CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----X

October 3, 2011 Start: 10:10am Recess: 11:55am

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

BEFORE:

MARK S. WEPRIN Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Council Member Maria del Carmen Arroyo

Council Member Leroy G. Comrie, Jr.

Council Member Daniel R. Garodnick

Council Member Robert Jackson

Council Member Jessica S. Lappin

Council Member Diana Reyna

Council Member Joel Rivera

Council Member Larry B. Seabrook

Council Member James Vacca Council Member Albert Vann

Council Member Vincent M. Ignizio

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

Emir Dupeyron Owner Café Condesa

Anthony Magliulo Owner Mad Park

Jonathan Keller Special Project Planner Bronx Office of City Planning

Gifford Miller Principal Signature Urban Properties

Robert Frost Principal Signature Urban Properties

Ernesto Vela Architect Dattner/Architects

Ryan Singer
Deputy Director
Bronx Office of City Planning

Carol Clark Assistant Commissioner Housing Preservation & Development

Joshua Laird Assistant Commissioner for Planning and Parklands Parks Department

David Shuffler
Executive Director
Youth Ministries for Peace and Justice

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

Kelly Terry-Sepulveda Board Chair Bronx River Alliance

Elena Conte Organizer for Public Policy Campaigns Pratt Center for Community Development

2	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay, we're
3	going to get started. Who's here from the cafés?
4	Okay. Good morning, everyone. My name is Mark
5	Weprin, and I'm the Chair of the Zoning and
6	Franchises Subcommittee. And I'm delighted to be
7	joined this morning by the following members of
8	the Subcommittee: Dan Garodnick, Vinnie Ignizio,
9	Chair Leroy Comrie, Larry Seabrook and Joel
10	Rivera. We're also joined by Maria del Carmen
11	Arroyo, who has a project that's in her district
12	on the agenda. We're going to start out with two
13	cafés. The first is Land Use No. 468, Café
14	Condesa. Condesa. And we're going to ask Emir
15	Dupeyron, is he here? Yeah. Sorry, I don't think
16	I got your name right. Dupeyron. Close enough.
17	At least, maybe not for you, but for me. [laughs]
18	Please go to the mic, state your name for the
19	record, and describe the application that you're
20	seeking.
21	[pause]
22	EMIR DUPEYRON: Hi, this is Emir

EMIR DUPEYRON: Hi, this is Emir Dupeyron, my name is Emir Dupeyron. Your Council Member Christine McQuinn, Christine Quinn. This letter is, as our agreement with the Chair,

Council Member Mark Weprin, and the Council Member
of the Subcommittee of Zoning and Franchise, that
we will be committing to the following. Number
one, we will reduce the size, the size of our
sidewalk café from three tables and seven seats to
three tables and six seats. Number two, the
westernmost table will be reduced from 22x42
inches to 24x12 inches. Number three, an
additional chair will be added to the middle
table. Four, these changes will be reflected and
revised plans will be submitted to the New York
State, to New York City's Department of Consumer
Affairs. If they have any questions, you can call
me on my office. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you, Emir. I have a letter that you, stating what you just read.

EMIR DUPEYRON: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: I understand Speaker Quinn's office is okay with these changes to the application. And I'm wondering, anyone on the panel have any questions for this applicant? Seeing none, thank you very much.

EMIR DUPEYRON: Thank you, have a

Τ	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 6
2	good day.
3	[pause]
4	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: All right.
5	We're now going to call up Land Use No. 484. This
6	is SD 26, from Speaker Quinn's district. And I'd
7	like to ask Anthony Magliulo [phonetic], come on,
8	come on up. [pause, background noise] No. Have
9	a seat. Please make sure the mic is on. State
10	your name for the record, and then you can
11	describe the application for the café.
12	ANTHONY MAGLIULO: Thank you.
13	[pause] Well, thank you very much. We
14	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: [off mic]
15	State your name, please.
16	ANTHONY MAGLIULO:are very
17	grateful that you are considering to give us the,
18	the permit to, for this perfor the outdoor café,
19	in front of
20	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: [off mic]
21	State your name for the record.
22	ANTHONY MAGLIULO:and state
23	what?
24	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: [off mic]
25	State your name again.

2	ANTHONY MAGLIULO: My name is
3	Anthony Magliulo. I'm also known as Tony May, and
4	the business. Magliulo was too tough to
5	pronounce, so [laughs] I went to chand now I
6	think we met with the community board and we
7	agreed to some stipulations. These stipulations
8	have been revised, revisited, by the, this
9	Council, your midtown office. And a letter that
10	we will sign and send later on to your midtown
11	office, will state that we will set up the café
12	according to the plans approved by the New York
13	City Department of Consumer Affairs. Two, we will
14	remove the two planters currently located outside
15	the restaurant entrance, and within the proposed
16	sidewalk café zone. Three, we will instruct our
17	wait staff to direct smoking patrons to move east;
18	meaning to move away from the residential
19	building. Four, we will have a metal sign located
20	on the right of the restaurant entrance, that ask
21	a smoking patrons to move east again. We will
22	only, in other words, we have the wait staff
23	telling them to move away from the residential and
24	the restaurant to smoke, if possible, and we do
25	that verbally as well as on a sign that we will

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	place on the right side of the entryway of the
3	restaurant. Five, we will mark the boundaries of
4	the sidewalk café. We have a metal stanchion
5	already planned but we will also mark the sidewalk
6	where the boundaries are of the sidewalk café.
7	And six, we will reduce the operating hours of the
8	sidewalk café to Monday through Thursday, from
9	11:30 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., and Thursday through
10	Sunday from 11:30 to 11:00, and Sunday, noon to
11	10:00 p.m. So, hopefully, this is satisfactory to
12	this Council and we get an approval.
13	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Great, and
14	you'll give a copy of that letter to the Sergeant-

at-Arms, so we all have it. This is in Speaker Quinn's district, and we understand that, with discussions, thank you for that lien. I just got the nod that they are in agreement with this letter. Not a moment too soon. So, thank you very much, Tony. Anyone have any questions? ANTHONY MAGLIULO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: No? Okay. I guess not. Okay, well, thank you very much. ANTHONY MAGLIULO: Thank you very

much.

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES
2	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: And thank you,
3	and just make sure to give a copy of that letter
4	to the Sergeant-at-Arms. [pause, background
5	noise] Good. All right, we're going to move up
6	to the rest of the agenda now. We're now going to
7	call on the Crotona Park Rezoning and Text
8	Amendment. It's Land Use Nos. 485, 486, 487, 488,
9	489, 490. And 490, that's it. And I'd like to
10	call on the following people to please come up.
11	[pause] Mr. Miller, actually, I was just asked if
12	we could do the other item first. Would you mind
13	terribly? [background comment] All right. I'm
14	always the last to know, what can I say? It was
15	good to see you, anyway.
16	MILLER: [off mic] I'll be here all
17	day long.
18	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: [laughs] And
19	there'sAll right. We're going to switch gears
20	now and go to the next, last item on the agenda,
21	which was 4Land Use No. 491,
22	Williamsbridge/Baychester Rezoning. I'd like to
23	call on Ryan Singer from City Planning. He's
24	doing this one?
25	MALE VOICE: Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. And
3	Jonathan Keller. And they're joined by Caroline
4	Grossman. All right, gentlemen, I apologize to
5	all, for my, taking people out of order here.

Whenever you're ready, you know the drill.

JONATHAN KELLER: Thank you. I'm Jonathan Keller from The Bronx Office of City Planning. This is the Williamsbridge/Baychester Rezoning proposal, which is, if, guess I'll wait till you guys get the presentation. [background comment] All right, it's 181 blocks, full or partial blocks, in the north central Bronx Community Board 12. As you can see on slide two, the rezoning area is bounded by The Bronx River Parkway to the west, Co-op City to the east, East 233rd Street to the north, and East Gun Hill Road to the south. Some of the neighborhoods in, surrounding it, are Wakefield, Owensville, Baychester, Co-op City, Pelham. The area has ample public transportation options. There's a 2 and the 5 train elevated subway on White Plains There's a branch of the 5 train in Baychester. Number of buses crisscross the area near the Bronx River Parkway, New England Thruway

in the area, as well. The study area land use,
what I tell people mainly is that this, this, the
only consistency in this area is that it lacks
consistency. In the eastern portion of
Baychester, it's mainly single family, two family,
detached homes, smaller one-story homes. As you
move west, from Laconia West to White Plains Road,
it increases in density, but it's also a large
mixture of housing types. You have single family,
two family homes, and multifamily apartment
buildings. Moving west to The Bronx River
Parkway, it's even, gets denser, there's seven
story apartment buildings, as well. Although
there are a couple of pockets, as we'll see later,
of single and two-family detached homes. The
existing context and pictures, on slide five, you
see there's some of what has happened in the area.
There's detached single family homes next to eight
story apartment buildings. I won't walk you
through all of them, you can look at them.
There's, on page six, the existing zoning is
dominated by R4, R5 and R6 districts. Quickly, R4
districts have a FAR of .9 and a maximum height of
35 feet. R5 districts have a maximum FAR of 1.25

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and a maximum height of 40 feet. However, they do have provisions for higher densities, called infill densities, which we'll get to later. R6 districts have a maximum FAR of 2.43, without any building height limits. There are also R71 and CA1 districts in the area. The existing context, based on what I've just said, it's a stable residential working community, ample transit options, the corridors are primed for new opportunities, and there are good, there's a good mix of formal and informal social services and private businesses in the area. However, zoning has not reflected the reality on the ground, it's inconsistent along the major corridors, it's created disjointed development and it's unpredictable, and it hasn't created human scale on the major corridors. And the infill FARs I'll talk about has a lot of out-of-context development in the lower residential areas. Therefore, the proposed zoning seeks to preserve the unique neighborhood context, encourage growth along wide streets and around transit hubs, and also update the commercial overlays, virtual strength in the residential side streets, as well. The proposed

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

zoning districts, this is the overview. I won't, we'll get into the details as we flip to slide ten. R4 and R4A, there are three R4A districts in the Baychester neighborhood. These are only oneand two-family detached homes. R4 districts in Williamsbridge and Baychester are, allow all housing types in both have a maximum FAR of .9. Slide eleven, proposed zoning R5 and R5A, two R5A districts are proposed west of White Plains Road in the area that I said is more dense. These are two pockets of mainly one- and two-family detached They're larger one- and two-family detached homes, with the maximum FAR of 1.1 R5 districts are proposed in the Williamsbridge neighborhood, with this has a maximum FAR of 1.25 and a maximum building height of 40 feet. districts are proposed along Bronxwood Avenue and Laconia Avenue. It has a maximum FAR of two, maximum building height of 40 feet. The existing zoning on either side ranges from R6 to R5 or R4. And this also has another component which we'll get to in just a second. R6 and R6A, these districts are mapped in the Williamsbridge neighborhood. R6As are along East Gun Hill Road,

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

along Carpenter Avenue, between White Plains Road and Carpenter Avenue, and East 233rd Street. an R6 district along White Plains Road. districts again have no height limit. This will allow, along White Plains Road for developers to adapt to the externalities of the elevated train. And the R6A districts of, do have a height cap, and this will be in the residential areas of 70 feet. Lastly, an R7A is proposed below 218th Street, around the transit hub of the 2 and the 5 train. There's a Metro North stop in the area, as well. It's a very wide street, 90 feet on either The picture you see there is just the side. northbound traffic that has a maximum FAR of four. A maximum building height of 80 feet, and unlike north where we are proposing R6 is a wider street, and so the R7A will actually make, encourage the development to have a consistent street wall and create a human scale for, and to foster a walkable neighborhood here. What I was alluding to earlier, the infill FAR that the R4 and R5 districts in this neighborhood have allowed for, the R5D districts are basically taking the, this infill provision away, making the base FARs be the

only FARs that work here. So, this area in the middle, Paulding, this R4 area today has a 1.35, essentially FAR, but under the proposed zoning will have a .9. And lastly, we are updating the commercial overlays and we are also adding, I believe, five new overlays, where existing commercial uses exist today, but do not have overlays. And decrease in the depths of the overlays from 150 to 100 feet to preclude commercial encroachment on residential side streets. And that is all. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much. I'd like to now call on Council Member

Larry Seabrook, because he wants to describe his opinion on this subject. Before I do that, Larry,

I want to welcome Council Member Diana Reyna from Brookleens, that's Brooklyn and Queens. Council Member Seabrook.

COUNCIL MEMBER SEABROOK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I certainly want to commend City Planning and The Bronx unit. We had the opportunity to go over, this has been a long running discussion as to how and what had to take place, and it was tremendous,

with the community there was an outcry for years
and years to deal with this, and then we saw this
explosion of, of developers coming in and just
doing what they wanted to do within each and every
block, and just disturbing it. I'm not one who
believe that we should preserve everything that
should be preserved and no development shouldn't
take place. And I think that the City Planning
did a good job in terms of pushing all of the
development on the White Plains Road area to allow
that, and I was in support saying that we need
housing units and affordable housing and
everything else, and I'm in full support of this,
because they've dealt with all of those issues and
concerns. So, they've done a fantastic job. The
only thing that I think that, that has nothing to
do with the zoning but the conversation is don't
say that there is ample transit options [laughs]
'cause you could never tell the people in Co-op
City
JONATHAN KELLER: [laughs]

COUNCIL MEMBER SEABROOK: --that

there are ample transit options, and people who

live down in the valley in terms of getting, they

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have to get the jitney buses and everything else to get around. So, that's about it. But you all have done a fantastic job, and I commend you, and I am in full support of this, which has taken place. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Seabrook. Does anyone, after hearing that glowing endorsement, have any questions for these gentlemen from City Planning? No? It's pretty glowing, no? That was pretty glowing. All right, well thank you very much. Look at that, how easy that was. Thank you, gentlemen. You can take your charts with you. We're ready to go? Any other delays? We got the commercial? All right. Now, once again, I'd like to call on the Crotona Park group, again that's Land Use Nos. 485 through 490, inclusive. I'd like to welcome back Gifford Miller, literally and figuratively, yes. Robert Frost, Ernesto Vela, and Nick Hawkins. I also want to acknowledge the presence of two other former members of the Council, Melinda Katz and Ed Wallace. And they are here, too, for advice and if we need it. And what's the other thing? Gentlemen.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 MALE VOICE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Welcome. And whenever you're ready to proceed. Just state your name for the record.

GIFFORD MILLER: You know, there. [laughter] It's been a while. First of all, thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee for that nice welcome, and it is indeed a pleasure to be back here with, with all of you. I, I want to take a moment just to introduce my, my partners here, and our team, a little bit more. This is Robert Frost, he's my partner at Signature Urban Properties, we are the principals of this effort, and as developers we hired, we think, one of the finest urban architects in the world, really, Dattner, which is doing fantastic work in The Bronx, in particular at Via Verde and many other places, and we have Ernesto Vela here, who's part of our team, as well as - - and Nick Hawkins is our Land Use counsel, and of course also as you pointed out, Melinda Katz and Ed Wallace, who are former Council Members and wise advisors in this effort. You know, it's good to be back and see you all. It's, what I've been doing for the last

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

five years is to try to take some of the work that we did here and apply it to the private sector. And my efforts, and Robert's and my efforts, as partners has been to try to identify opportunities for more affordable housing. We believe strongly that this is a City that has tremendous need for affordable housing. And I know when I was in office, and I know all of you, it's really, you know, if it's not the number one concern that you hear, it's, it's way up there, right? People need to be able to afford to stay in this City. so with quality housing. And so our desire and our intention and our focus over the last five years has been to try to identify areas of the City where we believe that there could be opportunity for the development of that high quality, affordable housing. And, and to our mind, I think we've found a terrific opportunity here, in Crotona Park East and West Farms. an area, I don't know whether we have the aerial here, we can just give the aerial, just to give a sense of exactly where it is. Obviously, Maria and Joel are extraordinarily familiar with it, but this is an area of The Bronx and of the City that

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

has tremendous transit. The 2 and the 5 and the 6 lines are all within a couple of blocks of the proposed rezoning area, and also a significant number of schools, some of which are right on the shoulders of the area, couple--one of which is actually in the industrial area. And what we were looking to do was to find something like this, and what's there today, unfortunately, is an industrial area which is significantly underused, which is nonperforming and not meeting the needs of the city, and is unfortunately a drag on the community around. And what we tried to do was to start, and we were successful, I think, in starting a very collaborative process, working with the community boards, working with elected officials, working with the Department of City Planning and with nonprofits like the Mid-Bronx Desperadoes, and we have Derek Lovett who has been working with us on this, who's here from the Mid-Bronx Desperadoes. And to complement the work that, that those groups and the City and elected officials have been doing in this area over the last several decades, to really do an extraordinary job of stabilizing and improving

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this area, but to take this one last stretch of industrial area where there is very, very little activity and unfortunately some of the activity that's there is of an undesirable kind, as you get when there's not a lot of activity in an area. And to turn it around, and turn it into something that's of tremendous use to the community, and ultimately to build an exciting new development. I want to thank all of the elected officials, the Borough President, the community boards. We're very pleased to have been able to work collaboratively with them and to have their very, very strong support. I want to thank DCP and HPD, who have been very thoughtful and helpful, and, and we're very excited to be here. I'm going to, I want to say one word on the subject of labor, 'cause I see some of my friends from organized labor that are here today. We have had a very constructive and open dialogue from day one, with the building trades. And, and I appreciate their openness and thoughtfulness with which they've pursued this discussion with us and I think they appreciate it, and I know they appreciate the openness and thoughtfulness with which we pursued

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the discussion with them. We, we don't have, what we have, you know, is preliminarily designed buildings, and we're pleased to show you what we think, and we're going to be able to unveil further detail here of our, of our proposal. don't have schematic drawings that allow us to go out to bid and to be able to get real numbers, we don't have a construction partner yet. We're in the rezoning process, as you know this is a rezoning application with a number special permits in order to permit the type of affordable development that I think is in, in everybody's interest, and that the community has been so strongly in support of. But because we don't have those kind of specifics, we're not at the point yet where we're able to open it up to really have a real meaningful, specific discussion on the, on the economics and the feasibility of using building trades. But what we've committed to is to, is to, as we go forward, have that very open and meaningful dialogue, to be clear about the economics, and to work together to see whether it's feasible within the constraints of the HPD and HDC programs that we intend to develop this

affordable housing with. If it's feasible, we're certainly going to be working towards being able to do that with the building trades. So, I want to thank them for their openness, the leadership has been terrific, and the rank and file as well, and we really appreciate their, their constructive involvement. And going forward, look forward to that being also part of that in that very open and hopeful air. Now, I want to now introduce my partner, Robert Frost, who's going to take you through some of the more specifics of the actual project, and then we'll hear from our architect in a few minutes. Thank you. Robert.

ROBERT FROST: Thanks, Gifford.

And thank you all. You all have, I think, in front of you a handout, and I'm not going to flip through it page by page, but I do want to describe the project just a little bit for those of you who are less familiar with it. On the properties that we control, we're very excited that we're going to be able to build about 1,300 apartments in ten separate buildings. In addition, the proposal includes about 46,000 square feet of local commercial retail space, to support that housing,

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

as well as to activate the streets where these buildings will be, and to provide amenities and jobs for the residents there. In consultation with the community, with elected officials, with the Borough President, we have, we always had planned on having open space, and we've been able to expand on that. If you want to see more detail on that, you can refer to page eleven in the handout. But specifically, what we've done is in our original design, was to have open spaces dividing up these very long blocks. The blocks especially from a 174th to--sorry, from 173rd to 172nd, and then from 172nd South are 600 feet long. And people can get somewhat abandoned as they walk down those blocks. So, working with City Planning, we were able to design these open space corridors which both bring in light up into the surrounding community, as well as allow people to pass through, those are areas that we'll maintain. We've also added, and you can see a nice, a nice rendering on page seven, of how these will connect to West Farms Road, you'll see there's a lot of natural rock in this area, and we've designed staircases that will allow people

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to pass from Boone to West Farms, thereby further activating the West Farms area. In addition, and you can see this, this is in the southern area, what we call the southern area. In the middle of the southern area, we've designed and will maintain and build a public playground, that'll be for the, both for the residents of the buildings that we're proposing, as well as for people in the area. And working with the School Construction Authority, we've committed to provide a 530 seat school, should the SCA determine that that's necessary. And we'll effectively sell it to them for a dollar. That's noted in here as Building 3C. And, and so we're pleased to have been able to work that out. Just as a general description, we, we refer to this as being in two different areas, what we call the southern area and the northern area, it's basically divided by the Cross-Bronx Expressway. We do not control all the property in this area, but the entire area is being rezoned. Of the buildings that we propose, we think that it's going to be built over time. We know it'll be built over time, in about a seven to ten year span. And we're committed and have

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

heard lots of very constructive commentary from the community, and again from elected that to have a mix of affordability here. Virtually all of the units will be, certainly the first two buildings, will be built within affordable programs, but that, as you all well know, can be defined in different ways. So, our first two buildings, one is a LAMP program, which is a lower income program, a 60 percent AMI; the other building is a NUHA [phonetic] program, we're targeting an 80 percent AMI as the maximum AMI rent. The, we also believe, and we're excited that, as we've studied this in the EIS, that because this is a not very robust industrial area today, that the construction of these buildings will actually create permanent jobs, and they'll be permanent jobs that, that people in the, in the community, people who live in this community, can have. There will be building operations jobs, there will be local retail jobs, and the like. So, we anticipate, and the EIS projects, a net increase in jobs of 140 jobs in this area. And finally, I just want to discuss before I turn over to, to our architect Ernesto Vela, from Dattner, how excited

б

we are to have them on the project. As Gifford
mentioned, Dattner is at the leading edge of
design of affordable housing and affordable
housing with an environmental and green component.
We anticipate and plan on building these buildings
to what's known as the Enterprise Green Community
Standard, which is the, for lack of a better term,
the lead standard for affordable housing. And
Ernesto can discuss some of that in greater
detail. And, and that's it, so I'm pleased, we're
very pleased, on behalf of Gifford and our other
partners, to be here today, and I'm going to turn
it over to Ernesto.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Ernesto, state your name again for the record.

pour time, I'm Ernesto Vela, I'm with

Dattner/Architects. We're very excited and

committed to this project. We've, as Robert was

saying, we just are about to complete Via Verde,

which is going to be an exciting project in that

it provides both sustainable and healthy living in

a range of affordable housing opportunities.

We're completing Cortland Corners, just recently,

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

just a little bit north of Via Verde, at 161st Street. And Cortland Crescent which is also next to Cortland Corners is going up soon. And these are projects that are in the same spirit as Via Verde. Specifically with West Farms, Gifford and Robert's mission to us was to create a project that was both outstanding housing and affordable. And that it provided an enlivened street both at West Farms and Boon Avenue, streets that are, have very little pedestrian traffic right now. Also, to connect West Farms, which is--sorry, let me just go through the generals and to connect West Farms road back to the community, which has been sort of disconnected right now because of the industrial area. And to provide quality public spaces for the community abroad. And, sorry, the community, broader community, and, and the tenants, the future tenants in the building. Going a little bit more specifically on the plan, if you turn to page, page three, which shows the aerial view of the proposed massing, the challenges with the site were that these are very narrow blocks, also very long, they're, as Robert was saying. There's a significant grade change

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

from Boone Avenue to West Farms, about 20 feet at some points. And there's a large rock outcropping that is on the southern portion of block 3014, which is 172nd Street and Boone Avenue. solutions to these challenges and in collaboration with the Department of City Planning, we looked at orienting the, the greater massing along West Farms Road, and creating an urban edge along the Sheridan. Then the massing steps back down to, to Boone Avenue from 15 stories, down to five six stories, a scale that's more in keeping with the, with the res--existing residential neighborhood to the west. The buildings are organized around courtyards, and in between these buildings, you have the mid-block open spaces that Robert was referring to. These spaces will have stairs that connect you down to West Farms, they'll be publicly accessible, and they'll have entries to the residential buildings at that point. You can also see the, I guess on the southern portion of, again, of 30, of Block 3014, the children's playground. We've tried to do the massing as varied as we can, to give the buildings a sense of more organic growth. And we'll see those as we go

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

through the renderings. If we go to the next board, which is, this is a view of Boone Avenue looking, looking north. With the existing conditions, industrial building, very little, very little pedestrian traffic. If we go to the next board, it'll show you, Boone, sorry, it's page five, should be following that. It shows you the, the midblock open spaces. You know, you would be able to have use of the, of both Starlight Park and the river, to the east. You would, I think you can see the entries at the midblock, and along the, along Boone Avenue you would have the school and retail, ground floor retail. This image shows a little bit more of the, sort of this massing as it steps down to, to Boone. If we got to the next slide, or image, it's looking along West Farms, looking north. And you can see Sheridan to the right, and you can also see the large rock outcropping on the left. And we proceed to the after view. It's looking the other way, it's looking south. This is page seven. And this is sort of what the proposed massing would be. You can see the two open spaces, one close and one at the very end of the buildings. You can see the

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

varied massing, the variations on the street wall. And you can also see the rock outcropping. the plan is to incorporate it both architecturally and also into the landscape so it becomes a feature as you walk up these stairs to, between Boone and West Farms. And now we'll go to the, the north site. This is across the, on the north side of the Cross Bronx. You can see the West Farms Squares just a little bit to the north of our properties. You can see also 20s, the existing Housing Authority Towers, 20 stories plus. And the concept for these where it's very similar for these buildings, was to mass them around courtyards, with the taller portions along West Farms for -- the courtyards would have parking underneath it. And it, if we go to the next slide. This is the view right now, as you look up West Farms. Industrial buildings, some open lots. You can see West Farms Square, sort of at the end of the end of the street where the elevator track is, and the Housing Authority Towers. And this is the view, as it would be after, defining the street wall, still giving it variety. Also, varying the massing and enlivening the ground

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

level with retail, that would connect back to WestFarms Square. So.

GIFFORD MILLER: Well, thank you, Ernesto, and thank you for all the work that you've put into this, and I think it's, I hope you'll agree, it's a very thoughtful and exciting design that they developed. I just want to, in closing, and I know we're going to have an opportunity after the City speaks to come back and answer questions, and I really look forward to having that chance. I just want to call attention to the members of the Committee, again, that this is a, this is a proposal that has been significantly improved over the last several years, this is an example of why we go through such a thoughtful and sometimes it's seemingly lengthy public process. But it really has resulted in a better proposal in a number of ways. One, is just the attention on activating the streets, one of the comments and thoughts that we got from the community boards and, and others, was, in trying to make sure we enliven both Boone and West Farms, and that's around trying to bring some retail down, so actually that we did expand

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the retail opportunities along West Farms Road. Here in the northern section you see the example, it would be local retail supportive of tenants and tenants' uses, but and also will serve to activate the streets. Also, another concept that was raised as part of this process, which we've incorporated, was, as Robert mentioned, the linking of stairways through the open spaces so that there's an opportunity to break up these blocks and have better connections between West Farms Road and Boone. The school is another example. I think this is a, I hope this, I think it sets a new standard, and I think it's a good standard for it to have, for an affordable housing proposal, to, to set aside land and to work with DSCA, so that DSCA--and I want to just explain how this works. This development is not going to be built overnight. It's going to take a number of years. And it's phased in. And so, the way that the work to deal with this school works is that we'd set aside the last site that we would develop, and therefore the school's Department of Education can, and SCA, can monitor the utilization of the schools right up until the

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

point when we reach the very last one of our developments, so that if there is overcrowding, there still is this opportunity for them and they can then take the site down from us for a dollar. And if there's not, we will build a daycare facility on that site, and if there isn't, if it isn't justified. So, I think it's a win-win, and I appreciate the SCA and the community's strong work on that, and look forward to working with them on that. Similarly, on open space, we have, we've done two things, I think, which I know is an area of concern, it's an area of concern for us, as many of you know, I get my Parks activism at home. Honestly, the, the old fashioned way, from, and have been an active Parks advocate for a long time. We've done a number of things in this proposal to try to address open space issues, as Robert men--first we're going to have two beautiful open spaces which will be designed by America's foremost public garden designer at no cost, as she's agreed to volunteer her services. But also, we've agreed to design and construct and maintain a children's playground, in order to try to address the active, open space issues, as best

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we can, within the financial constraints of what an affordable housing development can do. beyond that, I'm pleased that the Parks Department, as part of the EIS process, has agreed to, and similar to the way that the school's proposal works, to be reviewing as, as our development gets built, to be reviewing the impacts upon open space, after the first couple of buildings, and after the next couple of buildings. And all I can say is that we stand very ready to work with the community and with elected officials and other to try to be as active as possible in finding funding as we go forward, to address that. There's a limit to what we can do within the context of our, of our particular development, but, you know, all of you know me. committed advocate and that, and can be a persuasive guy, and I'll be working hard with you and with the Parks advocates and the Department to try to make sure we get as much resources into this community as possible. So, with that, I look forward to having the opportunity to come back I and few minutes and answer your questions, but I think now I'm supposed to cede the floor, is that

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 36
2	correct, Mr. Chair?
3	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Well, we could
4	go either way. If you think it's best to have the
5	City testify and then you come back
6	GIFFORD MILLER: I tend to
7	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN:which is
8	best for the Committee, I think.
9	GIFFORD MILLER: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Yes, which?
11	[laughter]
12	GIFFORD MILLER: I think that
13	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Well, it's a
14	multiple choice question. We could have you
15	answer questions now or if you think it's better
16	for us to hear what the City has to say for our
17	own edification.
18	GIFFORD MILLER: We think it's best
19	that thewe'd like to give the City an
20	opportunity to say a few words.
21	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay.
22	GIFFORD MILLER: And then I'll be,
23	I'm not going anywhere, so
24	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay, great.
25	GIFFORD MILLER:plenty of

2 opportunity.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: So, I'd like to then call up for the City, Department of City Planning, Ryan Singer, Joshua Laird from the Parks Department, and Carol Clark from HPD. In the meantime, I want to acknowledge the presence of Council Member Robert Jackson and also I'm sure the applicant would agree, Council Member Jessica Lappin, who has raised the bar on representation of the councilmanic district No. 5 [background comments] especially since there's a vote pending, and want to welcome her as well. Gentleman and lady, whenever you're ready.

[pause, background noise]

RYAN SINGER: Good morning, I'm

Ryan Singer, I'm the Deputy Director of The Bronx

Office of City Planning. I would note that DCP

would not normally testify at a City Council

hearing on a private application like this, but

this is a unique project. It is the largest

private rezoning in The Bronx, we say in decades.

We actually, we could say ever, but we're not 100

percent sure on that, so we think it's in decades.

The scope of the project is large, it's akin to an

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

area wide rezoning, like the Webster Avenue rezoning that the City Council voted on in March. The Crotona Park East project will allow an eleven block area to redevelop with a projected 2,635 units of housing and over 100,000 square feet of commercial and community facility space. City Planning worked very closely with the applicant to craft the proposal that takes advantage of the area's natural topography and respects the surrounding neighborhood, and takes a holistic approach to the planning for the future of this area, The Bronx. We encouraged the applicant to rezone a wider area in order to fully address the needs of the surrounding stable, residential community. Schools and parks were thought about to help transform this marginal industrial area, that's prone to legal activities, into a part, to be a part the existing vibrant neighborhood. housing with retail and community facility uses will bring much needed eyes on the street and provide affordable housing, local services, and open space in the Crotona Park East neighborhood. This is why both the community boards and the Borough President saw the wisdom in supporting

this proposal, and why the City PlanningCommission approved it as well.

CAROL CLARK: Good morning, I'm

Carol Clark, Assistant Commissioner from HPD. As

we've heard, this application that's before the

Council today proposes to authorize disposition

and approval of a UDAP designation of a 13 square

foot city owned parcel on a block which one of

eleven blocks of otherwise privately owned land.

That land is the subject of a series of privately

sponsored ULURP applications. HPD is the

applicant for LU 490, the subject of which is a

disposition site located at 1525 West Farms Road.

HPD proposes to dispose that property to an

adjacent leasehold owner for future development of

affordable housing, which has been described here

this morning.

JOSHUA LAIRD: Good morning, I'm

Joshua Laird, Assistant Commissioner for Planning
and Parklands with the City Parks Department.

We've been working closely with City Planning and
the applicant on the seeker review and ULURP
application for this project. From our
standpoint, there's a great potential benefit to

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the rezoning. Over the past decade or so, we've invested over \$140 million in The Bronx River. view the future residents of the rezoning area as constituents of The Bronx River. So their presence bodes well for our investment over time. We did not during our review that if the full implications of the rezoning area are realized, both the development planned by the applicants here today, as well as other future building sites that are included in the rezoning area, that there would be a drop off in the open space ratio for the area, that's obviously a concern for us, but as Mr. Miller indicated, we think the best approach is to monitor the neighborhood over time, keep up with our investments on The Bronx River. We've identified a few projects that have the potential to increase Park capacity in the area, and as the years go on, we will work with the applicants and with you and the administration to try and make additional park improvements in the area. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay, so this is how we'll work it, we'll ask questions of the City panel first, and then we'll bring back the

2 applicants for extensive questions later on.

3 Council Member Arroyo I know had a question for

4 this panel.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Thank you,

6 Mr. Chair, as I'm not a member of this

7 Subcommittee, but of the larger Land Use

8 Committee, I appreciate you giving me the first

9 crack at asking you, well--You're statement and

10 understand that the concerns I have raised about

11 the application stem from the environmental

12 impact, or the lack of sufficient open space. And

the impact that that would have on the community

14 long term. And the question I always ask myself

is, do all these agencies really work for the same

16 Mayor or not? That you've been working closely

17 | with the applicant or City Planning, yet we are

18 okay with recommending approval on a project that

19 would render a community already shorthanded on

20 open space, to approve a project that would

21 increase that impact, that negative impact. And

22 while you guys have done really phenomenal work in

23 certainly The Bronx around the parks and the

24 redevelopment and bringing our parks up to the

25 standards that other boroughs enjoy, I'm concerned

2.

about this long term impact, and the commitment to
monitor. And at what point do we get a commitment
in terms of funding for not only capital
improvements, but the ongoing programmatic funding
that would be required?

JOSHUA LAIRD: Some of the projects that we have indicated could--

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: And your colleague from City Planning should feel free to answer the question, as well.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Just state your name again for the record, because we got to be able to keep track.

JOSHUA LAIRD: Sure, again this is

Joshua Laird from the Parks Department. Some of
the projects we've indicated could alleviate the
additional residents using local parks are in fact
existing park sites that are underutilized now,
and there's no reason why we shouldn't begin
thinking about how to fund improvements to those
sites, regardless, frankly, of what happens in the
rezoning area. There's never a bad time to invest
in parks. So, I think that's part of the answer.
There are some schoolyards in the area that have

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the potential for conversion as part of our Schoolyards to Playgrounds program. Again, there's no bad time to explore with the schools and with the community whether those are desirable projects. And then lastly, I'd say one of the, you know, the great things about the adjacency of The Bronx River is you have Starlight Park right there, but The Bronx River itself and the greenway are a corridor through which there are connections to some of the really great parks of The Bronx that are just outside the rezoning area; Bronx Park to the north, Soundview Park to the south. And as our continued investment in the greenway is realized, those connections will be there for both existing residents and future residents of the area.

RYAN SINGER: Yeah, I'd echo what Joshua said, is that when we do these technical analyses for the environmental review, that we look at, we define a study area and then the problem is, is we don't, for example, this particular study area, included part of Crotona Park. But as everyone knows, that when you go into Crotona Park, you don't stop walking and

2	using the park simply because you've, you know,
3	reached your half mile radius of the rezoning
4	area. People from this, from these buildings will
5	use Crotona Park and they'll use the entire park.
6	And so there is some deceptiveness in the numbers
7	in our environmental review. But when those
8	numbers
9	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Explain
10	that.
11	RYAN SINGER: Okay. So, we create
12	a study area that's a half mile radius from the
13	study area. And when it touches a park like
14	Crotona Park, we only count the portions of that
15	park that are within the study area. It's math,
16	it's technical, it's, it doesn't make much sense,
17	to be honest, but
18	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: But so, the
19	environmental impact on the, or the open space
20	mitigation, is a pointless conversation?
21	RYAN SINGER: No, no, no.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: I'm not
23	clear.
24	RYAN SINGER: No, we create these,

this number to try to quantify these things, but

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it doesn't capture the full use of all of the resources, is all I'm saying. But when we got these numbers, it is a gut check, it is a, "Well, what do we do with this? What does this mean?" And so we turned to Parks and we talked to them about possible resources, properties that they own and the--and they identified a number of areas where they could suggest mitigation. And so, we worked with them and talked to them about what those might look like, and the applicant agreed to inform them of different, you know, when their applicant agreed to inform them when they reached various milestones in their development process. And so then Parks could do an assessment of the open space in the area, and then suggest mitigation. For us, that led us to think, "Well, this is, this is starting to come together, we can find a solution forward with this, and work with, continue to work with Parks. So that's how we, you know, from our, my agency's perspective, we approach these open space issues.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay.

That's a long explanation, neither one of you answered the question. How do we, moving forward,

۷	when we vote this application out, Gillord is
3	happy, the development begins, and over time, over
4	six, seven years, where are the milestones?
_	Where or how many units are developed and then

Where, or how many units are developed and then triggers a review or an assessment to determine what Parks mitigation will occur?

RYAN SINGER: From my standpoint, that's the, there's an agreement between Parks and the developer, and I, they need to speak to that agreement.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay.

[laughs] Threw you under the bus. [laughter]

JOSHUA LAIRD: I mean, I think the first milestone would be when the first, when the first buildings are ready to go in the ground, which I believe under the review are estimated to be over a decade away, not six or seven years away. And at that time we would look at the, we'd look at the population pressures in the area, we'd look at the number of units going in at that time, and we would, we would make an assessment about how critical additional park space may be, and we would take appropriate action. But as I say, you know, that assumes that we wait until they move

2.

ahead with their project. I think, you know,
given all of the organizing we've done in the
area, and the tremendous work of The Bronx River
Alliance, there is existing excellent, keep
improving on parks in the area. And I don't
think, I think, you know, the project itself may
create some additional demands, but I don't think
we would wait, necessarily, for those to occur to
say that we'd like to improve Daniel Boone
Playground or the avenue lots that we have that
have never been improved.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Okay, so,
Mr. Chair, given that I think no one at this table
will be here at that point, I need something
better than that. So, I'm going to leave it
there. I think you--

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: You don't mean on the planet, you mean just at the table there. [laughter]

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Who knows, at this table, will not be serving in this body. So, I, you need to do better than that, in order for me to go back to my community and say, "I'm okay with this," because Parks and City Planning,

and HPD, since you're all in such great support of this project, have made a commitment, as the City agencies, I think the developer has worked with everyone concerned, has heard the issues, but then places the responsibility of the open space mitigation really back squarely on your shoulders. So you need to do better than what you've done here today. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

want to get back to the other panel, if that's okay. So, I want to thank this panel. You may want to stick around just in case something comes up. So, I'd like to call back our panel, our applicants. As was mentioned, this rep-this area is represented by two Council Members, Council Member Arroyo, as well as Council Member Joel Rivera. And I know Council Member Rivera wanted to make a statement on the record before we get started with questions. So, Council Member Rivera, whenever you're ready.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First I want to thank everybody for being here at the table today, and having the discussion. I want to thank Signature

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Properties, Gifford and Robert and the entire time. I want to thank the advocates that are here from The Bronx River and the members from the building trades who are here today. I've had the opportunity to sit down with all the parties and today is actually a day we get to move forward. Whenever a big project comes, you know, before me in my district, my main question is, "Does the district need this type of project?" And the answer in this case is yes. The reason being is the number one issue that is always presented in my office, in the district office, which is actually not too far from the proposed rezoning, is affordable housing. The median income within my district is \$21,000 per year. So affordable housing is something that's extremely necessary, and also dilapidated housing. Unfortunately, some of the housing stock that's currently in existence within the 15th Council District, is dilapidated, needs to be rectified. There's too many violations within HPD for some of the buildings that currently exist. So residents of the 15th Council District in my belief deserve the opportunity to live in a new, clean environment

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that something like this would bring to the table. It's 1,300 units of housing that would be a huge benefit to my district, and I believe the neighboring districts as well. There are always issues, there's growing pains, but if you look at the actual site today, it's a desolate area, where unfortunately if you pick up the news articles over the past couple of months, there has been prostitution cases within the area, there's been drug dealing happening within the area, there's also been a shooting not too far off from the So, what can we do as a City to prevent that type of situation -- is the microphone on? What can we do as a City, you know, to prevent that. We can find the best possible use--is it on? We can find the -- just want to make sure it's going into--just want to make sure it's going in for the record. I don't think any of the mic's No? Is it recording? So what can the City do ... Testing, one, two, one, two. Okay. what can the City do, you know, to help prevent some of these types of situations? We can find the best use for this land, and this development just bring along the best use for it. I hear the

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

concerns from my colleague and I think there are legitimate concerns when it comes to open spaces, and I commend Gifford and company and the Parks Department for their commitment to work together to try to find ways to best deal with the increase in utilization of parks. We always invite more people to come into parks. We want to make sure it's maximizing, want to make sure it's nicely developed, and we want to make sure there's always programs taking place. And I will, for the next two-and-a-half years, continue the conversation with the Parks Department to make sure that we can do that. So, in a nutshell, my support is there for this project because it will increase the availability of affordable housing, it will bring something positive to an area that unfortunately has seen too much negativity, and will, you know, give an opportunity for the residents in my district to live in clean, up-to-date apartments that is not roach infested, rat infested, you know, infested with lead paint or asbestos, or mold and mildew. It's a great project, I want to thank Gifford and company again for their openness for the past several years, working with the

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	community boards, working with the local
3	advocates, working with the elected officials to
4	make sure that we can get a project that makes

sense for this district. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Mr. Miller, do you want to address the issues that were raised by Mr. Arroyo and by Council Member Rivera?

GIFFORD MILLER: Well, for--I think, I think partially just - - I share very strongly the views that we need to do everything we possibly can to improve the parks. I think that there are elements of our proposal that are good for the parks, there's no question in my mind at least, that replacing what's there now with the, with eyes on the Starlight Park is a quality, is a quality improvement for Starlight Park. I think we've made a pretty unprecedented commitment to open space for an affordable proposal in terms of the children's playground and the open spaces that we provided. But, it always is important for the City to be using its dollars wisely and equitably, equably, equitably? I don't know the word, I'm sorry. [background comment] Fairly, thank you, Council Member, fairly. But,

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and also thoughtfully and I think it's fair, I think it is fair to say that this is a project and a proposal that's going to take some time. And that we can't solve all of the problems today for the future, 'cause they're not even problems yet. The open space mitigation in terms of the active, in terms of the standard in terms of the ratios won't change until we've actually built several buildings. And so, the proposal that we've made with the Parks Department is to, and to maybe be a little bit more specific, it's when we go to build the second phase of buildings. Because there, even with the, after the first phase of buildings, there would be no impact according to the EIS and the active open space ratio standards. And it is certainly true that there are qualitative issues that you can take into account, as well. But it's when we go to build the second phase of buildings, which take time, by the way, I mean, everybody here knows it takes 18, 18 to 24 months to build buildings of this size and scope. So, according to the restrictive deck, we are obligated to advise the Parks Department when we go to begin the preliminary design of the second phase of

buildings. And that would still give the Parks

Department two years before, before those

buildings even come online. So, it seems fair to

me to be looking at this as a phased approach, and

what I can say is I'm committed to working with

you as a, as somebody who's going to be a part of

this community, I very much want to make sure that

we address these issues, as well, and thank the

Committee for its focus on it, and thank both

Council Members for their very long and thoughtful

involvement in improving this proposal.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Well, thank
you for your open-mindedness on these issues, and
I want to commend you on this ambitious project,
with, you know, a transformational aspect to it
throughout the neighborhood. Mr. Comrie you have
a question or a comment? Chair Comrie.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Both--both actually. I just want to commend the team for what you're doing here. A couple of members did ask if the project is actually going to look like this and still be affordable, if it's, with the amount of glass and open space looking in there. And hopefully the designs that are up-to-date are

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

actually the designs that will be implemented, so-

GIFFORD MILLER: It's a great question. The answer to that question is, "Yes," we're committed to buildings like this. Now, and we're committed to providing quality open space. That ain't easy, this is a challenge. I want to be very clear, bringing this development to fruition will be, you know, every bit as difficult as it has been to bring this rezoning [laughs] for which, taken a little longer, and cost a little more than we had planned. But we're committed to the work. And the other, I think you can, you can take some comfort from the fact that the, these are the kinds of buildings that Dattner has designed and built just a couple of blocks away on Via Verde. And this is what we're committed to. This is why, you know, we've, we spent the last five years working towards this, and we're absolutely committed to make sure that it is this kind of quality development.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And just for the sake of the--

25 GIFFORD MILLER: And can I just

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 make one other point?

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Yes.

GIFFORD MILLER: The other thing I think is that, that's related to that is, unlike a lot of times, you know, when I was in the City Council, and I'm sure all of you, you have affordable housing developments that come into your district, it tends to be like a one-off, right? Somebody finds a site, it's in the middle of a block, it's on the edge of a block, they build a building, and then they go somewhere else and they build something somewhere else. critical to the success of this entire development proposal that this work. That we can't build the first two buildings and then have them not, you know, and then walk away. We've got eight more to go. This is going to be a development that's going to take seven to ten years. The programs that the, at the HPD and HDC are going to change during that period. The, and so, I think all of these issues that have been raised are connected. If we don't make it work so that it's a quality place to live for the first several buildings, the next buildings won't be financed and won't work.

2	So, we are sort of not only, and I think you take
3	comfort from the commitment and the history of our
4	team, in terms of what we've done when we say what
5	we'll do, but you can also take some comfort from
6	the fact that we, we have to do it, or else we
7	won't be able to be successful with all the
8	different, other buildings.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And just
LO	for the edification of the public, that is
11	listening or may be watching, what is the numbers
12	for 60 to 80 percent AMI?
13	ROBERT FROST: Specific rent
L4	numbers?
15	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Yeah.
L6	[pause]
L7	GIFFORD MILLER: You mean the rent,
18	rent rates, right?
19	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Yeah, rent
20	rates.
21	GIFFORD MILLER: We are, we're
22	looking that up, because we want to be precise,
23	maybe we could take another question and come back
24	and answer that question while we look that up, is
2.5	that all right?

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 58
2	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Mm-hmm,
3	sure.
4	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay, we could
5	do that. Council Member Reyna has a brief
6	question.
7	[background noise]
8	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I won't take
9	offense.
10	GIFFORD MILLER: Well, I, well, you
11	know what, we now have an answer even, we have an
12	answer, we happened to get the numbers in front of
13	us, so
14	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay.
15	GIFFORD MILLER: Robert?
16	ROBERT FROST: So, these are the,
17	from the last published HPD term sheet, these are
18	actually the 2009 levels and they may have
19	adjusted slightly. But the 80 percent AMI for a
20	studio, the rent is \$872.00; a one bedroom is
21	\$1,098 of monthly rent; two bedroom is \$1,322; and
22	a three bedroom is \$1,527. The 60 percent AMI,
23	which is the maximum rent that would be in the
24	LAMP project, a studio is \$731; a one bedroom is
25	\$781; a two bedroom is \$942; and a three bedroom

3

4

5

б

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is \$1,087. And those are the maximum rents that would be charged. There are lower rent levels in each of those buildings, too, the way those programs work.

GIFFORD MILLER: And let me just note that one of the things that we've been very clear with and I think it's been good, is that there's been great agreement between the community boards, HPD, ourselves, is that we, we do believe there needs to be a mix of incomes in terms of this development, as we go forward. We want to see some low income, of course, because there are a lot of folks out there who are struggling and who desperately need housing like that. But we also want to see some more moderate income, as well, because there are a lot of moderate income folks that are struggling, as well. And you need a mix of that in order for this development to work. I want to bring it back again to the point that I was making before, which is unlike other type proposals like this, if we don't make the first two buildings work, no one's going to live in buildings three through ten. And so it's very, very important that we get that mix right, and

24 GIFFORD MILLER: Council Member.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: --make sure

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	that I understood, there's a percentage of City
3	owned land and there's a percentage of private
4	owned land, is that accurate?

GIFFORD MILLER: In the, in the area?

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: As far as this application is concerned for rezoning.

GIFFORD MILLER: We have a very--a court--within our--we own about 215,000 square feet of land. Within our 215,000 square feet of land, as we did our due diligence on our, on our proposal, it became clear that there was twelve square feet of rock that the City still owned. Because the sites, the southern sites that we own, that are next to Sheridan Expressway, used to be ordinary sized blocks. But the, but when the City came in and built the Sheridan Expressway, for better or for worse, they cut in and took over portions of these blocks, making the blocks narrower. And apparently, there was one of the historical lots that they seized in order to build the expressway and the, and West Farms Road, which is today basically a, sort of an access road for the Sheridan--when they seized those, there was

2.

apparently a historical lot that, you know,
must've looked, look like this is our block, there
was a historical lot like this that came in like
this and had just twelve square feet of the rock
outcropping that's along West Farms Road. So, one
of the appone of the, one of the items that's
before you is HPD has proposed to dispose

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: UDAP.

UDAP, to dispose of that directly to us for the market value of those twelve square feet of rock.

Which we're hoping we'll be able to afford.

[laughter] But, but for all practical purposes, it's really, it's a, and this is, to my astonishment, sort of a more common thing than one would think. There are these very small lots that the City holds, that are as of new use to the City, and it's just twelve square feet, and basically—So that's why it's really, I would describe it as more of a technical point than anything else, although we're appreciate of HPD's cooperation and their support for what we're trying to accomplish.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And the, the

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 63
2	twelve square feet that you referred to is not
3	buildable land.
4	GIFFORD MILLER: It is buildable.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: It is
6	buildable.
7	GIFFORD MILLER: We plan to build
8	on it. We're going to build on that rock, we're
9	not going to build, we're not going take the rock
10	out.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Mm-hmm.
12	GIFFORD MILLER: Because
13	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: It becomes
14	part of the foundation.
15	GIFFORD MILLER:because if we
16	take the rock out, there's no, there's no
17	development.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Mm-hmm.
19	GIFFORD MILLER: But it will become
20	part of the foundation and this means that we
21	don't have to sort of arbitrarily set the building
22	back
23	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Right.
24	GIFFORD MILLER:and that one,
25	it's literally like a 3x2x3

2 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Right.

GIFFORD MILLER: --square - -.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA:

[interposing] And my last question is related to the number of studios in the two buildings. So, if you could just give me the number of units broken down by studio, one bedroom, two bedroom and three bedrooms.

gifford Miller: We don't have that yet because we don't have fully designed buildings, and we haven't gone through—we're still on the rezoning process, so we don't have fully designed buildings. But I can tell you that it is our anticipating in the first, in the first couple of buildings, which we've proposed to HPD, it's, we would have ... it would be somewhere in the neighborhood, for 237 units, we would have, we would propose something like 14 total numbers of studios, 68 one bedrooms, 147 two bedrooms, and eight three bedrooms. So, a predominance of two bedrooms, a very minimal number of studios. Our goal here is for this to be a place, not a transient population—

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA:

Right.

_	
2	GIFFORD MILLER:but a stable
3	population of families. And as I said before, I
4	mean, now those numbers could change slightly, as
5	we, as we go through
6	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Mm-hmm.
7	GIFFORD MILLER:the process of
8	fully designing the buildings and working with
9	HPD. But I would say studios, we don't, we
10	haven't heard a lot of call for studios
11	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA:
12	[interposing] Well, I wouldn't recommend it, I
13	GIFFORD MILLER: Right.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: You know,
15	just my own experience as far as land use
16	applications and the affordable housing movement,
17	and a lot of these projects that are engineered to
18	apply for funding that only approves or
19	incentivizes approving more smaller units, as, you
20	know, a mechanism to be able to receive the
21	funding.
22	GIFFORD MILLER: Right.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: The issue is
24	that we're leaving out what is a demand
25	GIFFORD MILLER: Right

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 66
2	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA:for family
3	units. And so, I wanted to ask this question.
4	GIFFORD MILLER: Thank you.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I see you're
6	on the right path.
7	GIFFORD MILLER: Thank you.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I think you
9	can improve.
10	GIFFORD MILLER: Mm-hmm.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And I hope
12	that that is a conversation that you continue.
13	GIFFORD MILLER: I am
14	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Because
15	you're on the right track as far as decreasing the
16	number of studios and one bedrooms, and it would
17	be very helpful, I'm sure, in a community where
18	more families are looking for affordable housing
19	units, to be able to be accommodated.
20	GIFFORD MILLER: Right.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you.
22	There's a lot of thoughtfulness here.
23	GIFFORD MILLER: Thank you.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Between the
25	school, the open space, clearly it's not enough
	,i

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and I know that our Council Members are going to be working with Parks Department to deal with those issues. The mechanisms of trying to put together all these elements builds a community.

GIFFORD MILLER: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And it's not just about housing. And I appreciate that. Thank you.

GIFFORD MILLER: Thank you. very much agree and again, the same point I was trying to make before, but I think it's just, it's worth it to keep pounding in, which is we can't, we can't build a one-off with a bunch of studios in order to maximize our return. And I agree with you, this is, I remember being with many of you and struggling over the way the incentives work, so that there is more money that goes for studios, which doesn't make sense, right, because it should be based on the number of people, not the number of units. But it is what it is. But that said, I think HPD has been terrific about recognizing the same issues that we have, and we're very much on the same page. This is not, can't be a transient development, we can't do this just once, we have

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to get a development together that really is about permanently improving this neighborhood. frankly, the first couple of buildings, this is going to be a challenge. You know, this is an industrial area, and it's not a, it's not a good one, right now. And so, the first couple of buildings, they're going to be pioneers, and we have to have, you know, people that are really committed to the neighborhood, we got to have retail that meets their needs, we got to have enlivened streets, that's why we worked very hard. And one of the, one of the elements of the application before you is to break up those blocks. Because as people know, you know, these are 600 foot long blocks. It's very, very long blocks. And so by breaking them up, you know, people are often loathe to walk down a 600 foot block if they know that they don't have any, they got to commit to all 600 of those feet. COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Right.

GIFFORD MILLER: Right? So that's part of the reason, part of the application is to break those blocks up. So we're very much committed to it.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And I just wanted to make sure, Gifford, as far as the area is concerned, this is not an industrial business zone.

industrial business zone. When you, and we did a very careful block-by-block, door-to-door analysis of the jobs in the area. What jobs there are in the area, and there aren't many, the ones that are, the primary employers are actually what I would describe as more like satellite employers. There are a couple of ambulance dispatchers, for example. So when you look at the numbers in the EIS, it looks like there's a, there are 40 people working there, but 38 of them are in ambulances, you know, all over the place. There's actually one person there with a phone.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Mm-hmm.

GIFFORD MILLER: So, we believe that, you know, work can be done, and certainly we don't want to lose those jobs, but there's also a lot of vacancy in the area and most of the jobs are in those two, the middle blocks, the Department of City Planning asked us to make part

of this application, where we don't control any of the property. So we're talking about potential development that is way down the road. And is, I think, very highly, highly relocatable and recoverable. And I just want to say that, as for our ability to improve, you know, many of you know my wife, she makes me painfully aware of my ability to improve on a regular basis, so I concur with your point on that.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you, Gifford.

much. Okay, I think we're going to excuse you for now, and we'd like, if you could keep the charts here for a little while, 'cause we do have a panel who have concerns about this project. So, if you guys, we can excuse you guys, and we're going to call up the following people in opposition to this plan. Elena Conte, Kelly Terry-Sepulveda, and David Shuffler. This three panels [pause, background noise] Elena, you think, how long your presentation? How long would you--three minutes? All right. We're going to put everybody, we're putting each of them on a three minute clock,

then, now that you've volunteered that amount of time. We don't want to, without warning ahead of time. I know, you could've said ten, I don't know what I would've done. So, Jerry, we'll give 'em a three minute clock each. And then we'll ask some questions if there are any. You guys can choose who goes first. Please state your name for the record and describe where you're from, and as concisely as possible, your opposition. Okay, can we have quiet, please, in the room, and whenever you're ready.

DAVID SHUFFLER: Good morning. All right, here we go. So, good morning, my name is David Shuffler, Shuffler's spelled S-H-U-F-F-L-E-R. Thank you, first and foremost, for this Subcommittee on Zoning to listen and hold this public hearing on the Crotona Park East/West Farms ULURP. Again, my name is David Shuffler, I'm the Executive Director of Youth Ministries for Peace and Justice, which is a community based organization, located just blocks away from the proposed Signature site. Youth Ministries was founded in 1994, primarily to work with young people in their neighborhood. The major

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

highlights that we have were mentioned today, I heard things about Starlight Park, which is a result of twelve years of community fight and struggle. We also heard about Concrete Plant Park, which is another park that was driven from a community based project. I'm glad to say we've added over 33 acres of waterfront park space to this neighborhood in The Bronx. Signature Group has been very clear about the, these improvements, and the importance of how their development project could capitalize on the fact that these new parks are in the neighborhood. I will say we've been in a lot of discussion, both with the Signature group, even just until, up until last But like I said, there are some concerns that we have. So, I just wanted to just highlight a few of those. Starting with the open space, and as we know, there are going to be some impacts around open space with the added units that come into the project. It's great to hear that Signature is open to really looking at those, the mitigation towards park space going forward. that's really good. We do think that it does fall pretty short, right, I mean, what was very clear

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

today was that, that there weren't answers to many of the questions that you all had. It's very clear that there are more discussions that need to have, so I encourage the City Council when thinking about moving this process forward, the questions that you ask and the answers that you receive, do those two things jive with each other? The second piece that I wanted to bring up was the affordable housing piece. I wanted to just highlight that this project is a mixed use project. Many of it does rely and have some affordable housing units, but a lot of it is also not affordable. So, Council Member Rivera, I know a lot of it falls into your neighborhood, and you talked a little bit about how important it is, the need for affordable housing in our neighborhood. But I also want to encourage you as the local City Council member to look at the amounts of affordable housing as it relates to the project. When we heard Signature talking about 60 percent or 80 percent of AMI, those numbers drastically look different when you look at the [time bell] swaths of land in our neighborhood. So, I'll just wrap up now by saying, again, if you all are going

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to move this process forward, I really want to
encourage you all to get answers to the questions
that you all asked today. Rent levels is very
important, terms of affordability is very
important, mitigation towards park space is very
important. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much.

KELLY TERRY-SEPULVEDA: Thank you, good morning. I'll try and be, read as fast as possible. My name is Kelly Terry-Sepulveda. I am here today in the capacity as Board Chair of The Bronx River Alliance. So, good morning, and again thank you, Chair Weprin and Council Members for the opportunity to speak today on behalf of the Alliance. The Bronx River Alliance serves as a coordinated voice for the river and works in harmonious partnership to protect, improve and restore The Bronx River corridor, and the greenway, so that it can be a healthy, ecological, recreational, education and economic resource for the communities through which the river flows. And we do this by working alongside, you know, many of you and the public agencies here, but we

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

do have a different voice and a different responsibility, as community based advocates. So we applaud the changes Signature has made in response to concerns for community residents and elected officials, including the provision of a school in the proposal, the addition of a small playground, and capital renovations of existing parks. I've been told that I've actually credited them with that, before it's like actually anywhere in the restricted deck, so I'm giving them credit. [laughs] As well as the, you know, as well as several mid-block crossings. So, with all of that said, and that is great, with all of that said, I'm here this morning to share some tough, unresolved questions and concerns in regard specifically to the open space aspects of the action. But as my colleague David has mentioned, it's not just, you know, confined to those things. Levels of affordability, all of these things, there are some outstanding questions. So, we hope that the Subcommittee will utilize the fullest time allowable under ULURP, and we know that this has already been a long process, to address these concerns and additional concerns expressed by our

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

colleagues here today, before voting on this action. So, in terms of the adverse impact rezoning will have on the greenway, and the new parks alongside it, including Concrete Plant Park and Starlight Park, it is really about the ratio of not only open space, to non-open space, in an area that has, up until recently, had the least per capita park space residence, but it's also just about the type of space. So, active space versus passive space, that we need to be really concerned about. Also, we need to point out that the, that the application, I believe, relies, in order to come up with these ratios, on 2000 Census numbers. And so one of the questions I'm going to ask that I didn't even include in here, are what are the, is there any difference with the 2010 Census tracks? And does any of that impact any of the ratios that we're talking about here today? It's a question. I don't even know the answer. But you know, the 24 census tracks within a half mile open space study area, have been estimated, has an estimated current population of 92,179 residents, and [time bell] 12,622 workers, for a total combined population of 100,801 persons. So,

2	you know, essentially many of this population, 20
3	percent of the study area population, is ten years
4	old and under. So we have a very young community,
5	you know, with many families, and we hope and we
6	look forward to this development adding to the
7	vibrant community that we have. But we do have to
8	ensure that we're putting in provisions in this
9	text amendment, that will allow for a protective
10	policy so that the investments that we're all
11	raving about, the parks, the river, the
12	cleanliness, that all of that is maintained and
13	sustained. And I know I'm going over. But just,
14	I just have three little points I want to make.
15	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: If you could
16	just wrap it up as quickly as possible.
17	KELLY TERRY-SEPULVEDA: Yeah, I
18	will, and I promise. Elena said three minutes,
19	not me. I'm sorry [laughs] I'm sorry.
20	ELENA CONTI: [off mic] You can
21	have some of mine.
22	KELLY TERRY-SEPULVEDA: I'm sorry.
23	Okay, so, you know, the investments the City
24	refers to will only be relevant if they are

sustained and protected by policies. Okay, so we

need to have teeth. And I understand, we don't
challenge at all the good intentions of the
current developer attached to this action, but as
we know, this action will be one of the largest
private initiated rezonings in The Bronx history.
I just learned that today. And good intentions,
as powerful as they are, do not guarantee anything
to our communities over the long term. They are
just good intentions. And we ask that any good
intentions expressed here today on behalf of the
developer and the City agencies, are directly
translated into language with teeth in the
restrictive declaration as a text in this
amendment. We must be wary of unintended
consequences. Our heart is in the right place,
but we don't do what we need to do to ensure that
no matter down the line, whether it's ten years or
20 years, that they are effective policy triggers
that, you know, that are standard and will ensure
that all of your good intentions come to fruition.
CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay.
KELLY TERRY-SEPULVEDA: So with
that said, I

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you.

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

KELLY	TERRY-SEPULVEDA:	than
	TERRY-SEPULVEDA:	

3 you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much. Okay. Elena.

ELENA CONTI: Chair Weprin, Council Members, thank you for the opportunity to testify. I'm offering these comments on behalf of the Pratt Center for Community Development, but in support of our efforts by our community based partners. I'll kind of cut to the chase. The DEIS for the proposed rezoning reveals that the existing amount and quality of open space in the area is grossly insufficient for the current population, which is majority people of color and majority working class. The proposed action would make an already deficient condition substantially worse, which is a significant adverse impact that requires mitigation. The actions currently proposed as mitigation failed to address the despicable pattern whereby people in lower income neighborhoods are systematically and repeatedly denied access to quality open space. They lack sufficient quality open space to begin with, they are not protected from actions that further

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

diminish their already limited access to open space, and their open spaces do not receive a fraction of the maintenance and programming support as those in wealthier communities. this is a problem of citywide policy, and it's one that each time the City Council considers the exercise of its powers, it can opt to address. In instances like this, where there is a clear nexus between the rezoning, the proposed projects, their impact, and the nature and quality of open space, it's something that we all have a collective responsibility to be working together on, it's not singling out any particular entity, agency or member. Given this, and in addition, the City Council also has the opportunity to do more to ensure that the public investment in affordable housing that is slated to be developed in the proposed rezoning area, lasts into perpetuity. Right? And doesn't expire just when the programs expire. This is smart policy, given both the overall affordability expiration crisis that the City faces, which is extremely well documented, as well as the expressed needs of the community. in other rezonings, notably Hudson Yards, the

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Council could work with the applicant to outline and define terms under which it would agree to make all income restricted units permanently affordable. This would provide greater assurances to the surrounding community and to the eventual residents of the proposed development, that they will not be displaced in the future. So, in sum, where we're at, at this moment in time, the proposal on the table falls short of what the South Bronx deserves, and of the standards of equitable planning and policy. There's an opportunity here to do better and we urge the Subcommittee not to vote on this matter today, to allow for the Council to use the full amount of time that the ULURP clock offers, so that a plan that meaningfully addresses these issues can be incorporated into the restrictive declaration and other appropriate documents that accompany the action. Thank you.

much. Let me just ask a question before, and you can, any of you can jump in. So I'm trying to look at this objectively, and I look at an area that looks desperate for something to be done to

2	it. And this is a pretty ambitious project, as I
3	mentioned before, which brings in, you know, a
4	great looking development in an area that really
5	needs it. What do you think the market rate, ever
6	if we had no affordable housing, let's say they
7	came in and said, "We're not building any
8	affordable housing." I'm just curious, if you
9	have a better ideas, 'cause I'm from Queens, what
10	do I know? What would the market rate be in an
11	area like this right now, if you built it and just
12	let it go to market rate? Would it be much higher
13	than the numbers that were cited?
14	[background comments]
15	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Well, I can't
16	have that, though, unfortunately, at this moment,
17	butI know it's a little speculative.
18	ELENA CONTI: I'm not really sure
19	that that's the question, quite frankly, Council
20	Member.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Well, it was my question.

I know. [laughter] I think that the gentleman
from MBD will address it when you give him the

opportunity to, and maybe other folks will as
well. But I think that we've talked about two
buildings out of ten that are eventually going to
be developed. So, there's, you know, what the
market will bear at this moment in time, and it's
who those people are, and what kind of quality and
standard of living we're creating for them. It's
also about what happens to their families in 20
years, when they have kids and they've invested in
the community and would like to stay in that
community, and the economy is in a different
place, and the entire area is in a different
place. So, it's not about the rent levels now or
even in three years, when the first buildings come
on, or a commentary on that either way.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Right.

ELENA CONTI: It's about planning holistically for this community and making sure that affordable housing goes in lockstep with quality open space. But--

KELLY TERRY-SEPULVEDA: Yeah, and just, you know, I'm not, you know, I'm not a housing expert or anything like that, you know, but just, you know, as I was telling a Council

2	Member this, too, as I share this perspective, as
3	a kid growing up in Highbridge, I remember walking
4	to school, you know, past tons of abandoned lots,
5	tons and tons of abandoned lots, thinking, "Oh,
6	you know, what's going on here." And yeah, back
7	then, Highbridge was not a desirable, right,
8	place. Fast-forward now, you know, I'm now living
9	in the Pelham Park South area and paying lower
10	rents, right, than most of the developments that
11	are now built on those vacant lots are charging.
12	And so, what I want to say is, you know, yeah,
13	we've pulled cars and 15,000 tire, something
14	crazy, out of The Bronx River, at a time when
15	people were just like, "You know what? That's not
16	even a river." You know, why even bother?
17	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Right.
18	KELLY TERRY-SEPULVEDA: So I think,
19	you know, I understand your point, and I'm not, I
20	don't even know, you know, they may well be, you
21	know, bottom or
22	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: I don't know
23	why, though.
24	KELLA TEDDA-GEDILLAEDA:Mon know

very, very affordable. But we know that the

promise of the investment, you know, what our communities, we have the vision and we have the knowledge of what our communities are growing into becoming, because of the advocacy. And all we want to make sure is, is that the people who put the sweat equity into it, and stuck out all those years, are going to be able to raise their kids there, when better things come along. And same for their grandchildren.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Well, you know, okay, I mean, it just, it seems to me like the applicants, and I want to be clear, this is affordable housing, you know, and seem to have the same philosophy you do, on a lot of these issues--

KELLY TERRY-SEPULVEDA: Right.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: --you know, which is they'd like to see affordable housing, that's why they're doing this project. I'm so used to projects coming before us in areas that, you know, only millionaires would be able to afford at market rate, and here's an area where it really desperately needs it, the developers are only talking about thing to build something that is good for the community. It just, you know, I

2 just, it's a--

And that's all we're saying. We're saying that this is a great proposal, it's a great start.

EELLY TERRY-SEPULVEDA: Well, we agree, we agree with all of those supportive elements, and you know, I - - call me an idealist or you know, whatever, I just for and and both, and I see the Council Member over there, she says that a lot, "and and both," you know, is this the best? And that's all we're saying. We're saying that this is a great proposal, it's a great start. Do we feel that it could be stronger and that it should be stronger, given the--

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Right.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: I understand.

KELLY TERRY-SEPULVEDA: --the scope of it? And the longevity of this decision and will be lasting, for many, for all future development in the neighborhood, is in with that context that we're asking, "Can we do better?"

Councilman Arroyo, did you want to add something to that? I thought you--

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: [off mic]

Yes. [on mic] No, but since you put me on the spot. I think, first of all--

25 CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: I didn't mean

2 to do that.

thank you to Kelly and Elena and Shuffler, right?

[laughs] For, for your advocacy and for coming to the table with the developer, to, to nudge along the improvements that, compared to the proposal that was before us when I first saw it, and now, it is, it is different, because there has been some thought into, put into the final product here. And I don't want to belabor the point, but you know, the City agencies at the table here could not answer the questions. And that trouble me, significantly.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you, Ms. Arroyo, and I certainly didn't mean to put you on the spot. Council Member Rivera has a question.

very much. Just really a statement, I also want to thank you for being part of the entire process. I met with, had the privilege to meet with you in the past and discussed this project, and again like Maria stated, you know, the insights that you brought to the table were pivotal to make sure can get even to this point. And the question was, is

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this the best? Well, we don't know, until a project is developed, you take a bird's eye view of it and you determine at that point. My question is, is it better than what's there now? And the answer is definitely yes. Even with the, the projects in my view is completely affordable, because when you look at the area rentals, three bedrooms, you know, are probably more \$1700 per month, and even at the higher AMI, that comes in at a better rate, you know, on this project. So, looking at the entire project, as it's planned, it does in my book, in my definition, is better than what's being utilize there now, and what's needed for the neighborhood. So, of course we should always strive to improve, we should always try to find ways to tweak it, and that's why I think Signature, you know, where I think Signature has been forthcoming, you know, meeting with the local organizations, the community groups, and all the, everyone involved and interested, because I do honestly believe that they want to see something that we want to see, and that's a project that is long term, sustainable and works. But thank you guys, you know, for being part of the

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	conversation.	It's	definitely	needed.	Thank	you.
---	---------------	------	------------	---------	-------	------

KELLY TERRY-SEPULVEDA: Thank you, and if I, if I don't, I don't know if this is 4 5 appropriate, but I, you know, I just want to thank you for your sentiments, Council Member, and you 6 know, what we ask is that, you know, we find a way

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much. Any other members of the panel have a question? Okay, give me one second.

[pause]

to legislate these sentiments.

ELENA CONTI: Chair Weprin, could I add one quick thing while you're gathering stuff? CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Highly

inappropriate, but sure, go ahead.

ELENA CONTI: Okay. [lauqhs] Thanks. But to the point of rent levels and public subsidies, if one were to consider that the market right now would only bear rents that are comparable to the ones that are going to be subsidized, in my mind, that only makes more of a case and a reason, since the applicant is going to be using public funds to subsidize development at the same level as what would exist already.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

make sure that the assurances and protections that
we're calling for are incorporated so that that
public investment actually does what it intends,
as opposed to just simply making the pro forma
work out better.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. noted. Okay. Give me again, one minute. [pause] All right, no other questions for this panel. We're going to let you guys go, so you don't have to sit there on the spot, as they say. Just give us one minute here, we're just trying to work out one issue. [pause] Jerry, if you could try to get Council Member Jackson, who is on the 14th floor at a hearing room. That would be great. [pause] On this particular item, we're not going to vote today, we're going to hold off. Tomorrow there's a Land Use meeting. Tomorrow, right? [background comments] Tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock is the Land Use. We're going to meet before that, at 9:30 on that one item. And in a moment we're going to vote on all the other items that are here today. And I'm going to reiterate what those were. It was Land Use No. 468, with which Café Condesa; Land Use No. 484, SD 26, both in Council

COUNSEL: Council Member Garodnick.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Aye.

COUNSEL: Council Member Lappin.

COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Aye.

COUNSEL: Council Member Ignizio.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Aye.

COUNSEL: By a vote of nine in the affirmative, none in the negative, no abstentions, LU 468, 484 and 491 are approved and referred to the full Land Use Committee.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Thank you, and so we're going to recess this meeting until tomorrow morning, at 9:30, right here in this same hearing room. I got that right, right? Tomorrow morning. Just double checking. 9:30 tomorrow here. 9:30 is the Land, is going to be our Subcommittee, and 10:00 o'clock is Land Use, so please get here early. So we are going to recess this meeting until 9:30 tomorrow morning. Thank you very much.

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.

Signature [Vendor must insert scanned signature]
Date October 20, 2011