CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----X

September 15, 2011 Start: 10:00am Recess: 11:17am

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

BEFORE:

MARK S. WEPRIN Chairperson

## COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Leroy G. Comrie, Jr. Daniel R. Garodnick Robert Jackson Jessica S. Lappin

Diana Reyna Joel Rivera

Larry B. Seabrook

James Vacca Albert Vann

Vincent M. Ignizio

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

John Clifford Architect BJ's/Brooklyn Bay Center

Patrick Smith
Vice President of Real Estate
BJ's Wholesale Club

Ethan Goodman Land Use Counsel representing Thor Equities Law Firm of Wachtel & Masyr

Jesse Masyr Land Use Counsel representing Thor Equities Law Firm of Wachtel & Masyr

Adam Wolff
Deputy Director of the Manhattan office
NYC Department of City Planning

Gary DeBode President Edison Properties

Douglas Woodward Edison Properties

Andrew Canter Edison Properties

Kate McDonough Chair of Land Use and Zoning Committee Manhattan Community Board 5 2.

| CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Alright. Good                  |
|--|
| morning. My name is Mark Weprin. I'm the chair     |
| of the Zoning and Franchises Subcommittee. I'd     |
| like to welcome you all here to the Zoning and     |
| Franchises hearing. We are joined by the           |
| following members of the Committee who are here:   |
| Diana Reyna, Dan Garodnick, Leroy Comrie, Al Vann, |
| Jimmy Vacca and Larry Seabrook. Am I missing one   |
| back there? No. We are also delighted to be        |
| joined by the chair of the Finance Committee,      |
| Domenic Recchia, who is here and Robert Jackson-I  |

apologize-Robert Jackson from Manhattan.

We are going to start. Just some housing—the first issue on the cafes, Land Use number 449, Mezzogiorno Associates—we have a letter and there's a motion to file pursuant to withdrawal, and we have a letter withdrawing this application, so that will be withdraw. The second café, Café Condessa is off the agenda for today. It's laid over until our next meeting. Land Use number 456, Boerum Hill [phonetic] rezoning—we are not going to be voting on that today. We already held the hearing. That will be held before the Land Use meeting on Monday—Council Member Comrie's

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| 2 | Committee | at 10 | o'clock. | This will | meet at | 9:30 |
|---|-----------|-------|----------|-----------|---------|------|
|---|-----------|-------|----------|-----------|---------|------|

No? Monday at 9:30. You're shaking your head at me.

[background conversation]

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: I thought I had a happy meal or something. 9:30 on Monday morning we'll be having that hearing on this and maybe another item. Alright, so now for the main events. We are going to start with Land Use number 469 through 474-the Brooklyn Bay Center Thor Equities and I'm going to call John Clifford [phonetic], Patrick Smith [phonetic] and Ethan Goodman [phonetic] and Jesse Masyr [phonetic]. Please come up. Make sure, gentlemen, you all have seats. Are we short? No. You could set up your charts, and when you're all ready, please before you speak, state your name for the record into the microphone. Since there are four of you just so you know, when we look at the record, we want to know who's who when they speak, so as you speak, always state your name before you speak so we can keep the record straight. So whenever you're ready, you can start.

JESSE MASYR: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman and members of the Committee. My name is Jesse Masyr. I'm a member of the law firm of Wachtel & Masyr, and we're Land Use counsel to the applicant in this matter, which is an entity owned by Thor Equities. The matter before you is a number of actions, including a rezoning and a number of special permits that would facilitate the development of a BJ's Wholesale establishment on this site. With me today—to my left is John Clifford, who is the architect of the project, Ethan Goodman of my office and Pat Smith, a representative of BJ's.

I wanted to start before turning it over to them and giving greater detail on the project, and of course, being available to answer any questions you might have. To say that this contaminated site which will be cleaned up at great effort of over 20,000 cubic yards of material that will have to be removed and replace will then facilitate this important economic development project in this section of south Brooklyn. We wanted to make it very clear that we are very, very happy and pleased to be doing business with BJ's. We have a full executed lease

with BJ's and we expect BJ's to not only be our tenant, but in essence they are the developer of the site. They will build their own store and the parking that goes with it. We wanted to make very clear 'cause we realize that there's a reality in Brooklyn that this and - - circumstance will be anything but a BJ's and under no circumstance will this ever be a Wal-Mart. I know there's been some concern about that. We want to make that clear and put that on the records for clarity's sake. With your permission, I'd like to ask Ethan Goodman of my office, if he could briefly take you through the actions, which there are 6, that would be needed to facilitate this development.

ETHAN GOODMAN: Good morning,

Council Members, Chair Weprin. As Jesse Masyr

told you, we're in front of you for a number of

applications to build an approximately 214,000

square foot retail center. As you see by the

contacts [phonetic] map to my left, we are along

the Belt Parkway on the water at 1752 Shore

Parkway, for those of you familiar with the area.

We are actually nestled essentially between the

Caesar's Bay [phonetic] shipping center and the

2 Bayside Fuel Depot and probably about two blocks or three blocks northwest of Nellie Bly. 3 actually a fairly developed retail area as you'll 4 5 notice by Caesar's Bay and the New York Sports Club right next door to us. It is-however, all 6 those were built pursuant to variance; this is still in an M3 zone, so we are seeking first a 9 rezoning to an M1 district, and that will allow us to apply for a large retail special permit to 10 11 allow the proposed retail uses. We're also 12 seeking a number of other special permits; one of 13 which is to modify - - to build slightly higher than the 30 foot height limit on a waterfront 14 15 block. The highest portions of the building will 16 be approximately 56 feet. We are also seeking to 17 modify signage slightly to put some illuminated 18 signage facing the northwest and southeast, not 19 facing east directly onto the residences, but 20 oblique angled to them. We're seeking a special 21 permit for a public parking garage, essentially 22 only so we can put rooftop parking in here and keep the level of the parking garage low. 23 24 be a three level garage with ground floor, second 25 level and rooftop and will contain 690 parking

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

spaces. We are seeking a minor authorization to modify waterfront public access to allow one less connection from the street due to the long peninsular nature of the site. Otherwise the public waterfront access will be entirely compliant with zoning. It will be 2 ½ acres and will be open from dawn to dusk. I'll just show you the project briefly.

The project you'll see rendered in front of me and a side plan to the left of me, it will have a single entrance coming into and out of the service road to Shore Parkway. This will be great because it will prevent all conflicting vehicular movements. The service road is a one way road that goes essentially southeast or down on the right side of the screen there-right side of the board. People will come in a driveway here, park in the parking garage and enter the BJ's right from the nexus between the parking garage and the BJ's. On the second level, there is space for some additional smaller retailers. We don't have leases for those smaller retailers yet, but we're hoping we'll get leases in the future for those retailers. The first level will

| be approximately 138,000 square feet for the BJ's  |
|--|
| and we've got approximately 69,000 square feet on  |
| the second level to house additional retailers.    |
| Here's a rendering from the end of the peninsula   |
| looking at the parking garage. It will be a nice   |
| peninsula, a public waterfront esplanade with      |
| benches throughout, some tables. It will be an     |
| esplanade that will not be cut off from the water. |
| There will be a rocky slope going down to the      |
| water, so people can access and get very close to  |
| the water. In addition, there will be a large      |
| public lawn at the end. With regard to access to   |
| and from the site, we believe primary access will  |
| probably be along Bay Parkway and along the Belt   |
| Parkway and we have proposed a number of traffic   |
| improvements along Bay Parkway and especially the  |
| intersection of the Belt and Bay Parkway,          |
| including special turning lanes, signals,          |
| dedicated signals and additional signage to        |
| clearly direct people to Caesar's Bay and our site |
| straight ahead or onto the Belt to the left.       |
| We've done extensive analysis on this and we       |
| believe we've achieved a solution that allows      |
| traffic to still flow smoothly. With that I will   |

2 close and open up to any questions you have for 3 anybody on the panel.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much. Now I understand there is discussion about a letter regarding unions. Is that something you want to discuss on the record?

JESSE MASYR: Yeah, I have Mr.

Smith who is a representative of BJ's to my left,
but my understanding, and Pat, will stop me when I
go wrong, is that BJ's has always been committed
and has done all of its work in New York City with
union labor and has every intention to continue
that position and is ready to commit on the record
today. Correct?

PATRICK SMITH: Correct.

JESSE MASYR: That they will build this job entirely with union labor. We will effort—and make sure that we have to you in a timely manner before your vote, a letter from BJ's putting that in writing and committing it, but BJ's has always done their work in New York City, even in projects where they were not developers, but they were just merely the finisher of their site, and in fact, in one instance where the site

25

| Δ. | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCITIES 1            |
|----|--|
| 2  | itself was not built with union labor, they        |
| 3  | themselves with no obligation came in and did all  |
| 4  | of their work only with union labor.               |
| 5  | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay, thank                    |
| 6  | you. For the benefit of the Committee I know that  |
| 7  | Councilman Recchia is here and he wants to discuss |
| 8  | this project.                                      |
| 9  | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Yes, thank                 |
| 10 | you, Mr. Chairman—Council Member Weprin. If you    |
| 11 | give me the opportunity to ask a few questions—I   |
| 12 | just want to be very clear, Mr. Masyr, that this   |
| 13 | BJ's not any BJ's they built before in the future, |
| 14 | but that this one will be built with union labor.  |
| 15 | I'd like to hear that from you and from the        |
| 16 | representative from BJ's.                          |
| 17 | JESSE MASYR: Let's get it right                    |
| 18 | from the horse's mouth, Mr. Councilman.            |
| 19 | PATRICK SMITH: Thanks, Councilman.                 |
| 20 | My name is Pat Smith with BJ's Wholesale Club.     |
| 21 | This project will be built with 100% union labor.  |
| 22 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Okay, and                  |
| 23 | what's your position?                              |

PATRICK SMITH: I'm the vice

president of real estate.

| 2  | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: And you                   |
|----|---|
| 3  | have the authority to speak on behalf of BJ's to  |
| 4  | make this commitment-                             |
| 5  | PATRICK SMITH: [Interposing] I do.                |
| 6  | Yes, I absolutely do. 100%                        |
| 7  | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: 'cause I                  |
| 8  | don't want to hear later on down the road that he |
| 9  | testified without having the authority because    |
| 10 | building union is very important and I don't need |
| 11 | to have rallies in front of my house about        |
| 12 | building union. That's number 1. The other issue  |
| 13 | is the small retail. How many stores are there    |
| 14 | going to be-that could possibly be rented out?    |
| 15 | ETHAN GOODMAN: You know, however                  |
| 16 | it's subdivided. There's no division plan yet.    |
| 17 | It's about 69,000 square feet. Realistically, we  |
| 18 | think it wouldn't be more than probably about     |
| 19 | three stores, but if a restaurant or another      |
| 20 | smaller user wanted to come in and carve out a    |
| 21 | small space, that's a possibility.                |
| 22 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Okay, and                 |
| 23 | whose obligation is that? Is it BJ's or Thor      |
| 24 | Equities?   |
| 25 | .TESSE MASVP: B.T/s is the developer              |

2.

| of the site, just so not to get too deep into the | ıe |
|---|----|
| weeds, we are ground leasing the site to them, s  | 30 |
| they will be the inheritor of the approvals, if   |    |
| we're lucky enough to get them, and they will be  | 3  |
| the developer of the entire site.                 |    |

COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: So it would be up to BJ's to lease out those stores?

JESSE MASYR: Correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Not the equities?

JESSE MASYR: Correct.

other issue is with the sign illuminating. I understand you're going to try your best not to affect the people across the Belt Parkway who live there, but I need some commitment or that once the sign goes up, if there is a problem that BJ's is committed to working with myself and the community board in resolving any issue. I don't want to hear, "Well, we already spent thousands of dollars putting up the sign. We can't do it. It's impossible." 'Cause you never how a sign illuminates until it's actually up.

PATRICK SMITH: Pat Smith again,

2.

| Mr. Councilman, we will absolutely commit to work |
|---|
| with you and with the community. If that sign is  |
| a nuisance, we'll move it. We'll do whatever we   |
| have to do to make it work for the neighbors. The |
| neighbors are going to be our customers. They're  |
| going to be our members, and we don't want to be  |
| coming in as a bad neighbor.                      |

COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Okay, and of course, that would be at BJ's expense, right?

PATRICK SMITH: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Okay. Now hiring local—that's very, very important. I'd like to just put on the record that you're going to hire local from the Coney Island, Bensonhurst, Grave's End, Bay Ridge communities?

PATRICK SMITH: That's correct, sir. We'll be working with Workforce one and the career centers and we'll be working with your office. We're going to be—what we'll be doing is we'll be reaching out to the local community first before we go out to the rest of New York for hiring, so we're going to give all the local people first chances at all the jobs.

COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Right.

| Ι  | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 15          |
|----|---|
| 2  | Okay, and would I be able to make some            |
| 3  | recommendations to local workforce groups to work |
| 4  | with?   |
| 5  | PATRICK SMITH: Absolutely.                        |
| 6  | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Okay, and                 |
| 7  | just going down my list right here. I just want   |
| 8  | to be very clear that this is going to be a BJ's  |
| 9  | and Wal-Mart will not be coming in here. Is that  |
| 10 | correct, Mr. Masyr?                               |
| 11 | JESSE MASYR: That is absolutely                   |
| 12 | correct, Councilman.                              |
| 13 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: and how                   |
| 14 | long is this lease for?                           |
| 15 | JESSE MASYR: 25 years.                            |
| 16 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: 25 years.                 |
| 17 | JESSE MASYR: If I could also offer                |
| 18 | another issue that I know has always been on the  |
| 19 | mind of this Council and frankly, has shown       |
| 20 | extraordinary leadership was because of the       |
| 21 | efforts of the City Council, BJ's became a        |
| 22 | warehouse club in New York City that really was   |
| 23 | one of the first to accept food stamps            |
| 24 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA:                           |
| 25 | [Interposing] Right.                              |

| 2  | JESSE MASYR:and their policy                       |
|----|--|
| 3  | now, as it will be their policy here of course to  |
| 4  | accept food stamps in all of their units in New    |
| 5  | York City, and they currently do and rather        |
| 6  | successfully and in some way, it was the           |
| 7  | leadership of many of the members sitting here and |
| 8  | some of them who I'm looking at right now who      |
| 9  | really pushed us to that direction and we think it |
| LO | worked out really well for us corporately and we   |
| 11 | will continue. That is our policy.                 |
| 12 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: That's                     |
| L3 | greatly appreciated. The park that is going to be  |
| L4 | open from dusk to dawn, whose responsibility is to |
| L5 | take care of that park?                            |
| L6 | JESSE MASYR: That remains the                      |
| L7 | responsibility of Thor, correct?                   |
| L8 | MALE VOICE: No.                                    |
| L9 | JESSE MASYR: Our responsibility is                 |
| 20 | that we build it. Once we build it, we turn it     |
| 21 | over to BJ's and they operate the entire site.     |
| 22 | We're responsible to build it however.             |
| 23 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: I thought                  |
| 24 | BJ's was building it.                              |
| 25 | JESSE MASYR: BJ's is building                      |

| 1  | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 1/           |
|----|--|
| 2  | everything but the waterfront esplanade. We're     |
| 3  | building the waterfront esplanade.                 |
| 4  | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: You say                    |
| 5  | we, that means Thor Equities?                      |
| 6  | JESSE MASYR: Thor Equities.                        |
| 7  | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Okay.                      |
| 8  | Hold on for a minute. Mr. Masyr, do you think we   |
| 9  | could have that in writing that Thor Equities will |
| 10 | be developing the promenade?                       |
| 11 | JESSE MASYR: You can have that in                  |
| 12 | writing before lunch.                              |
| 13 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: And you're                 |
| 14 | going to upkeep it or BJ's?                        |
| 15 | JESSE MASYR: BJ's will be                          |
| 16 | responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the     |
| 17 | esplanade. We will be responsible for the          |
| 18 | development of the esplanade.                      |
| 19 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Okay, if                   |
| 20 | we could have that in writing, that would be an    |
| 21 | issue-   |
| 22 | [crosstalk]  |
| 23 | JESSE MASYR:have it in writing                     |
| 24 | today, Councilman.                                 |
| 25 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Okay.                      |
|    |  |

| _ |          |       | -         |       |         |          |
|---|----------|-------|-----------|-------|---------|----------|
| 2 | Alright, | 77011 | kn∩w      | thic  | 1 0     | a —      |
| _ |          | you   | 12110 W , | CIIID | $\pm 0$ | $\alpha$ |

JESSE MASYR: [Interposing] And Council Member, if I might, I would also like to— as part of the letter—to give you and your members the assurance that not only will we be building it, that we will be building it with union labor.

COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Of course.

Greatly appreciated. I just want to—this is a very important project in my district. Once it passes, how long do you think before construction starts?

MALE VOICE: We have--our plans for the building are completed now, so once this passes, we will be filing for our building permit immediately. It's still going to take some time. There's a lot of work that has to be done on the site—the environmental cleanup—

## COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA:

[Interposing] Right. The cleanup.

MALE VOICE: --but that hopefully will start as soon as we get our building permit, we hope that that construction will start the next day.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: And what

| 1  | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 19           |
|----|--|
| 2  | is your expected date of opening?                  |
| 3  | JESSE MASYR: We would hope within                  |
| 4  | two years we would have a unit opened on the site. |
| 5  | MALE VOICE: From the time we start                 |
| 6  | construction from when the building gets turned    |
| 7  | over to us, it will take us about a year to build  |
| 8  | it.  |
| 9  | JESSE MASYR: Council, this is                      |
| 10 | Jesse Masyr again, as I said in my opening         |
| 11 | statement, we do have 28,000 cubic yards of        |
| 12 | material that first have to be removed.            |
| 13 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: I know                     |
| 14 | that site that needs to be cleaned up. So would    |
| 15 | it be open before December of '13?                 |
| 16 | JESSE MASYR: Oh yeah.                              |
| 17 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: That's                     |
| 18 | very important.                                    |
| 19 | JESSE MASYR: If not, there's going                 |
| 20 | to be-   |
| 21 | [laughter]   |
| 22 | JESSE MASYR: Well, I don't know                    |
| 23 | about November. You said December, Councilman.     |
| 24 | [background conversation]                          |
| 25 | COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: You know,                  |
|    |  |

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm out of office. I'm out of office. My Republican colleague over here. Okay. Like I said, this is very important to the community. It's jobs. It's all about jobs, and that's why it's very important to hire local. Local people come in, they relate to each other, and it's a really great opportunity. You know, I learned my lesson once before. I was a city councilman; I was on the community board. Home Depot came in and begged the community to be allowed to come in, and they made all these promises. They promised the world to the Coney Island community, and on opening day, the Assemblywoman Adele Carter [phonetic] and myself went there 'cause I just got elected, and there was like 200 people lined up waiting for the mayor, and we went down and asked each person where they came from. I could count on one hand out of 200 people how many people come from the Coney Island community. On one hand, I could count those people. It was sad. And Home Depot said they're going to do this in the community; they're going to do that. They don't even donate a can of paint for clean ups in Coney Island. It's a disgrace. From then on, I wanted

2.

| to make sure that when any new project that | 5    |
|---|------|
| they're going to be community-oriented and  | do I |
| have that obligation from BJ's that you'll  | be   |
| community-oriented, participate in communit | ΞY   |
| activities?                                 |      |

PATRICK SMITH: Yes, sir, and if you look at our history in New York City with our Adopt A School program and other things that we do in the community, I think BJ's has been a great corporate neighbor and will continue to be on this project as well.

COUNCIL MEMBER RECCHIA: Thank you very much. Alright, thank you, Mr. Weprin. I think I've taken up enough time. I encourage all my colleagues to vote aye. This is very important, and it'd be hundreds of jobs.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Recchia. Just before I get to the other questions, I see in the City Planning Report that at one point the Commission cites a letter that was written to the borough president from June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2011 agreeing to work with the community board, elected officials, DOT on traffic mitigation—do you know the letter I'm referring

25

Mr. Comrie? Chair Comrie?

| 2  | to? We don't have a copy of that doesn't                    |
|----|---|
| 3  | need it now, but if we can get it for later—a copy          |
| 4  | of that letter from June $16^{ m th}$ . I'd like to call on |
| 5  | Council Member Seabrook who has some questions.             |
| 6  | COUNCIL MEMBER SEABROOK: Thank                              |
| 7  | you, Mr. Chairman. Just one question—this is                |
| 8  | fantastic in terms of what you've done, but there           |
| 9  | was always a question that I raise when you're              |
| 10 | building these large complexes in these                     |
| 11 | communities—this issue of parking that people have          |
| 12 | to pay to shop, and I've had a real problem, and            |
| 13 | I've always said that to you. I got a real                  |
| 14 | problem with that people have to pay to shop—this           |
| 15 | parking.  |
| 16 | JESSE MASYR: This parking lot is                            |
| 17 | designed and it is the intention not to be                  |
| 18 | charging for parking. I'm getting tired of                  |
| 19 | getting beat up by you, Councilman.                         |
| 20 | COUNCIL MEMBER SEABROOK: Okay,                              |
| 21 | that's a big issue that I had—that people have to           |
| 22 | pay to shop. Okay.  |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you.                              |

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Good

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

morning. Can you detail the clean up—you said you have to clean up toxic materials. Can you detail how that's going to be done and what type of materials are at the site and whether or not you've had the proper EPA or review processes to determine what that is at the site?

ETHAN GOODMAN: Sure, as Jesse said, it's approximately 20,000 cubic yards of This is the material that was illegally material. dumped by a prior owner on the site forming essentially a - - around a lot of the perimeter of the site, especially on the end of the site. site is under a consent order with DEC that existed prior to the applicant's purchasing the site. And the site is being cleaned up in conjunction with both the city and the state regulations and that consent order. There are or will be restrictive declarations signed and recorded against the property to bind the owner to clean up the site pursuant to those agreements. All of this work will be done under the watchful eyes of the city and the state. Most of the materials-it's not-I know you mentioned were toxic materials; not a lot of the materials rise to the

level of hazardous materials, but they are contaminated and a lot of them cannot be reused on the site and have to be removed, so they will all be removed. We need to both get a notice to proceed from the city and state, saying that we have submitted to them a protocol for cleaning up the site, and it has to be in accordance with all their approvals. And then before we can actually build the store and open the store, we have to get a closure notice from them, which basically certifies that we've done everything pursuant to the - -.

CHAIRPERSON COMRIE: Once this berm [phonetic] is removed, will that be part of the esplanade area? What's going to be done to make sure that whatever was there doesn't either have leeched into the ground or has a permeable smell or anything that would come back to...?

planned for this site is both a vapor barrier to protect any residual vapors from coming up into the store. Outside, you don't have the issue of vapors as much because it doesn't get enclosed; it can actually be released. There will be some

2.

| vents around the site to make sure any methanes go |
|--|
| out into the air and don't get stuck anywhere, and |
| also, there will be-how many feet?                 |

MALE VOICE: Two feet.

ETHAN GOODMAN: Two feet of clean fill throughout—basically in all areas that are not paved. The grade will be brought down—two feet of clean fill pursuant to city and state — we brought on to basically perform a protective layer.

JESSE MASYR: Councilman, as you know—Jesse Masyr—none of this work can begin unless a health and safety plan is approved to ensure that people working on the site are not in any jeopardy from the methodology used to remove whatever the materials are.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And that plan has already been developed and approved?

ETHAN GOODMAN: Yes, it has. The health and safety plan is already in.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. And then, just one other question. Council Member Recchia was detailed in assuring about local hiring and you mentioned working with the

б

workforce in the community and also another group to ensure local hiring. Does BJ's have those relationships now or are they developing those relationships?

PATRICK SMITH: We mentioned
Workforce One, and the Councilman has some other
people in mind, and we're going to work with his
office to make sure that we get the widest
possible net cast in the local neighborhood to
make sure that the local people get the jobs.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And can you just explain for the public--I know that we met earlier—how you'll do the parking mitigation and the truck traffic moving in and out of the building, so that the public can know - - at the hearing?

need even further details than what I'm talking about, we can—John Clifford, the architect can talk about it. You'll see on the right side of the top image that blue area—those are all loading berths, and what the trucks will do is they'll come—the trucks will come down here along the service road. They will come in this entrance

here. They'll come in and back into these loading berths entirely in the enclosed area, not on the street, and when they're done, they can pull right out, and there's a second curb cut to allow them to come out. So there's no conflicting with the cars, and there's no conflicting with inbound and outbound trucks, and they'll all be entirely within the site when they unload.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And will you be working with DOT to do stop signs or traffic lights, so that the trucks can get in and out or the traffic can get in and out—the turns?

because of the flow of that street, we're not planning to put additional stop controls—stop or a traffic light over there, but we do believe because the width of the curb cuts and the ability for them to just pull right in just like the cars, that they'll be able to go in and out pretty much and still retain a free flow of traffic there. If in the future, there is any problem with traffic either here or anywhere else in the neighborhood, we have committed to one year after the store is open to go back out and have our traffic

| 2 | consultant do a follow up study to see where there |
|---|--|
| 3 | are any problems and recommend improvements if     |
| 4 | there are any                                      |

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: What's the width of accessory road? Do you know?

ETHAN GOODMAN: This road—

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE:

[Interposing] The main road that connects the shopping center and BJ's.

[background conversation]

essentially the total width of three travel lanes; they use on street parking for one of them, so there's always fully two travel lanes, and obviously to get in and out right in front of our store, we would have to remove—there wouldn't be on street parking there 'cause we'd need to get in and out and clear that area.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay. I would strongly suggest you try to get as much traffic mitigation as possible so that you can get an unimpeded flow of traffic in and out of the facilities just to encourage folks. Folks are driving faster and driving distracted more than

| 2  | ever, and the more you can assist them with        |
|----|--|
| 3  | getting in and out safely would be probably better |
| 4  | for you actually. I want to thank you for          |
| 5  | describing that for the committee, and then you    |
| 6  | said that the second floor would be retail or      |
| 7  | could it be a community facility if a retail       |
| 8  | doesn't work or are you focused on retail?         |
| 9  | ETHAN GOODMAN: Well, right now                     |
| 10 | with the M1-1 zoning, there is some community      |

with the M1-1 zoning, there is some community facilities that are permitted there as of right. They're fairly limited, so it's not the full range of community facilities would be able to put there as of right; we would have to go for further actions to get community facilities in that second floor.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay.

Alright. No further questions.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Comrie. I didn't mention that we were joined by Council Member Vincent Ignizio and Council Member Jessica Lappin. Does anyone on this side have a question? No? Anyone else? Anybody else? Well, thank you very much, gentlemen. We are going to close this hearing,

3

4

5

б

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

but we are not going to be voting today. We are going to be waiting to receive the follow up documents. Right, Mr. Recchia? And we'll probably be also voting on this item on Monday 9:30 before Council Member Comrie's Land Use

JESSE MASYR: Thank you.

meeting. So thank you very much, gentlemen.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. As they clear away, we are going to move up to our next item, which is Land Use numbers 475 to 477 inclusive. This is the 28<sup>th</sup> Street rezoning, which we have a PowerPoint presentation queued up, I see, so we'd like to call the City Planning representative, Adam Wolff, Brenda Levin [phonetic] is representing them, Douglas Woodward [phonetic] representing Edison Property, Douglas Woodward, Gary DeBode and Andrew Canter [phonetic] from Edison. If you have enough seats there-you may have to... This is a rare joint presentation of City Planning and a private developer, a publicprivate partnership. Yes. And operating the slideshow is Carolyn Grossman [phonetic]. Whenever you're ready, make sure again like I told the other panelists, please state your names

б

ahead.

before you speak each time you speak just to keep
the record straight. So however you want to
organize this public-private partnership, go

ADAM WOLFF: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman, members of the committee. My name is

Adam Wolff. I am the deputy director of the

Manhattan office at the Department of City

Planning and I'm here to present the Department of

City Planning's application for a Zoning text

amendment to create a new Zoning District—what

we're calling M1-6D. I'm also joined here by

Carolyn Grossman, our director of governmental

affairs, who is going to be helping me with the

slide presentation. Thank you very much, Carolyn.

So next slide please. Just to be clear from the start, as I mentioned I'm going to be presenting this first application. I am joined at the table by representatives from Edison Properties, who will be discussing two separate, but related applications. Essentially the Department's creating this new Zoning District. Edison Properties is the first applicant to utilize this—or proposing to utilize this new

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Zoning District, M1-6D, and they would be going for this Zoning Map amendment and will discuss this in further detail after I complete the presentation, and they also are proposing a special permit for a public parking garage.

Next. So to get right into this, I think that the background will also help explain some of the relationship between the Department and the applicant here. The origins of this district really start from a general understand of some of the larger trends that have been going on and some of the existing manufacturing zoning districts, which are located generally in the Midtown south area of Manhattan in Community District 5. These areas are outlined in red here. They're generally located between 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenues between 23<sup>rd</sup> Street and 31<sup>st</sup> Street. There's another little pocket further up as you can see here-just north of Empire State Building. And they sit generally between the Midtown office and entertainment and shopping core and also, some growing residential communities to the south of Chelsea in the 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor here. They are manufacturing districts today. Although, they

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't really function anymore as the traditional manufacturing districts as they were originally created for-mostly they're really become a reservoir-an important one at that-of class B and C or affordable office space, and yet, because of the zoning, they don't allow for other compatible uses, such as residential uses or the vast majority of community facility uses today. is just a slide showing some of the-the trends shown in... Carolyn, can you go back please? Just on the right hand side, this is just highlighting 2000 to 2009. On the right hand side, you can see employment kind of the decrease from the blue to the red in industrial sector employment, and then on the left hand side is the non-industrial sector, commercial employment, increasing, and this is a trend that's been ongoing. Actually, the area has done quite well. This is also just for the manufacturing zoning districts that I showed on the previous slide. In fact, over this period of time, the employment actually increased 7.3%, so it's doing quite well. At the same time, we have some what we think are some issues with the current zoning-next slide-which is kind of

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

epitomized by a lack of investment in these manufacturing districts. You have a prevalenceyou have a very old building stock [phonetic] for one. You have a prevalence of surface parking lots, lack of retail services, streets are relatively desolate and kind of chopped up with a lot of curb cuts, and especially at night, the area can feel relatively desolate. What you do see happening actually and what we have seen is a number of hotels being developed in these manufacturing districts-kind of a byproduct of the zoning, which allows for hotels, but not other compatible uses, and these hotels are often really set back from the street-15 and 20 feet. rise vertically without setbacks and really are out of character with the existing built context, which is more of this high street wall and articulated - - that you can see here on that There are some good things, we think, slide. going on here that we want to preserve and protect. This is the affordable office space district - - M districts. At the same time, we think the zoning can be looked at again and really improved to allow for potentially new compatible

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

uses, and sensitively do that in the sense of 2 protecting kind of the existing resources that we 3 have there.

It was against this backdrop that we were approached by Edison a few years back. They control a property, which is the small yellow rectangle here between 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> Streets, and between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenues and requested and wanted us to request ability to have residential uses on that site. And again, against the backdrop I just discussed, we agreed to look more closely at it, and quickly realized we didn't have a zoning district off the shelf that we could just put in place that would accomplish multiple goals and be sensitive to the fact that there is something here that is worth protecting and providing special regulations for. So we went into a more in depth study of the two mid blocks between  $7^{\text{th}}$  and  $8^{\text{th}}$ Avenue from 28<sup>th</sup> Street to 30<sup>th</sup> Street and looking into what was there on the ground and kind of howwhat the character was like and how we could craft the outlines of district based on analysis of that particular area. Just to show you on the Zoning Map, the area we're looking is an existing M1-5

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

district. It's 5 FAR [phonetic], medium density, manufacturing district. And the goals that came out of that study really are highlighted here on this slide; first and foremost, protecting the concentrations of existing class B and C office uses and light industrial uses. We also wanted to allow for the targeted residential development as we're doing that and where new residential uses would be allowed. In addition, promoting the creation of affordable housing was a goal of this district and clearly, where new development was going to happen, make sure that the development fit in with the existing context that was already there in this area, which is well-established and has some pretty significant buildings that we wanted to make sure were respected. And then overall, the goal was really about supporting a vibrant mixed use district, mixed use area, office—a live/work environment that is 24-7 in character, and you'll see that as we go through the use regulations of this district.

I'll just highlight the main ones - really about creating this mixed use
environment. Okay. So again, highlighting the

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

mix of uses, it will allow for a wide variety of uses in this district similar to MX districts. We'll get into the specific protections for existing concentrations of commercial light industrial uses, talk about how it will allow for residential development. Ground floor retail and transparency requirements and there is a special permit for larger hotels. I'll get into that, okay. So this is just a land use map of this two mid block area, showing-and it's pretty busy, precisely because there are a lot of different uses here. And so you can see already in this district there are a lot of uses. The zoning district would support this mix that's currently there that would still allow for commercial light industrial uses to locate in this area and it would also allow for targeted residential areas. Just to note that the gray represents surface parking lots; the red, commercial office, and then there's a mix between some of the others generally characterized as really a commercial office district, a class B and C office district with a secondary presence of residential and light manufacturing uses and surface parking lots. So

| in order to provide the   | protections for non-        |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| residential uses and the  | e regulations would         |
| actually require that fo  | or zoning lots that have    |
| buildings with more than  | 1 40,000 square feet of     |
| floor area, those non-re  | esidential uses in those    |
| buildings would have to   | essentially be one for one  |
| replaced if any floor ar  | rea in that building was    |
| converted or if the buil  | ding was actually           |
| demolished. The 40,000    | number was actually—I'll    |
| get to it later. It was   | s originally 50,000, but it |
| was modified during the   | process at the commission   |
| level, and the community  | v board and borough         |
| president had a major co  | omment that that be         |
| changed. By protecting    | those non residential uses  |
| in this two midblock are  | ea, we got approximately 80 |
| to 85% of all the commen  | ccial floor area and        |
| employment [phonetic] ir  | n those areas actually      |
| having protections on the | nem. On the flip side for   |
| residential use, everywh  | nere that's not shown in    |
| purple here And sorry,    | the purple lots are shown-  |
| those are the ones that   | are more than 40,000        |
| square feet. Where it's   | s not purple, that's where  |
| residential uses would k  | oe allowed as of right.     |
| Other uses would also st  | cill be allowed, as well as |

б

community facilities would all be allowed on the

other lots.

Quickly, about the ground floor retail would be required for 50% of the frontage for lots that have greater than 50 feet of frontage, and so this is just an example showing a 70 foot wide new development. - - zoning lot, 50% of that or 35 feet would have to have a ground floor retail use. The other 50% could be other things, such as lobby and community facility uses. Also transparency would be required—50% transparency for the full frontage of the building.

And then finally, the special permit for hotel use. As I mentioned, there are quite a--what we do see is there are quite--a lot of hotels have been developed. Here's a couple on West 28<sup>th</sup> Street between 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>—actually, 6th and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenues. And this special permit was really written into the regulations in order to make sure that hotels don't preclude residential development on those sites that are most suitable for such use.

So, you can move on to the next

3

4

5

б

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

slide. This is now going into the bulk regulations of the district. And so starting with FAR, the FAR for this proposed M1-6D district really reflects the densities that we see in this two mid block area. You can also see that we're just south of Penn Station here and the Midtown office buildings along 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue into the north. It's a relatively high dense area. On the previous slide, the green buildings—the dark green-showed all buildings that were above 11.4 FARs. We're talking about a pretty dense area. The FARs proposed would be 10 FAR for manufacturing, 10 FAR for commercial, 10 FAR for community facility and for new residential, this area would be included within a inclusionary housing designated area, so you would have 9 FAR base for residential, which could be increased to 12 through the inclusionary housing bonus. that bonus is essentially the same that we have for many other rezoning that the Department has proposed in the past and the Council has approved 33% floor area bonus for providing essentially 20% of the floor area for affordable housing. Again, units are required to be permanently affordable,

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and they can be on-site or in the general vicinity

of the area. Sorry, Carolyn. Move on to building

- - . That's fine.

In terms of building form again the idea here was to make sure that new development fit in with the existing context, which you can see from the slide on the right here having high street walls and strong bases and setbacks and articulated tops. And the regulations are quite complex to try to recreate in some manner in a modern building, but some of the features that you see in these slides here... It's just a couple more examples. This is actually a shot through the applicant's property looking to some of the buildings in the study area here in the proposed rezoning area-an image of the articulated tops. Go ahead, Carolyn. Thanks. Here's an image showing how the regulation would work. You would have an 85 minimum base height. Buildings would have to lineup at the street line. You'd have a maximum 125 foot base height. These are for narrow streets; these are the narrow street regulations. Above that, you'd have a sky exposure plane [phonetic] that requires buildings

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to basically be developed within that sky exposure plane up to a maximum of 15 foot setback and then it could rise to a maximum of about 210 feet. The top two floors would actually be required to be further articulated through what we call a "penthouse rule" and essentially pinched in on the sides. This was actually the lowest building height given the proposed density of 12 FARfitting 12 FAR into this envelope was very tight, and so it actually is a fairly tight envelope, and we expect buildings built out to 12 FAR to utilize some of these multiple setbacks and dormers [phonetic] and so forth. For wide streets, here's just another image showing what the regulations would allow on wide streets-maximum building height of 290 feet, 10 foot setback is required on wide streets and a little bit higher base heights. Also the text just to be comprehensive here has a provision for the existing M1-6 district that would require buildings to be developed to the street line and rise to a minimum base height of 125 feet and a maximum of 150 feet. This is a couple of images just showing how that rule would affect the west side of 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue between 28<sup>th</sup> and

2 30<sup>th</sup> Street.

The rest of it is about the public process to this point. There was unanimous approval from the Community Board 5. Also, the Manhattan Borough President approved this project. The main issue was really reducing the threshold for which protections for non-residential uses kick in. That was originally certified at 50,000 square feet and was modified at the commission to 40,000 square feet. There were some other modifications that were really proposed to strengthen the district regulations with an eye towards the goals of the district and furthering those goals. So I think that concludes my part of the presentation.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Council Member Garodnick has a question on the City Planning portion.

ADAM WOLFF: Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Very quickly—thank you—it looked like from your presentation that you were only looking to do M1-6D for that particular block. You're not proposing this for any other blocks in the area,

2 is that correct?

ADAM WOLFF: We are not proposing to map the actual district in any of the areas.

That - - be proposing the map and in these two mid blocks. Conceptually, I think--and the origins of the district come from more of a conceptual idea and understanding of what's happening in the other M districts as well—the M1-6 areas, which are further to the east and which were kind one of the first slides. It's not contemplated at this time to think about mapping M1-6D in those areas.

Further study would probably have to happen in order for that to occur, but I think it's contemplated that it's a district that may have some applicability in some of those areas.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: And in terms of these two mid blocks between 28<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> Streets, Edison does not own all of it? It impacts others sites as well. What will be the practical impact of a zoning change here? I understand that there's a specific proposal that we're going to hear about, but for the non-Edison properties that exist in this zone.

ADAM WOLFF: Well, I mean there are

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

other sites that are essentially surface parking lots, and I think Edison could talk to this as well. They prepared the AIS [phonetic] for this proposal, but it's likely that over time, many of those sites or some of those sites could be developed with residential uses as of right. There would be, again, protections. We don't expect, especially with the protections put in place, for the non-residential uses that those uses would remain. Hopefully, it actually creates an environment where investment into the existing buildings continue knowing that in fact those commercial office uses will be required to remain - - to the future. I do think you'll start to see an introduction of some residential uses; perhaps, some community facility uses, but you'll retain the existing kind of commercial presence that you have there, so the idea is at the end of the day you get kind of a mix of uses and a balance between the two.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Last question from me, and I'm sorry to interrupt all this, but you picked 40,000 square feet as the amount—the threshold—

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 ADAM WOLFF: [Interposing] Yeah.

3 CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: --for the

4 protection of the non-residential uses. Why did

5 you pick that number specifically?

ADAM WOLFF: Well, I think a couple of reasons; first, the idea was to capture the vast majority of the existing non-residential uses and especially the concentrations of those uses, so where you have large buildings for example that really can function as office buildings as a whole-and it contained today a concentration of those uses-wanted to protect those. Those buildings generally were above—the breaking point was around 40,000 square feet. By putting it at 40,000 and by creating that threshold there, you capture about 80 to 85% of all the existing commercial uses and about 85% of the existing employment. At the same time, we have other goals that we're trying to achieve, so we wanted to also allow for new investment and residential uses in areas and it'll make that some of the underutilized sites able to accommodate new uses such as residential uses.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK:

Thank

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr. Garodnick. Alright, we're going to move to Edison now. I'd ask them, if you could just do it as quickly as you can 'cause we are running up against the clock a little bit. Thanks.

GARY DEBODE: Okay. Thank you. Good morning, Chair Weprin, council members. My name Gary DeBode and I'm the president of Edison Properties. You may know us as Edison ParkFast or perhaps, Manhattan Mini Storage. We're also the developers of the Ludlow [phonetic], which is a rental apartment building with both affordable and market rate units down in the Lower East Side. In addition, we're the owners of the Hippodrome Building, which recently achieved LEED's Silver status after a significant renovation. We're excited to be the first applicants to be in M1-^D district. We believe it's a comprehensive and thoughtful designation, which makes great sense in this neighborhood in creating an innovative live/work environment. It will allow us to make a significant investment in this neighborhood and we believe will create vitality on the streetscapes

б

on both 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> Street. We're very happy to have received the unanimous approval of the community board, the City Planning Commission, as well as the support of the Borough President.

Aside from these good outcomes, we've had very comprehensive and productive meetings with the Land Use staff as well as the Speaker's district office staff, which has helped inform our plan.

We truly appreciate everyone's support in this application and I'd like to introduce Douglas

Woodward, who leads our planning team, and will present the details of this application. I respectfully request the approval of this application.

much. My name is Douglas Woodward. I will be very quick. Adam was very comprehensive, and I don't think you need a lot of detail on the background here. We did a substantial outreach, went to many elected officials, lots of community groups over the last couple of years and received fairly positive comments from just about everybody.

If we could turn to page 3 in the

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

handout in front of you, what that identifies in the red is the Edison site; it's a through block [phonetic] site between 28th and 29th Streets between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenues. It's a parking lot now with a parking garage on it; there are 130 spaces in the existing lot, 240 in the parking garage, which would be demolished for the construction of 2 new buildings. On page 4, you can see an artist's rendering—an architect's rendering—of an illustrative scheme for what those two buildings might look like. We're not sure exactly that this is what they're going to be, but the City Planning design controls are fairly tight, so we have a 210 foot envelope with 9 other height and setback controls, which mimic the full coverage commercial loft buildings in the area, so we will building very much in context with what exists. The next page, page 5, is something Adam went over. This is the M1-5 district existing and the changes that are on 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue for the other bulk controls. On page 6 you can see a very brief preliminary description of our development plan. We have about 30,000 square feet in this site, 210 feet for 2 buildings, M1-6D 407 units of which 82 would

be affordable, so this is adding considerably to the stock of affordable housing in the area.

Ground floor retail 4,500 square feet in part—
that's due to requirement by City Planning to have an active streetscape on 28th and 29th Streets. You can see that in the rendering here, which you'll see later in your packets as well. That retail will be adjacent to a lobby and to garage exits and entrances. We're also offering—there will be an amenity space in the middle for the building, which could also be commercial space, and that's about 11,000 square feet. The parking will be 325 spaces in two levels below grade; we currently have 371 spots on the lot.

Page 7, this actually speaks a little bit to Council Member Garodnick's question about what the effect might be on other properties in the area. We identified seven projected development sites for potentials sites to conversions, so there could be a fair amount of activity in these two mid blocks, and we studied these comprehensively as the reasonable worst case development scenario, which is what the AIS calls it, with a build year of 2019, so we think that

3

4

5

б

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

these developments could occur in 2019. I did extensive work with the community and with our consultants to make sure that there would be no traffic congestion, no issues with blocking the sidewalks or anything when these started to be built. One page 8, you can see what a build out of the development might be on the southern block. That's our development in gray with the yellow lettering on it. The developments in red are simply illustrative for what the other buildings, if they got built out, would look like. again, this is purely illustrative. There are no plans for those as far as we know. We're the only project that actually is assembled and ready to be approved. And for the northern block, you can see that on the next page on page 9. There were some questions about the context of the area. We think that the 210 feet, which we worked on with City Planning actually fits in very nicely with the general character of the area and you can see in the elevations on page 9 from 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> Streets that both buildings fit in terms of context, setbacks and overall height with the existing fabric. On page 11, there's just a detail of what

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

those height and setback controls would be. Page 12 shows a ground floor plan of what we would be doing. There is an entrance on 28th Street for the garage--here are currently ins and outs on both streets-and an exit and an entrance on 29th Street and a through block lobby from 28<sup>th</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> that would be connecting the two sites through a podium. There would be open space in the middle of the block, as well, 60 feet wide. Page 13 you've seen before. And just a very brief description of the parking facilities, as I said, we have 371 spaces now under an agreement with City Planning we asked for 325 and entrances on 28<sup>th</sup> and 29 Streets, but we're reducing the number of exits. We'll have only one at this point. And we're reducing the curb cuts significantly from 202 feet to 41, so that's an 80% reduction of curb cuts on the street. And then, we don't need to go into detail for the bicycle parking, but under the new City Planning rules, there have to be a lot of bicycles here. So those are the next three pages. That's the parking garage, which we studied extensively with City Planning. We think this will work well with the development and with the

б

2 other developments in the area.

As you know, we're across from the future FIT project, so we're very much looking forward to what FIT and we will do for the streetscape in this area once we get built. And then, before we take questions, just take a look at pages 18 and 19, where you can see how these buildings would conceivably fit into the overall context here.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Have there been any discussions with Madison Square Garden about the parking situation?

DOUGLAS WOODWARD: No direct discussions. No.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: I mean, just those of us who live far away and don't have public transportation easily accessibly even though this is a very accessible site, what happens to parking around Madison Square Garden? What is the final calculation of how much parking we end up losing around the Garden and in that area?

DOUGLAS WOODWARD: Well, there are several lots—the only ones that we really know are

DOUGLAS WOODWARD: And as a parking

company, we're all in favor of that.

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you.

|    | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 33          |  |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|--|
| 2  | Mr. Vacca?  |  |  |  |
| 3  | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Can I ask                   |  |  |  |
| 4  | just quickly what is affordable housing? What are |  |  |  |
| 5  | the income guidelines for the affordable housing  |  |  |  |
| 6  | apartments?                                       |  |  |  |
| 7  | ANDREW CANTER: Hi, Andrew Canter                  |  |  |  |
| 8  | with Edison Properties. It's assumed to be a 50%  |  |  |  |
| 9  | AMI for 20% of the building units, so it's a      |  |  |  |
| LO | standard 80/20 program.                           |  |  |  |
| 11 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: So what does                |  |  |  |
| L2 | that come to for a family of four? What do you    |  |  |  |
| L3 | computer? What does that mean?                    |  |  |  |
| L4 | ANDREW CANTER: It's just under                    |  |  |  |
| L5 | \$40,000.   |  |  |  |
| L6 | MALE VOICE: Yep. 36.                              |  |  |  |
| L7 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: So a family                 |  |  |  |
| L8 | of four who makes \$40,000 or less could get an   |  |  |  |
| L9 | apartment here?                                   |  |  |  |
| 20 | ANDREW CANTER: 36,000.                            |  |  |  |
| 21 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: 36,000 would                |  |  |  |
| 22 | be the tops?                                      |  |  |  |
| 23 | ANDREW CANTER: Yes.                               |  |  |  |
| 24 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: So a family                 |  |  |  |
| 25 | would have to make 36,000 or moreA family of      |  |  |  |
|    |   |  |  |  |

| 1  | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 56           |  |
|----|--|--|
| 2  | four?  |  |
| 3  | ANDREW CANTER: Or less.                            |  |
| 4  | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Or less for                  |  |
| 5  | 20% of the apartments.                             |  |
| 6  | ANDREW CANTER: Yes.                                |  |
| 7  | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Okay. Thank                  |  |
| 8  | you.   |  |
| 9  | DOUGLAS WOODWARD: And the                          |  |
| 10 | apartments would be the same mix as the rest of    |  |
| 11 | the building.                                      |  |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Mr. Comrie?                    |  |
| 13 | COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Um, I just                  |  |
| 14 | wanted to comment on the parking issue again from  |  |
| 15 | a different aspect, and this is the second project |  |
| 16 | that City Planning has sent to us where they have  |  |
| 17 | reduced the amount of available parking spots at a |  |
| 18 | property that would be able to take additional     |  |
| 19 | spots, and I'm concerned as their philosophy and   |  |
| 20 | practice. As you've seen from Edison's             |  |
| 21 | presentation, this area will become more dense.    |  |
| 22 | The surrounding city, the access to Madison Square |  |
| 23 | Garden allows the need to have the maximum amount  |  |
| 24 | of parking available, but yet the City Planning    |  |
| 25 | has sent us this proposal without the Council's    |  |

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ability to restore parking. I think that that's a process and a practice that needs to stop from the City Planning level because we need to make sure that outer borough residents, people from around the NYC metropolitan area can come and park at some place in the city. They can ride bikes after they get here, but they're not riding from Westchester or the Bronx or southern Queens. did when I was 16 and 17, but I'm sure not going to do it now. I don't mind sharing a bike when I get here, but I'm not riding from south Queens here even after we get in shape. We only had one member that did that—he lived in Flushing. He did it for about a week and quit. I just think thatand I don't mean to be flippant here, but I'm actually very upset because the Gotham Center project in Long Island City, where we needed parking for other residents in Queens to park in Long Island City, City Planning sent us the envelope without us having an ability to change it. Now this project where clearly Edison has been parking 371 cars and they would mind continuing that, they're forcing them to-they said it politely during the presentation-but they're

forcing them to take 325 spots when they were clearly parking 371 cars. They're doing more density in an area where more people are coming in. There's going to be a real opportunity for more density to come into that area, but you're eliminating parking. It doesn't make sense to me. I think it's bad City Planning, and I think we need to look at it as a committee and also as a Council to try to push back on this issue because they're going to cut off their nose to spite their face. I appreciate Manhattan residents wanting safe streets, but we need to allow commerce and tourism to fully take flight, and we need enough parking for people to come in, so that they can appreciate the city. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you,
Chair Comrie. Does anyone else have any comments
or questions for this panel or City Planning?
Okay. Thank you, gentlemen and lady. We have one
other person who wants to testify on this matter,
so as soon as they clear out, I'd like to call up
Kate McDonough from Community Board 5, who's here,
and she is going to be testifying in favor of this
change as well. Thank you. Ms. McDonough, you

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have a choice of seats there, and whenever you're ready, push the button and state your name and how you feel.

KATE MCDONOUGH: Is it on now? Yes, it is. Yes. Good morning and thank you, Chair Weprin, for this opportunity to speak to you and the committee members. I am Kate McDonough, a member of Manhattan's Community Board 5 and chair of its Land Use and Zoning Committee. I am here today to speak in support of the applications pertaining to the M1-6D rezoning in midtown Manhattan. At its June 9, 2011 meeting, CB5 voted unanimously to approve the three applications that are before you at this hearing. Our support is based on our long held and long voiced concern for the protection of class B and C office space for the city's small, growing and creative businesses and the M1-6D's district's explicit protection of these uses in buildings with more than 40,000 square feet. We also endorse the kind of mixed use development the M1-6D zoning district will facilitate, which we believe to be an important way to create and maintain economically vital and stable neighborhoods or as we often say, "having

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 the chance to turn parking lots into buildings
3 instead of the other way around."

Recent years have seen a disturbing amount of Manhattan's class B and C office space either replaced with new class A office construction or converted into luxury residential development, but if small, growing and creative businesses, businesses where residents from all five boroughs come to work--if they cannot find affordable office and industrial space, they will either no longer thrive or else they will leave the city. Our small businesses fuel our city's economy and create new jobs, but we need a place to turn on the lights and without some protection, that will be harder and harder to do. It already This is why CB5 has endorsed these proposals. They strike a thoughtful balance between encouraging mixed use and residential development, including affordable housing, while continuing to safeguard both commercial and light industrial use. It is notable I should point out that this zoning district will continue to have M status. The new M1-6D district will also give these blocks urgently needed contextual height and setback

regulations. We encourage the Department of City

Planning to continue to investigate in close

consultation with CB5 other areas in our district

where this approach might be appropriate.

If these applications are approved, we support plans by Edison Properties to construct a new residential development with approximately 407 residential units, one that Community Board 5 hopes will be constructed so to achieve LEED Silver certification. CB5 also supports the provision of a below grade public parking garage in the development and applauds Edison's commitment to pursue the inclusionary housing bonus that will set aside 20% of the building's floor area to affordable housing.

But despite our support, CB5 is concerned that by enabling as of right residential development, new M1-6D districts will create demand for and add to Manhattan's already overcrowded public schools and other stressed city services. We're particularly concerned that with the larger policy issue of school overcrowding.

According to the EAS, this action is projected by 2019 to increase school utilization for elementary

schools to 218.4% up from an already projected extraordinary 213.5%. While the metrics used by the EAS mean that the project's impact remains below actionable thresholds, it will still add residential development to a neighborhood where schools and other city services are seriously overburdened. The incremental effects of multiple rezoning, even if each is small and discreet, can have the same impact as huge single projects.

While there are no simple solutions, we should still try to improve the EAS process as well as find a way for the relevant city agencies to better coordinate to collectively address demands for services before residential units are added, not after.

CB5 is eager to play a constructive role in any such efforts. Thank you again for this opportunity to speak in support of these applications.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much, Ms. McDonough. Does anyone have a question?

Mr. Garodnick? Nobody? Mr. Comrie, Chair Comrie?

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: I don't have a question. I just want to congratulate Ms.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

unanimous consent. Mr. Jackson, I notice, did

compliment you as well. Anybody else want to run

for Manhattan borough president here or anything?

[laughter]

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: With that in mind, thank you very much, Ms. McDonough. let's recap. We're going to close this hearing, and here's what we're doing now. Just again to recap on the two cafés. Mezzogiorno Restaurant was withdrawn--motion to file pursuant to withdrawal. The Land Use number 468, Café Condessa, is laid over to our next meeting. will be voting on Monday at 9:30 in this room for the Boerum Hill rezoning, which is Land Use number 456 and other numbers, Boerum Hill rezoning. on the Brooklyn Bay Center, which is BJ's Wholesale Club, which we heard today, we will be voting on Monday, which is Monday 9:30 and again, in this room. Now the only item we are voting on today is the one we did the items... Alright, so we will be voting on allowing Mezzogiorno, submitting their letter pursuant to withdrawal and coupling that with the items we just heard on the 28<sup>th</sup> Street rezoning, Land Use numbers 475 through 477,

| affirmative, none in the negative and no          |
|---|
| abstentions, LU 475, 476 and 477 are approved and |
| LU 449, a motion to file pursuant to withdrawal,  |
| is approved and referred to the full Land Use     |
| Committee.  |

much, Mr. Hilton. A reminder, we are now going to recess the Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises until Monday at 9:30 in this room before the Land Use meeting, so please arrive promptly and we will vote on the two remaining items on that day. Thank you very much and everybody enjoy their weekend.

I, Kimberley Uhlig 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.

|           | Kimberley | Uhlig |
|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Signature | ()        | U     |
| Date      | 9/28/11   |       |