corporation. The
City intends to acquire this section of the
Highline, and turn it into a public park,
continuing the Highline all the way from
Gansevoort up to 34th Street. When provisions for

Hudson yards were placed in 2005, the future of
the Highline in this section was actually
uncertain. And so, techthe zoning for the
Eastern Rail Yards doesn't have any requirements
for the Highline. So, this text amendment would
correct this and facilitate the implementation of
the Highline on this site. So, I'll just kind of
go through how that would work. Zoning for the
Eastern Rail Yard contains a series of
requirements for public access areas on the site.
These include a series of actual listed spaces,
things like an outdoor plaza, the indoor
connections, things like that. But it also
contains a series of percentages of required space
on the rail yard. 55 percent of the site is
required to be publicly accessible area. The
proposed text would maintain those requirements,
but also require that the Highline on the Eastern
Rail Yard, shown on the first map, the ERY
Highline, be one of those required spaces.
Additionally, the 10th Avenue Spur, which is a
City owned portion of the Highline, would be
permitted to count for those requirements. To
meet the requirements for the site, the amended

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

text would include requirements for payment for rehabilitation work, landscape improvements, as well as funding for annual maintenance. amended text would also include timing obligations to ensure that the Highline be provided as part of the initial phase of development on the Eastern Rail Yard. Total payment for the rehabilitation and landscape improvement for the ERY Highlight is \$27.8 million. Additionally, the amendment would modify the heightened setback controls for the Eastern Rail Yard to accommodate the Highline. As said before, originally the text didn't have any, there wasn't, the Highline wasn't existing on the site, in the future, so this would modify that to accommodate it. The amendment would require that any portion of the Highline west of the curve be open to the sky, and no building be more than, closer than five feet to the Highline. And then for the portion east of the curve, the--a building could overhang the Highline subject to design controls including a minimum 60 feet height above, before the building could actually begin. amendment was approved, subject to conditions by the community board, and then unanimously approved

2.

let's--

by the Commission with some modifications based on
the community board's concerns in April. So
that's the Highline text amendment, and I don't
know if you want to do question on that or switch?
CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Could e do,
wait till the end and do questions? You think
they'rewould cause you problems? No. Okay,

FRANK RUCHALA: No, that's fine.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: --let's do 'em both, we can do questions together then. I think it's better that way.

MICHAEL SEMWELLY: Great, thank
you. Good morning, Council Members, my name is
Michael Semwelly [phonetic] and I'm with The
Related Companies. I'm here to talk about an
associated application for text amendments with
regard to the Eastern Rail Yard and in particular
the site planning of the yards. If you saw the
post this morning, it was a great article
describing the fact that we are about to start
construction on the first new office building in
Hudson Yards since the 2005 rezoning. We're very
thrilled to have that announcement, it's a huge,

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

billion dollar investment in New York, and we're proud to be a part of that; the anchor tenant of that being Coach, who's a longtime New York City company, and we're very pleased to have them as our first tenant on the yards. The 14 text amendments that are associated with the Eastern Rail Yards may seem complex but we've tried to bundle them into four key issues to focus on: interior open space, as Frank alluded to, there's a requirement for 55 percent of the eastern yards to be public open space, of which up to 15 percent of that can be interior. We've had some changes through discussions with tenants and retail tenants, in particular to reconfigure that. But I want to just clarify that we're not looking to reduce any of the open space requirements, we're just looking to reconfigure them. Another area has to do with an outdoor pavilion for retail in the plaza, and I'll go into a little bit more detail about that. But a kind of café space in the required public outdoor open space. Similarly, we're looking for changes to the signage text, along 10th Avenue, to increase the amount of signage there. Currently, the

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

regulations do not really acknowledge the fact that this is a three block long kind of megablock, rather than one kind of typical Manhattan, 200 foot wide block. And then finally, there's a plaza on 30th and 10th, which is required in the 2005 zoning for the eastern yards, but it also happens to be the location of a major DEP easements for access to the third water tunnel. So there are some requirements that we can't actually fulfill. There's a packet in front of you, a purple packet, with Eastern Rail Yard text amendments, and if you just want to flip through with me, I'll try to walk you through some of these changes. So, there--the first page is a site plan that shows you the two yards, the eastern yard is to your right, the western yard is to your left. We've been working hard over the past four years since we were the designated developer back in 2008. We rezoned the Western Yard in 2009, to accommodate mixed use development. And this is actually the second round of text amendments we've had on the Eastern Yard, since we were designated. I'm going to focus predominately on the Eastern Yard. The next

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

page, the one with the purp--the orange on it, shows you the ground, the ground floor. Most of these text amendments have to do with the ground plan and the public spaces that are either outside or inside, but you can see the configuration of the interior retail open spaces around the word "Department Store," there. If you turn the page to Interior Open Space, you'll see the original diagram right here, of--this was the required open spaces in the 2005 rezoning that occurred, that shows you the difference between the open public space and green and then interior space in blue. We've had lots of conversations with retailers and in particular, we're planning a substantial amount of retail space here. I mean, unlike a lot of other developers, who proposed redevelopment on the yards, we're proposing nearly a million square feet of retail, destination retail space, which we think will certainly serve the community on the west side, in general. So, as a part of that, we're looking to reconfigure the space in order to accommodate a large anchor department store. you turn the page, the floor plan here shows you that reconfigured space, so basically east/west

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

galleries, that would be lined with retail, so we're just looking to change some of the requirements. There are minimum height and width requirements, we're looking to narrow the corridor slightly but raise the height of them. So, again, no net change in the type of space, but we think it's a more high quality space, which actually would permit more typical ground floor retail. And all of that is triggered by the creation of a large atrium on the plaza. So, this, these renderings here show you that new atrium, which would be required, a minimum size of 4,500 square feet, minimum height of 60 feet, and fronting the major plaza facing west. So we think this is an improvement to the plan, in both the community and the City Planning Commission agreed to that. next page just shows you a view from the plaza itself of what the atrium looks like, that's the pink area highlighted there. And that brings us to the 11th Avenue Pavilion. If you will recall when the Eastern Rail Yard was rezoned in '05, right across the street was a large stadium. As I mentioned before, we've rezoned that to accommodate mixed use development on the Western

3

4

5

б

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yard. And having done that, we've also inherited the configuration of this open space. We're actually looking to create a relatively small retail pavilion on the western side of the public space that would be kind of like a café with a restaurant and maybe a beer garden or something upstairs. But something that would be kind of an everyday uses, so something you would walk on your way to the subway, you could pick up a newspaper or flowers or a cup of coffee on the way. But we think it helps enliven that public space, which is very, very large, and would be kind of desolate, we think, if--particularly before the western yards are built out. We've had a lot of back and forth, both of the community and the Commission on this. And we've agreed to certain, I would say significant constraints on it. So, we went into the original application in January with a minimum floor plate size of 6,000 square feet, and that was reduced to 3,600 square feet through discussions with the community and the commission. So, in aggregate, the pavilion will be only about 11,000 square feet. But we still think it's important in order to enliven that plaza and open

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

space. There was also an original height 30 feet which through discussions with the community was reduced to 24 feet, maximum height. So I think we've been pretty responsive to the community and the commission in general in terms of their requests. Go forward about three more pages, there are just some pictures in there of other cafés but the idea, as I said, is a relatively small pavilion. If you turn to the page that says "30th Street Plaza," that'll take you to the third issue that we're confronting here. On the corner of 30th and 10th, and the original zoning, there is a requirement for a plaza. So if you turn to this page here, you'll just see a general configuration of where that is. So, it was a required plaza that was 200 feet long and 60 feet wide, and it was required to conform with POPS standards. This is, I think, largely a clarification of the original zoning, because you can't actually comply with POP standards because half of it is a DEP easement, wherein you can't have anything permanent on it. So, we've agreed to movable furniture and movable artwork, but nothing permanent on that portion of the easement.

2	So, while we've reduced the amount of amenities
3	there, it acknowledges the fact that there's this
4	DEP easement, and there are continuing
5	conversations both with DEP and the community.
6	A:nd what you'll see, also, are some renderings of
7	what that will look like. I should also mention,
8	this is a major entrance into the south office
9	building, that Coach will occupy also a major
10	entrance into the retail center. It'll also be a
11	major entrance into the Highline. So we think
12	there are plenty of activities there that will
13	make sure that it's an enlivened space and not a
14	bleak plaza. But I think we've gotten good
15	feedback from the community in terms of the types
16	of amenities that would be here. So we would try
17	to have it as green as possible, but we think
18	these, these new requirements reflect the reality
19	of the third water tunnel. The last issue is 10th
20	Avenue signage. So if you turn just two more
21	pages, you'll get a view, an elevation of what we
22	call the super block along 10th Avenue. So,
23	current requirements, or current requirements on
24	the site, are no more than 1,500 square feet of
25	signs on 10th Avenue. Now, that's a typical

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

requirements in the Hudson Yards District, and that's generally fined for a 200 foot long block. But we have a 720 foot long block. Furthermore, we have prohibition or a severe control on signage facing the plaza. And we've agreed to controls facing the Highline. So we basically have no signage on the plaza, we have no signage on the Highline, so 10th Avenue is the only place we could actually have signs. So, we've worked very, very closely with the community, back and forth in terms of having increased signage there, so we're looking to have about 4,400 square feet of signs along 10th Avenue. We originally went into the application with the ability to have it all flashing, the community pushed back on that, and we've agreed not to have flashing signs above 40 feet. What this also does permit is one large sign for hopefully a great department store, which we're going to attract, to come here. But again, we believe certainly with the size of the block, certainly the diversity of uses on the Eastern Rail Yards, that this amount of signage is appropriate, particularly given the scale of the development we're talking about. I know it's a

	2	lot	of	absorb,	I'm	happy	to	answer	any	questions
--	---	-----	----	---------	-----	-------	----	--------	-----	-----------

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much. I know a number of the members of the Committee have some questions. I'd like to start with Council Member Dan Garodnick.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And my questions are just a piecemeal on various things that you said, so forgive me. First relates to the Highline and the 55 percent publicly accessible requirements. So, as I understand it, right now there's a, the requirement is that on the whole eastern site, that 55 percent of it be publicly accessible, be open, privately owned public space. This application, relative to the Highline, would allow the Highline to be included as part of that, is that right?

FRANK RUCHALA: That's correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Now, what does that do to the rest of the public space? What is the implication of that for the rest of the site?

FRANK RUCHALA: I'll take it, or do you want to?

2	MICHAEL SEMWELLY: I got it. The
3	short of it is that it reduces the amount of
4	interior open space. Because what we would have
5	hadgiven the constraints on the Eastern Rail
6	Yard and how it was, how the open space was
7	originally designed, described, you kind of get to
8	the 40 percent by default. You kind of have to,
9	given the plaza size and shape and the
10	requirements. So we would have had to have 15
11	percent of that interior, of the open space be
12	interior. By capping the Highline, there's a net
13	reduction in the amount of interior open space
14	while keeping the aggregate the same. So you end
15	up with more outdoor space, which we think is
16	better, it's, you know, more useful and it's
17	actually open to the air and the sun and the
18	elements.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: You end
20	up with more, did you say? More
21	MICHAEL SEMWELLY: More exterior
22	space.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Oh, more
24	exterior space, okay. And just for the mechanics

of the Highline, it progresses northbound up to

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK:

I see,

of their open space requirements, subject to the

25

similar payments that would need to be made for
the portion of the ERY Highline, which is the
portion on their site. It basically gives an
option, again, really to make the 55 percent open
snace requirement for the site

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Is ... so, is that space the equivalent of the rest of the Highline, would people experience it much like they experienced the rest of the Highline?

FRANK RUCHALA: The--yeah, I mean-[background comment]

PETER MULLAN: I think it's--just introduce myself, my name is Peter Mullan, and I'm the Vice President for Planning and Design at Friends of the Highline. I think it's important to separate out that the goal I think of all the stakeholders now is that all portions of the Highline are continuous and considered part of a single public open space that is owned by the City of New York. I think the distinction between the ERY section and the 10th Avenue Spur is really just one of funding. Okay? In that the zoning now that 's being proposed requires the developer to provide funding for the section that's on the

2	ERY, and it gives them the option to provide
3	funding for the 10th Avenue Spur portion, if they
4	choose to count it towards their open space
5	requirement. If they don't count it, they don't
6	have to pay for it, we have to fundraise for it
7	separately.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: So other
9	than the fundraising piece
10	PETER MULLAN: Right.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK:which
12	obviously is a, you would rather have them opt to
13	use that as part of the requirement, I would
14	imagine
15	PETER MULLAN: Of course. Always.
16	[laughter]
17	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Is
18	there, is there anyit seems, it's unclear to me
19	from looking at this picture, how a member of the
20	public might enjoy that particular spur as opposed
21	to the rest of the Highline, which is sort of a
22	straight shot up and down, this is sort of a, I
23	don't know, it looks like an appendix.
24	MICHAEL SEMWELLY: I think that's a

very sensitive because it is unusual in that, I

2.

mean, as Peter will tell you, it's one of the
largest, most contiguous pieces, so it's actually
made, it's probably, you know, best used for
events, it's kind of a dead end, it doesn't' lead
anywhere. So, it would be some kind of
destination rather than kind of the pathway, I
think.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: It's big enough for what kind of an event?

FRANK RUCHALA: I think, you know, some of the ideas that we're considering is you can use it for, you know, public events, or private galas or theatrical performances. One of the design concepts is to create an outdoor theater in that location. So, we haven't resolved that yet, but I think, you know, one of our, for those of who that have been on the Highline, one of our challenges is that we're, it's relatively narrow. And so when we do have an area that is physically larger, it gives us an opportunity to do something that's a little more programmatically intense, I think.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Is there any public access up to the Highline from that

Τ	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 24
2	spur? Or is that truly a dead end from another
3	access point?
4	FRANK RUCHALA: I think that
5	there's, in the plan there's an intention to have
6	a stair that comes up from the 30th Street, the
7	10th Avenue Plaza, up to basically the sort of the
8	western side of the 10th Avenue Spur.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Didn't
10	you have picture of that at one point? Yeah,
11	okay.
12	FRANK RUCHALA: Okay.
13	MICHAEL SEMWELLY: Yeah, and
14	there's a rendering in your packet, a rendering.
15	So if you look at this view over here, with the
16	two yellow trees, so that's a view of the plaza at
17	30th and 10th, showing where the stair is.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Hold on,
19	let me, let's just get there for a sec.
20	MICHAEL SEMWELLY: Sure.
21	[background comment]
22	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Right,
23	numbered pages, by the way, that would've been a
24	good idea, huh? Hold on. [background comments]
25	That's not =the one, I saw, I saw yellow trees.

Т	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 20
2	[background comment] Mm-hmm.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Sorry.
4	Sorry, I can't see where you're pointing to. But-
5	-there is a stair already in the plan
6	FRANK RUCHALA: No, no, in the plan
7	there's a stair that would come up from this
8	location and land you in this
9	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: This
10	location being 10th Avenue-
11	FRANK RUCHALA: Correct.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK:into
13	the 10th Avenue Spur of the Highline.
14	FRANK RUCHALA: Correct.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Right?
16	Okay.
17	FRANK RUCHALA: Correct. And it's
18	possible, and probably will be required, that we
19	have another access point on the east side of the
20	street
21	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Of 10th
22	Avenue.
23	FRANK RUCHALA:of 10th Avenue,
24	purely for egress purposes.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Now that

PETER MULLAN:

On the main, on the

25

б

2 main site plan--

3 COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay.

Hold on, hold on. Is that page two, or the second page. Aha, right, go ahead.

PETER MULLAN: So here this shows you the ground floor of the eastern yards, as it's described. This kind of L shape area that I'm outlining is one of the required outdoor plazas. So the, the western side of that, around, hear 11th Avenue, the whole, this whole plaza was basically planned for having this big destination where my hand is, having the big stadium on the western yard.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Right, right.

PETER MULLAN: So, as we're looking with the landscape architects and potential tenants, we keep seeing that this western yard basically has no reason to be there, the western side of this. So we're creating this very small destination, which is kind of a day-do-day destination, and you should, you know, recall, especially in the future, there'll be about 4,000 apartments here, particularly in the western yard.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, on the way to the subway, which is just to the north where my finger is, we want to create a place which draws people both from the plaza, westward, towards 11th Avenue, but also create kind of a destination on your way within the plaza that's kind of a day-to-day retail use. It's required to be retail, it can't be anything other than that. It's going to be two to three stories, it has a maximum height of 24 feet. And the program we're anticipating, as I mentioned, is some kind of food service, like a café, a restaurant on the roof, you know, some kind of flower shop, newsstand, that kind of activity. Because again, as I like to--and I think the community grew to embrace this as well. You know, we're creating a million feet of retail here. don't really need 11,000 square feet of retail here. I mean, I don't need to compete with myself. But I think it's important for an urban design standpoint to have an activity there, because you know, unlike a kiosk, which would close, we want to create something which is more 365. So, this isn't like a, you know, a witchcraft in Bryant Park, this is something a

2	look, we're actively marketing, we have, we're
3	having conversations with every major tenant there
4	is out there. We're very, we're thrilled to have
5	Coach anchor the first building. They have
6	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: And
7	that's, and sorry, that is Tower C, where is that?
8	PETER MULLAN: Correct, yeah,
9	that's Tower C. So, it's the south office tower.
10	That building needs to be delivered to Coach by
11	mid-'15, because they have some lease expirations
12	that we need to deal with. So that, the southern
13	portion of the, the eastern rail yard will be
14	completed by mid-to late '15. We're marketing
15	the, the north tower, it could be completed as
16	early as mid-'17. Again, that's pending getting a
17	significant anchor tenant for it. And the retail
18	would follow along with the north office tower.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay,
20	so
21	PETER MULLAN: But we can build
22	them separately. The south tower does not require
23	us to build a platform, the south tower does not

require us to build a retail, the south tower does

not require us to build anything other than

2 itself, and its associated public space.
--

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Right.

And Council Member Ignizio and I both agreed that

our wives will be most appreciative of the, of

Coach and whatever else goes in there. Mine,

8 careful. [laughter] Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you,
Council Member Garodnick. Council Member Reyna.

however, works on the block, so I should be really

for your wallet. [laughter] I wanted to just take a moment to just appreciate, you know, all the work that has gone into this massive undertaking. I wanted to just take a second to understand what type of traffic mitigation assessment has taken place with this particular ... next step in relationship to this text amend—text amendment regarding the Highline, you know, and the development of commercial and future residential?

MICHAEL SEMWELLY: Sure, I'll try to--I'm not an environmental lawyer, but I'll try to do my best. So there was a full EIS, completed--

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 34
2	FRANK RUCHALA: Well, thethe
3	types are shifting and the locations
4	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Right.
5	FRANK RUCHALA: But I think overall
6	that that's
7	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Right.
8	FRANK RUCHALA:that that, you
9	know, there is enough flexibility already in the
10	zoning for those types of chafor changes. So
11	this was additional
12	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: So there was
13	no necessary amendment to the EIS for further
14	supporting documentation.
15	FRANK RUCHALA: That's correct.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Okay. And I
17	wanted to take a moment to understand, as far as
18	this project is concerned, what is the MWBE
19	utilization rate and dollar value amount? For
20	this project.
21	PETER MULLAN: I'll answer the
22	second question first. I think it was reported in
23	the paper today that we're looking at about a
24	billion dollar project for the first phase, which
25	includes both the podium of Tower C and the Tower

PETER MULLAN: Yeah, yeah. We do have a number of MWBE consultants working on the project today. I can get you a list of who's

23

24

25

2	working on it right now, and we can talk about a
3	list going forward of contractors or other
4	vendors.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I would appreciate that, and just to understand exactly the performance level, as far as this project is concerned moving forward, is very important to me, as Small Business Chair, to the Committee. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you,

Council Member Reyna. Council Member Comrie.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Just to

follow up on Council Member Reyna's question, if you can get that to us before, to the full Committee, before the full committee votes--

PETER MULLAN: Sure.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: --on
Thursday, the information on the people that are
working on MWBE and the contractors, that would be
helpful. I wanted to ask you, the--you've had,
you vetted this before the community board, did
you discuss what your feedback was from both the
community board and the borough president's
office, in your presentation?

FRANK RUCHALA: Yeah, I can go
through what some of the changes that we've made,
based on each of the different components. There
were, there were essentially no comments on the
interior open space aside from changes to the
operating hours, so the current operating hours
would, are proposed to be 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.
In the case that a bridge is built over 10th
Avenue, which is required when the adjacent
building provides interior public open space,
those hours would be extended. That's a direct
requires from the community board, so those hours,
the interior hours would get elongated to be 6:00
a.m. to 1:00 a.m., acknowledging the fact that
people would be using the interior space to get to
Penn Station, and other areas. And the community
board has, I think they've embraced that and
agreed to extending the hours. Similarly, there
was a request for the exterior hours, which are
currently planned to be 6:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. for
the outdoor space. That any driveways that we
have remain active and open 24/7, and we've agreed
to that. So any

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Which are

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 30
2	including the interior roadways?
3	FRANK RUCHALA: No, yes, so all the
4	interior roads that you see here
5	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Right.
6	FRANK RUCHALA:if there are
7	roads provided, that they be accessible 24 hours.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay.
9	FRANK RUCHALA: And we've agreed to
10	that.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. And
12	this space between the cultural pavilion and Tower
13	C, what is that space, it's a
14	FRANK RUCHALA: That's a required,
15	it's called connection, the connection to the
16	Highline, that's a space that's required to be 80
17	feet long, is that, 80 feet wide, Frank? And it's
18	a required public space that permits the Highline
19	to connect to the outdoor plaza. It has minimum
20	width and height requirements, minimum 80 feet
21	wide, and I think it has a minimum height of 60
22	feet. But we're planning it to be open to the
23	sky.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Is that, so
25	that but you're not doing any plantings or

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 4
2	the trains.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay.
4	FRANK RUCHALA: The minute we get a
5	large tenant for this building here, we're going
6	to have to start the platform.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: But your
8	million feet of square space in Tower A is
9	required to be on the platform.
LO	FRANK RUCHALA: Yeah.
L1	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Mm-hmm.
L2	FRANK RUCHALA: Yeah. It's kind of
L3	ironic, but our tallest building is on top of the
L 4	rail yard; the shorter building is on the real
15	land.
L6	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Right. And
L7	what's your timeframe for the, the department
L8	store in Tower A?
19	FRANK RUCHALA: That would all be,
20	we hope to be 2017. It's all pending, we need a
21	very large tenant to kick off that building. So,
22	if you know of any million square foot tenants,
23	we'd be happy to talk to them.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Mm. Well,
25	yeah, Facebook [laughter] That's what Robert

25

Τ	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 41
2	Jackson said. And just, the question, so, to do
3	the platform, you'd have to, you had to speak to,
4	the, to who at the rail yards? Is that
5	FRANK RUCHALA: The Long Island
6	Railroad.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Oh, it's
8	the Long Island Railroad.
9	FRANK RUCHALA: Yeah.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And you had
11	to meet the federal standards for that? And
12	FRANK RUCHALA: Mm-hmm.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And who's
14	going to monitor the, the development of the
15	platform for that, then, to make sure that the
16	concrete is not concrete from, from a negative
17	source, orbecause we've been hearing about
18	porous concrete and concrete problems. And who's
19	going to, who's going to check that and develop
20	those checks and balances?
21	FRANK RUCHALA: The, the railroad
22	actually will own the platform, so we're going to
23	build it so it's, the, you'll be, you should be

certain that the railroad, and we are working

very, very closely together, to ensure the highest

2	quality for the platform. Because while we build
3	it, they're going to own it. So we own everything
4	from, you know, call it like, you know, from
5	platform up we own it, including the buildings,
6	the dirt, trees, the flower, everything from
7	platform down, the columns, the foundations, the
8	structure, the Long Island Railroad will own and
9	control.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And so this
11	roadway between the department store and the
12	fountain and the café, that'll be all on platform?
13	FRANK RUCHALA: Yes. And they're
14	all private streets
15	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And they're
16	all private streets, but they'll stay open 24/7.
17	FRANK RUCHALA: correct.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: But the
19	maintenance will be up to the developer.
20	FRANK RUCHALA: Yes.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. And
22	I appreciate everything. It's, so it'll look
23	pretty much like the area around Grand Central, at
24	the end of the day.
25	FRANK RUCHALA: We hope so, even

2 better.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: All right, great, just, I just wanted to ask one more thing, Mr. Chair. Did the opportunities for, the smaller restaurant/café and creating opportunities for ownership, who is going to, or restaurant, how are you going to advertise that, the same way you're looking for the million square foot partner, you're looking for a Shake Shack to come in there, or--

MICHAEL SEMWELLY: It's hard to say. I mean, I think that the café wants to be something a little more authentic. I mean, we have this real struggle--I mean, we want this to be a part of the neighborhood, we don't just want to have it feel like it landed from Mars. So we've been working very, very closely with the community, and we're thrilled about the Highline and the Highline text amendment, and all the great stuff that's, great restaurants and cafés, etc., that have grown around it. So, we would work hard to work to find, you know, a local, locally attractive user for it. But it's a very different thing, the platform, the pavilion's very different

Well, fortunately, but, otherwise she would [laughter] fortunately for her, but unfortunately for us, because we don't get to have her sage advice on this, but she has expressed her support on this measure. Any other questions? Seeing none, I'm going to thank you gentlemen for coming.

23

24

25

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 45
2	FRANK RUCHALA: Thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Move to close
4	this hearing.
5	PETER MULLAN: Can I just have one
6	moment, just because
7	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Sure, have a
8	moment.
9	PETER MULLAN:I, I do have quick
10	statement, I just want to put, because I'm not
11	officially the applicant.
12	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay, all
13	right, we'll let, official statement, state your
14	name again.
15	PETER MULLAN: My name is Peter
16	Mullan, and I'm the Vice President for Planning
17	and Design at Friends of the Highline. And I just
18	want to say, first of all, thank you to the
19	Committee, and the Subcommittee and the Committee
20	and the Council in general, for all of its support
21	for the Highline over the years, and just
22	recognize that this is really a major milestone in
23	the history of the Highline. For a long time, as
24	Frank mentioned, the Highline at this site has
25	been uncertain, and there was a lot of thought

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that is should be or would need to be torn down in order to facilitate the development. And I want to thank The Related Companies for their work to figure out how to incorporate the Highline into the development on the site. And this text amendment essentially will permanently guarantee the preservation of the entire historic highline. So, it's a big, it's a really, it's a major victory, I think, for all supporters of the Highline. I really want to thank the Council for--I mean, we've been through a lot of text amendments to, on the Highline, and as you all know, and, and hopefully this might even be the last. But it's, it's a big day for us, and we really want to thank you. And we fully support this text amendment going forward.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr. Mullan, and we do love happy endings here, so we hope there will be one here. Thank you all very much. We're going to close this hearing now, going to move on to the next item on our agenda, Land Use Item, which is the special TriBeCa text amendment. And I'd like to call up Marcie Kesner and Chris Balestra, or so. Did I mess that up?

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

[background comment] Close enough. Not really,

but--[pause] I want to, all right, Marcie's doing

a--picture boarding. But once you're done, take

your time, please state your name for the record

and whoever wants to go first can start.

MARCIE KESNER: My name's Marcie Kesner, I'm an Urban Planner with the firm of Kramer, Levin, Naftalis & Frankel, Land Use counsel to Taconic Investment Partners, which is the applicant for this text amendment before you. Taconic is under contract to purchase both 412 and 415 Greenwich Street and the adjacent existing building at 401 Washington Street. With me is Chris Balestra representing Taconic, who can answer questions you may have about, more detail about the building and construction. This, this is a text amendment to the special TriBeCa mixed use district, which was approved by the City Council in October of 2010. The text, as it was approved two year ago, two-and-a-half years ago, included a grandfathering provision to allow for the completion, the construction of a new building, on a site in, at the corner of Lake Street and Greenwich Street, in TriBeCa, which had

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

already been approved by both Board of Standards and Appeals, pursuant to a variance, and by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, pursuant to a, which had issued a certificate of appropriateness, to build a new building, which would be very carefully designed to match the building, existing historic building, adjacent to it at 401 Washington Street, 401 Greenwich Street. grandfathering provision that was approved in 2010, basically stated that the special permit had to be--or, I'm sorry, the permit for the new building had to be granted before the expiration-before, for a two year period, within a two year period, which expired on January 12, 2012. former owner, who had been the applicant of this project, which was the sep--which was actually the current owner, 71 Lake Street, LLC, was unable to obtain its building permit prior to January 12, 2012, they were unable to proceed because of the economic conditions over the past couple of years. The, they are now in contract with Taconic Investment Partners to, who intends to close on the property and build the buildings that were approved pursuant to the variance and landmarks

approvals. The text amendment that's before you
now, which extend the grandfathering provision for
an additional four years. It wouldit's
specifically limited to a building that was
granted a particular variance. It would not apply
to any other building. And without this, the
building could not proceed, because there are
still waivers that would be required pursuant to
the, the current TriBeCa zoning. Our architect is
unfortunately ill today, so he's not able to be
here to discuss the building. Mr. Balestra and I
could answer questions if anyone has specific
questions about the proposed building or the, the
renovation of the historic building adjacent to
it, which is also going to be purchased by
Taconic.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Super. I know Council Member Reyna had some questions she wanted to ask.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I just needed clarity on the expiration date. What is expiring, exactly?

MARCIE KESNER: There was, in the existing, in the zoning text, there's language

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	that states that, however a building,
3	notwithstanding any other provisions in the
4	special TriBeCa district, a development of a
5	building pursuant to a variance, granted by the
6	Board of Standards and Appeals, number 23109BZ,
7	would, the builcould be continued provided that
8	a building permit was issued within two years of
9	the grant of the variance. What we are doing is
10	putting, is proposing new text which would say,
11	within six years of the granting of the variance.
12	So it would allow for an additional, and
13	additional four years in which to complete the
14	building.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And if the
16	text was not renewed, what would happen?

text was not renewed, what would happen?

MARCIE KESNER: The building would have to be redesigned, because the current plan, the building was, which was approved by the Landmarks and the board, by the Board of Standards and Appeals, was specifically designed to match the adjacent building. And--

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: But the BSA variance was issued based on hardship because of, this was an M zone?

25 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And how long

24

building.

2 ago was the new zoning text?

MARCIE KESNER: The new zoning was approved in October of 2010, so the Board of Standards and Appeals approval was in 2010, the Landmarks Preservation Commission was the end of the 2009. While they were in the process of getting their final approvals, and public process, the text amendment came through.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And the landmarking was of the variance building?

MARCIE KESNER: The his--this is in the historic district--

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Okay, so it's a historic--

MARCIE KESNER: --historic

district, the historic building which is adjacent
to our site, is a seven story, I think, seven
story warehouse building. The site that is
covered by this text amendment, is a site that's
improved with a one story parking garage, which
was determined in the landmark, in the report by
the Landmarks Preservation Commission on the
historic district, to be a noncontributing
building.

Certain changes were made to the, to the plans,

25

showing there was a concern about the, the fire ladder coming down, which we moved the planter in and we moved two tables and five chairs. So, this way, you have more than three feet of clearance, when that comes down. We also, and the original plans, we were going to have the planters, so we amended these plans, so to show the planners.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay, great.

I know the Council Member, Robert "Action" Jackson was on the scene last night, and he has a statement he wants to make.

thank you, Mr. Chair. In fact, I visited the premises last night, to review everything with respects to the specs, that's submitted. Let me just say that actually in the briefing document, it says, "63 tables and 128 chairs for a two year term." That is not what was approved by this City Council two years ago or even four years ago. It's incorrect. It's incorrect based on the submissions to us, by DCA. I've already talked to the representative from the Mayor's Office that I'm not pleased with the way that DCA has basically given us wrong information. And in

fact, in speaking to the owner last night, we communicated that where the fire escape which falls directly outside of the end of the property, there needs to be three foot clearance, with respects of fire codes, and he fully understands that and plans to comply with it immediately. And as far as the planters, he indicated, and the planters are now in the tentative plans that they're submitting. Based on that, along with the agreement of all of the outdoor cafés in that particular area, there's an agreement from I think Sunday through Thursday, they close at 10:00 p.m.

VICTOR SANTOS: Yes.

Friday, Friday and Saturday, they close the outdoor café at 12:00 a.m., so that residents that live in the immediate area and above, will be able to enjoy the comfort of their home. Based on that, I--based on that, I'm concurring that, that this be approved, not what's listed here: 63 tables and 128 chairs. But based on 44 tables and 89 chairs, which was what was amended in this tentative amendment, by the owner, that the formal plans will be submitted by his either attorney or

2.

architect at DCA, ASAP, before whatever deadline
that is necessary. So, based on that, the owner's
going to submit another letter, immediately before
Thursday, indicating about the, theokay, may I
read this into the record?

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Yes, you may.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.

This is to myself, regarding Mamamjuana Café sidewalk renewal. "Dear Mr. Jackson: I write this letter to you as the President of Vita Café, Inc., dba Mamajuana Café. I would like to inform you that I agree to the same stipulations placed by your office. When we first applied to renew our sidewalk café, which include Sunday through Thursday, sidewalk café, will be closed at `10:00 p.m., and Friday and Saturday, sidewalk café will be closed by 12:00 a.m. midnight. I would also like to inform you that I will have my architect submit new drawings showing the removal of the two tables and five chairs on the east end, it should be the west end--

VICTOR SANTOS: West end, yeah.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: -- the west end of the sidewalk café, as well as the planters

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	being moved in at that location, to allow the
3	three foot clearance for the fire escape ladder.
4	These new drawings will be submitted to your
5	office by Thursday, May 24, 2012. If you have any
6	questions or concerns, please feel to contact me."
7	This is signed by Victor Osorio [phonetic],
8	President. So with that, the one little thing was
9	at east end, it should be west end.
10	VICTOR SANTOS: West end.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: I'm in total agreement with going forward.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: You're ready to go forward today and Mr. Santos, the table issue, you agree with what Mr. Jackson said.

VICTOR SANTOS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Well, that's good. Any other, anybody else have any questions for this gentleman? No, thank you very much for coming down. So, with that in mind, that closed this hearing, and that is the last item on our agenda, so I'd like to move to a vote on these items: that would be Land Use No. 603, Mamajuana Café; the related items, No. 604 and 605, that was the Eastern Rail Yards and the

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 59
2	COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Yes.
3	COUNSEL: By a vote of seven in the
4	affirmative, none in the negative, and no
5	abstentions, LU 604, 605, 606 and 603 are approved
6	and referred to the full Land Use Committee.
7	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr.
8	Hilton, and with that in mind, the meeting is now
9	adjourned.
10	[gavel, background noise]

I, JOHN DAVID TONG certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

John David Toz

Signature

Date June 11, 2012