CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----X

April 3, 2013 Start: 10:37 a.m. Recess: 11:37 a.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

MARK S. WEPRIN Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

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

Diana Reyna Joel Rivera James Vacca Albert Vann

Vincent M. Ignizio

Ruben Wills

APPEARANCES

Ian Haggerty
Queens Office
NYC Department of City Planning

Noreen Doyle Executive Vice President Hudson River Park Trust

Greg Carney Principal Young Woo and Associates

Gary Handel Handel Architects

Ross Moscowitz Counsel to the developer

2	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Good
3	morning. Good morning everyone. My name is Mark
4	Weprin. I am chair of the Zoning and Franchises
5	Subcommittee, and we are joined today by the
6	following members of the Subcommittee: Council
7	Member Jessica Lappin, Council Member Diana Reyna,
8	Council Member Ruben Wills, Council Member Dan
9	Garodnick, Council Member Al Vann, Council Member
10	Robert Jackson. We are also joined by Diana
11	Reyna's two young sons, Diego and Adrian
12	[phonetic], age seven and five respectively, and
13	we are happy to have them here. We have a couple
14	of items on the agenda. One is a larger project
15	that we are going to do second, the Pier 57
16	project. We are going to start with Land Use
17	number 787 having to do with the AirTrain
18	[phonetic]. City Planning is here to make a
19	presentation. I'd like to call Ian Haggerty up.
20	Mr. Haggerty, you know how to work the mics there?
21	IAN HAGGERTY: Yes, sir.
22	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Very nice. He
23	does it all. Whenever you are ready, please state
24	your name for the record and describe what the
25	project is

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 IAN HAGGERTY: Good morning,

Council Members. My name is Ian Haggerty. with the Department of City Planning Queens Office, and I am here today to present a text amendment to the special downtown Jamaica district, the zoning resolution. It's an application by the Department of City Planning. The amendment would modify locations where bulk and sidewalk width requirements apply on just nine blocks of the special Jamaica district in the vicinity of the AirTrain terminal on Sutphin Boulevard. Basically, the goal of the text amendment is to remove bulk regulations that were designed to accommodate specific buildings that we know no longer are supposed to be built and replace them with regulations that are more consistent with the rest of the district. It affects the western end of the special district, and no changes are proposed to the allowed floor area or the range of uses that are permitted at any of these sites. It is only affecting the streetscape. This proposal basically seeks to address three shortcomings with the existing bulk rules. The first is that as I mentioned the

original bulk regulations from 2007 in the Jamaica 2 plan were designed to accommodate very specific 3 proposals that we know are no longer going to be 4 5 built. Second, the regulations don't adequately enhance new buildings' relationship to existing 6 buildings in some locations and we want to tidy up the rules a little bit, and finally, previously assumed assemblages of land are no longer likely 10 to be assembled in the same way, so we have some 11 smaller footprint buildings to expect in the 12 future. The rules that we are directly addressing 13 are restrictions on curb cuts and ground floor 14 use, the requirement to replace 100 percent of the 15 street wall at the street line, the maximum street 16 wall height and mandatory sidewalk widenings and 17 these are all prescribed in specific locations to 18 the use of maps in the zoning text. The massing 19 diagram that I brought on the left there shows two 20 potential development sites in the area and 21 examples of what could be built under the existing 22 rules on the top and the proposed streetscape 23 rules on the bottom. These aren't actual 24 proposals, but demonstrate likely outcomes under 25 each set of rules. We are looking ahead to the

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

future, and these sites will eventually be developed. There are two areas that warrant the most attention. One is at--and this is looking up Sutphin Boulevard towards the underpass of the AirTrain terminal, the portion just next to the Long Island Railroad Overpass. For about 50 feet there the rules that were applied in 2007 missed those sections, and so we want to tidy up the rules a little bit and bring everything that applies on that block across the entire block so we get a continuous street wall. You see the proposed rules on the bottom would allow us to accommodate a building that A) puts its entrance to its curb cuts and other services around on 94th Ave., so as not to interrupt traffic on Sutphin Boulevard, and B) allows the building to address the street in a uniform pattern that lines up with the retail shops that have been developed underneath the underpass over the last year. second site is the site just south of that. see it is sort of rendered mostly in yellow here on Sutphin Boulevard between 94th and 95th Avenue. You may know this is a cleared site that is awaiting development, and it was originally

3

4

5

б

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

planned to host a wholesale market that would take retail goods in off of cargo plans from JFK and sell them at wholesale. That proposal fell through and the site is now more likely to be developed as a mixed use development, and so we are planning in this proposal the same rules that apply to the rest of the district. Instead of a sheer wall on Sutphin Boulevard and on $95^{\rm th}$ and $94^{\rm th}$ Avenues, we would require a setback between a height of 40 to 60 feet, and we also would allow recesses if the developer so chose to provide them on 95th Avenue and 94th Avenue. Likewise the prohibition on curb cuts would be maintained on Sutphin Boulevard, but allowed on 95th and 94th Avenue again to keep the cross traffic off of the main street and maintain a viable pedestrian corridor along Sutphin Boulevard. In addition to adjusting the rules at these two locations there is some general cleanup proposed to make the sidewalk widening and street wall location rules of the district more consistent. First we would remove a 100 percent street wall location. other words, you have to when you redevelop a building place, the entire street wall up against

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the street line and create a solid wall. We would remove that requirement from two streets--147th Place and Waltham Street, both of which have a lower density character and we felt didn't need to have that sort of strong requirement. You still can provide 100 percent of the street wall at the street line if you so choose when redeveloping these properties, but we now allow for this district standard, which is 70 percent. Under the 2007 sidewalk widening rules, new developments in certain locations are required to widen the sidewalk on their own property, much like a front yard requirement, and so in this proposal, we are also addressing the sidewalk widening rules and I have passed out a diagram. It's the last two pages in your packets there that show the exact rules, and I won't go into too much detail on the exact locations of each and every change that we made, but suffice it to say that we are introducing a new regime, which scales back some of the more broader, wider sidewalk widening requirements that were required on Sutphin Boulevard where we would be--as shown on the diagram here, where we had these ten foot

2	widenings. We have actually eliminated those
3	because of the unnecessarily large sidewalks that
4	those would create, up to 33 feet in some
5	locations, but we are maintaining at least 16 feet
6	of sidewalk width down the entire width of Sutphin
7	Boulevard, which is the main corridor here, which
8	is enough for a tree pit and ten feet of clear
9	passage. On the side streets, we have readjusted
10	some of these to maintain at least a minimum of 12
11	feet. There are some locations where no sidewalk
12	widenings were required and we are now proposing
13	to require them. That would be on 94 th Avenue
14	where we have a current ten foot sidewalk. If
15	that gets redeveloped, we would like to see 12
16	feet, so we are proposing 12 there. The other
17	location is down here at 146 Street. Again, it's
18	a rather narrow sidewalk, so we are looking for a
19	minimum of 12 feet, and we believe this regime
20	will basically allow for more reasonable
21	development at the north end here, but still
22	provide sidewalk widenings where they are
23	absolutely necessary, and so that concludes the
24	presentation. I will be happy to take any
25	questions.

2.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very
much. This project incorporates three different
Council districtsCouncil Member Comrie, Council
Member Wills and a little piece of Council Member
Gennaro. We have Council Member Wills here with
us at the moment, and I know he has something he
wants to ask or state, and then we have other
guestions from the panel.

morning. You went over this with us in detail and we are all supportive of this program. I had one question for you. The Sutphin Boulevard between Sutphin Boulevard and Waltham Street on 97th Avenue, there was a proposed development for the 97th Avenue to 95th Avenue, a hotel to be there, and then it would be attached to the Waltham Street property going over to Liverpool. Would this affect that in any way with the new residential properties that would be placed there behind the hotel on Waltham and Liverpool?

IAN HAGGERTY: The only way it would affect it is with slightly more flexibility in the street wall requirements on Waltham Street, whereas previously they would be required to make

2.

a sheer wall basically across the entire Waltham
Street before the setback, 100 percent at the
street line. Now they would be allowed to provide
up to 30 percent of the wall as recesses so there
would be more variation that is allowed. The
floor area and the use this will have no effect on
that.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLS: Thank you.

IAN HAGGERTY: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Great.

Council Member Garodnick?

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank

you. I just realized that I am a little confused

about the big picture here, which is it sounds

like there were rules put in place back in 2007

covering bulk in the sidewalk, et cetera, and that

there was an anticipated development that was

going to take place that is no longer being

assembled or taking place. Is that correct?

IAN HAGGERTY: Yes, sir.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: And that is what is precipitating the application by the Department of City Planning today. Is that right?

IAN HAGGERTY: That is correct. We

were approached originally by Greater Jamaica
Development Corporation, who has an interest in
the property on the north side here 94 th Avenue,
and they had asked us about the possibility of
basically they have issued an RFP. They are
looking for someone to develop this site as a
hotel use and the rules were written in such a way
that did not accommodate first of all such a small
sliver on that site, and secondly, because of some
strange ambiguities that were in the text that we
wanted to clear up, we felt we needed to do a text
amendment too.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: So I don't understand. Has Greater Jamaica Development Corporation owned this site during the course of this entire period?

IAN HAGGERTY: They have owned just the corner site. It was assumed in 2007 that a larger site would be assembled, but that has not happened, and they are going ahead with the RFP for just the corner site, which is a rather narrow site.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: And the corner site is the area that is the orange

2	building	over	there?

IAN HAGGERTY: That is correct.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay.

Why would this have been more appropriate if the buildings had been assembled and had moved forward the way that was anticipated back in 2007?

IAN HAGGERTY: It would have been more appropriate because it would have allowed essentially all of the loading functions to be placed further down the block. In this site, basically--

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK:

[interposing] Right. When you are pointing to that, I don't know what that is or what that leads to.

IAN HAGGERTY: - - Sutphin

Boulevard and 94th is this corner here. With a

longer site there--with their current site, which
is just this corner piece, they would be forced to
place the loading dock around on Sutphin Boulevard
because of two things--number one, it's prohibited
from the south side here and number two, it's not
prohibited from this section here, which was an
oversight on our part in the beginning when we

2	proposed the original 2007 rules, so this proposal
3	does two things. One, it prohibits the curb cuts
4	on Sutphin Boulevard, and number two, it allows
5	them on the south side of this block, basically
6	the north side of $94^{ ext{th}}$ Avenue. In the original
7	proposal all of that would have been further down
8	the block beyond the prohibited area, so this
9	basically allows for this smaller building to be
10	configured in such a way that doesn't impede
11	pedestrian traffic on Sutphin Boulevard.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay.
13	So this reallyit is being done because of the
14	needs of the Greater Jamaica Development
15	Corporation and the EFP which is going out for the
16	development of that site right there on 94 th
17	IAN HAGGERTY: [interposing] That
18	was the original impetus for this, but as I
19	presented, there are a number of other things that
20	we cleaned up at the same time.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Alright.
22	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
23	IAN HAGGERTY: You're welcome.
24	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Council
25	Member Wills again.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLS: I am sorry.

I just wanted to clarify though to Council Member Garodnick, the second property is something that we are looking at and this helps us with the mixed usage on it. We are hoping that we can maybe put a college residence there mixed with the YMCA which we have a dire need to have a new YMCA there, so this also helps us do that, so I wanted to make sure that it wasn't just an imposition on the Greater Jamaica Development Corporation's needs, but it also helps us do that and free up a lot of the pedestrian traffic to go to that building. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Question for Council Member Wills or City Planning, so that second site, is that owned by--who is that owned by?

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLS: I believe

that is owned by - - Stark [phonetic]. It is a

huge lift to try to get the leasing deal done with

that property, but New York College right now is

going--their plan was to go north to south and we

are talking to them to try to expand the

university, so they can actually go from east to

Thank you.

west because of the groundwater and different
things like that we are having issues with. So
this property would be something to help with the
revitalization with the hotels that are supposedly
surrounding these properties. During the economic
downturn a lot of the projects had to be put on
hold.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN:

Any other members of the panel have any questions? Diego, you have a question? No questions. Okay, good. I see none. Well, thank you very much. We are going to close this hearing. I know members of the public are here to testify on this. Okay. We are going to close this hearing, and move on to the next item on our agenda. Next item is in Speaker Quinn's district. It is Pier 57. It is Land Use number 786. I apologize. It is four items made up on the Pier 57 project. It's Land Use 783, 784, 785 and 786. The following four people are here to testify: Noreen Doyle [phonetic], Greg Carney [phonetic], Gary Handel

[phonetic] and Ross Moscowitz [phonetic].

Gentleman and lady, if you could please state your

name when you speak so the record can accurately

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

reflect who is speaking at the time. I don't know who is starting, but whenever you are ready, please proceed. Thank you.

NOREEN DOYLE: Good morning. name is Noreen Doyle. I am an executive vice president at the Hudson River Park Trust, and I am joined here today by Greg Carney, a principal at Young Woo, Gary Handel, the architect for the project and Ross Moscowitz, land use counsel. Before we begin I thought it would be helpful to provide a bit of context on Hudson River Park, and what Pier 57 means for it. So Hudson River Park is a five mile long park along Manhattan's West Side from Battery Place to 59 Street. It includes, piers, lands underwater and a rather slim land section between the bulkhead and the West Side Highway, and Hudson River Park is unique in a number of respects. First, it was created by New York State legislation; the Hudson River Park Act of 1998 created the park and created the Hudson River Park Trust to design, build and operate the park. Hudson River Park is the first of the parks in New York City to be identified with the goal of being self-supporting, so while

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the city and state have been very generous over the years about giving funding to construct the park, we generate all of our operating income ourselves. We don't receive any city or state operating income, and so we are making our 16.5 million annual operating budget generally through a combination of rents from certain commercial piers, Chelsea Piers, Circle Line are examples of those that you may be familiar with. We also have fees for certain guest events in the park, and are able to accept donations through Friends of Hudson River Park. We are also a 501(c)3. The park contains a mix of New York State and New York City property, and Pier 57 is actually state property. It is owned by the New York State Parks Department, but under the terms of the Hudson River Park Act, Pier 57 is one of the permissible commercial sites where we can have revenue generating uses in the park, and Pier 57 like the other commercial piers is subject to ULERP [phonetic], which is why we are here today. 57 is a hugely important opportunity for Hudson River Park. You may have read in the newspapers that we are actually trying very hard to address

our various financial budgeting issues, and if
Pier 57 is able to come online, it will provide
significant additional rental income to the park
that we would use for park operations, and we have
been working on Pier 57 for over four years at
this point. It's an approximately 375,000 square
foot historic structure located at 15 th Street in
the park. The first page of the handout shows you
from a site perspective where it is located. The
pier was used for about three decades as a
municipal bus garage, and it is now vacant. In
2008, the Trust issued a request for proposals for
Pier 57, and among our standing goals were
creating a quality park enhancing development for
a combination of cultural, educational,
recreational maritime and other uses allowed by
the Hudson River Park Act, providing an
opportunity for park and water enhancing
activities to expand the public's enjoyment of the
waterfront and for restaurant, retail and other
commercial uses in a new and exciting setting and
respecting the pier's historic structure. I
should note that the pier is actually not a New
York City landmark, but it is listed on the state

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and national registers of historic places. 2009, with the unanimous support of our advisory council, the Hudson River Park Trust mandates us to have an advisory council which includes all of the local elected officials, community boards and other civic and environmental organizations, and also our Pier 57 community working group, the Hudson River Park Trust board of directors conditionally designated Young Woo and Associates as the developer for Pier 57 in 2009, and we have been working with them since that time to advance the planning and environmental review process for Pier 57. We worked particularly hard on planning high quality public open space, ensuring that in water construction impacts respect the Hudson River habitat, and of course, addressing traffic. In this regard, we sought to balance the commuting needs of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, those that will be attracted to Pier 57 and those that are already in the park, and we have been very gratified throughout this process to hear Community Board 4's support and the borough president's support and the City Planning Commission's support for all the community work we

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

feel we have done to get the project to this

stage. I look forward to answering your questions

4 later in the presentation. Now Greg Carney will

5 describe the actual goals of the project.

GREG CARNEY: Good morning. Again, Greg Carney. I am one of the principals at Young Woo and Associations, and I just want to acknowledge Noreen and her team and the Hudson River Park Trust and the great working partnership we have had to get to this stage. The project we are proposing today is really consistent with the original vision and concept we laid out back in 2008 and into 2009 before we were designated, and that is essentially to create a cultural hub on the riverfront and to do it in this great historic structure in a way that we don't do too much intervention with the quality and the character of the space, which you will hear more about from Gary Handel. It really is meant to organize a series of retail and entertainment and cultural uses around an inside street. We want to make the project an extension of 15th Street. The next page in your handout shows the existing front elevation of the project. In sum total, 438,000 square feet

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of gross space and our program allows for up to 305,000 feet of gross leasable area. If you flip to the next page I can tell you about the main anchor use. Both in terms of setting a stage and a tone for the project and also acting as a draw the real principle occupant of the pier is a creative urban marketplace. We have some images of outdoor marketplaces from around the world, but the idea is really to create a mix of smaller merchants, vendors, startups, some existing brands that would mix in with this totality of small users to create an anchor in and of itself. Really to make a destination and to create more of an experience rather than a strict shopping transaction--it is not a mall. It is not a flea It really is a carefully curated mix of these small tenants put into one place under cover. The upper right hand corner is an image from DeKalb Market, which is a project we did a couple of summers ago in Brooklyn, similar concept, smaller scale--in that case an outdoor venue. You will see shipping containers. flip to the next page, we will talk a little bit about that in a second, but some of the other

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

program elements -- the cultural anchor for the pier is Tribeca Film Festival, which will come in to program the rooftop and provide a variety of entertainment and film screening starting with the film festival, but extending into other program. There is a real emphasis on food in the project. A number of different kinds of venues--sit down, we want exhibition on educational uses in the food area, and also entertainment meant to create an interactive experience with customers. There are four larger restaurants that are planned for the space around this marketplace. You also see several of the water uses mentioned. We have made that a focus from the beginning starting with a small water launch, and then we also have assessed a plan for a marina in response to some of the feedback that came from the community throughout the process to introduce more opportunities for That is a second phase to the project. boat use. The last collection of images is really to introduce this signature element in the project. We are making use of reclaimed and repurposed shopping containers, and these will house a lot of the smaller tenants and merchants in the project

and serve to organize the street front that we are creating in both levels of the main structure of the pier. You get an idea in the two diagonals of what some of the interior space will look like, which is also shown in the left board in front of you, and then just a couple of illustrations on the other diagonal with some creative ways that retailers have been able to combine and - - together these containers to create interesting spaces for retail and with that I will pass on the Gary Handel to take you through the program.

GARY HANDEL: Good morning. Gary
Handel of Handel Architects. Pier 57 is a unique
structure as you can see in this view from the
Hudson River. It was designed by an amazing
engineer, Emil Praeger, who came to prominence as
the chief architect for the navy during World War
II where he designed a series of floating concrete
breakwaters that were used in Operation Phoenix to
facilitate the landing in Normandy at D-Day. He
used a similar strategy for the creation of Pier
57, and up north on the Hudson River, he create
three concrete case - - structures, each one
longer than 360 feet long and 82 feet or wider,

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

floated them down the Hudson River and basically sunk them into place where they became the foundations for Pier 57. One of them if you look at the structure forms the foundation for the head house, which you can see as the lower structure adjacent to the West Side Highway and two of them form the foundations for the pier structure that you can see extending out into the Hudson. structure is unique in a number of different ways. You can see the two levels of sliding panel doors and then the burtons on the top, which create this filigree that was used to facilitate the loading and unloading of freight. If you turn the page you can see our view looking north, looking from 14th Street to the north and you can see the project is basically a restoration project. goal is to put this building back into good service, but with a new use, and so you can see the rehabilitated face. You can see the restored burtons, and then you can see a little bit about the rooftop programming behind the filigree structure on the top, and then if you turn the page you can see the elevations of the project, and again, it is essentially, the project is on

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the national register of historic places mostly for its foundation construction that I described briefly, but the image that Greg showed you initially in terms of the photograph, the head house will be restored, all the brick repointed, the cast stone repaired, the windows replaced or repaired. Each of the 128 four panel sliding doors will be restored to use. If you turn the page again, you will see the plan and in the yellow and orange is the container market that Greg mentioned, and it forms that internal street, which actually meanders through the building giving views out to the north and south so the people can experience the river. The gray is a ramp that will take you from the ground level up to past the mezzanine level, which is up to the third floor. If you turn the page again, you will see an internal perspective of the project on the ramp with the idea of these containers inserted into the structure. Each of the two principal levels of the pier is approximately 28 feet tall, the structure is about eight feet deep, so two levels of containers can be inserted into each primary level. You can see that on the next

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

series of renderings basically where we have arrived on the third floor and are looking back down to the ramp, and then next you can see the new public esplanade along the side of the piers which will be put into public access. There will be 30,000 square feet of complying public space. There will be additional 5,000 square feet of offsite public open space, which is an expansion of the Hudson River Park esplanade and approximately 65,000 square feet of publically accessible open space on the roof, which you can see on the next drawing the rooftop plan with the open space, a rooftop pavilion and some shade structures, and this would be where Tribeca Film Festival would have their events. If you turn the page you will see a perspective of the rooftop pavilion, which will provide a small restaurant up there as well as bleacher seating for Tribeca, and then if you turn the page, you can see that rooftop garden, which will comprise over 65,000 square feet of public open space as well as the shade structures that we are planning to enliven the park. In meetings with National Park Service, they didn't want trees on the rooftop. They felt

that it wasn't in character, so we came up with
the idea of these sliding industrial shade
structures, which are more in character with the
building that will provide the amenity that we
think the public deserves, and then on the next
image you can see our setup for Tribeca using the
bleacher seating with the rooftop pavilion and
looking towards a screen that would be mounted on
one of those shade gantries, and I'll turn it over
to Ross now.

ROSS MOSCOWITZ: Thank you, Gary.

Ross Moscowitz at Strickland, Strickland and counsel to the project developer. I am going to briefly run through the actions that are before the Committee on the Land Use side. The first request is a rezoning from the M23 district what currently exists to an M15. The second action that is being asked for is a special permit pursuant to 13561 to allow for an accessory parking garage. As of right, we are allowed 35 parking spaces. The applicant is seeking to have 74 parking spaces totally accessory, not open to the public. The third action is to modify section 4210 to allow for a in excess of 10,000 square

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

feet to retail, and I am going to back to this as to why we are asking for that. That is also a special permit, and the fourth action is a bucket of special permits because of the waterfront zoning. Everything we are doing here it's in existing non-compliance under the waterfront regulations, so anything that we are doing here requires these special permits, so anything we are putting on the roof increases the height, anything that we are putting on the waterfront increases the non-compliance, so that is a bucket of special permits that because of this site obviously being a pier being in the waterfront requires this. I'd like to go back to the special permit on the retail to understand why we are seeking that. Greg described to you, we are going to be in a lease all position with the Trust. The Trust will lease it to Greg and his team, and then part of that then will be leased to what is called Urban Space Management. Urban Space Management will be the operator and controller of the 100,000 square feet or so of these containers. Because it is a series of licenses that will go into each of these containers, we would be violating the 10,000

square foot. This is not meant to have a big box.
In fact we have specific rules within our deal
with the Hudson River Park Trust that we can't
have a big box, but because the way the zoning is
written, we have to seek this special permit. So
if you think about, we will have 100,000 square
feet leased as retail, but then they will have
subsequent leases, so therefore, we needed to
apply for this special permit because of the
10,000 square foot limitation. I am happy to
answer any questions or specifics as well.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Great.

Alright. Let me call on Council Member Wills who had a question.

COUNCIL MEMBER WILLS: Good morning, gentlemen and lady. Mr. Handel or anyone else can answer it, the marketplaces, the pictures that you have for the marketplaces, are these representations the top left and bottom right something that—are those true representations of what you will be doing? Because I know that you said that they are not going to be a mall or flea market.

MALE VOICE: Can you hold up the

NOREEN DOYLE: I will try answering that. No, for one Hudson River Park is requiring that for the most part of the time, the rooftop is just plain public open space; however, we have

22

23

24

25

very strong personal experience. Directly to the south of Pier 57 Hudson River Park Trust has been programming another public pier, Pier 54 for a period of almost a decade also with free movies, with free concerts, including rock concerts. It's in the meat market area generally. We really never receive complaints about the noise from those events, and we would be requiring that Young Woo be responsive if there were any.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Let me ask another question, where do people park to come here? What is the plan on parking?

Park Act does not allow us to have public parking at Pier 57, and among the things that we have looked at very closely, and we actually have our traffic consultants here if you want to dig into this a little bit more deeply is we did modal split surveys at Pier 54, which is the pier that I was just referencing where people do public events, and a large percentage of people for this project are expected to come on foot, with public transportation and in taxi cabs to some degree, but we really are not intending for this to be a

public parking facility. There are a number of parking garages nearby that we have identified in our EIS [phonetic], and there is enough capacity in those for the projected demand.

ROSS MOSCOWITZ: And if I could just add, Council Member, the permit that we are seeking again is just for accessory, not for public.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Understood.

Okay. I just wanted to know if that causes an issue. I know Chelsea Piers has a parking lot that has always been the source of some problems.

It's expensive. It's hard to get to. They complain about their parking. I assume this is an issue that has come up and public transportation is not that close by, is it? The subway is a hike. Isn't it?

MALE VOICE: The subway, but there is a very good bus system that does come very close, but in terms of the number of spaces, it is the only number of spaces because it is historic down below. We can only really put 74 spaces in, and we are only allowed 35, so we wanted to get at least some more amount that would allow employees,

2	visitors, tenants to have some spaces, but
3	generally speaking, you are right, there is very
4	limited parking.

NOREEN DOYLE: I would also say that Community Board 4 very much likes the fact that there is such limited parking, and I think that they would--from their perspective they believe that there are existing public garages nearby that should be used if somebody is going to drive to the pier.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. I bring up parking and Council Member Comrie has a question.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning. Question I had that I didn't ask before. How about truck loading and unloading for the materials and goods that are going to be coming? How is that going to happen and what is the plan for that?

GARY HANDEL: If you look at the ground floor plan the area shaded in gray is a truck loading facility for larger trucks. Because of the way that the pier has been developed, we can actually bring smaller vehicles right into the

facility and up the ramp, so we will have the ability to handle smaller things directly in, and then we have truck docks that are at the northern edge of the head house to handle larger vehicles.

You worked out time of day for truck loading and unloading? Is there going to be something where you are focusing on evening loading or had that been worked out with the community boards? Was that an issue that had been brought up?

GREG CARNEY: We spent a lot of time talking about what the mix and cycle of deliveries might be for this kind of program, so as Gary described, the loading dock is the main receiving area. To the extent that there is actual direct penetration into the building by the larger trucks, that is for sure after hours, and in fact probably a very limited window at night to deal with that concern. We also in our circulation plan, in the circulation road we have allowed for the ability when needed to stage some of that operation on the frontage road.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Will that impact the Chelsea Pier site? This site is right

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 37
2	adjacent to Chelsea Piers, correct?
3	GREG CARNEY: Yes.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And is that
5	where the trucks load and unload for Chelsea Piers
6	as well?
7	[background conversation]
8	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Next to
9	last page? Thank you.
10	[background conversation]
11	COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: So your
12	truck loading and unloading will be on West 17 th
13	Street?
14	NOREEN DOYLE: Yes, just to walk
15	you through this I have other copies if you would
16	like to pass those along, and again, we have our
17	traffic consultants here. Chelsea Piers has a
18	whole separate dedicated service road. That is
19	not used at all by the project. What you can see
20	on this diagram as it makes its way down to you is
21	a separate ingress where the arrow is turning.
22	That is the ingress to the project. The Chelsea
23	Piers egress is what you see immediately adjacent
24	to it, and we have taken an extremely close look
25	for every good reason at how any of the not

just trucks deliver and being delivered, but
taxis, all the vehicles coming to the project will
interact with the Chelsea Piers egress road with
Route 9A and with the frontage site. The project
in order for it to success obviously traffic has
to work. We can't create a bottleneck. The State
Department of Transportation will not accept a
bottleneck. Chelsea Piers will not accept a
bottleneck. Hudson River Park Trust will not
accept a bottleneck. And so we have done a lot of
calculations about assumptions for presumed taxi
drop offs, if there is a bus there, if there is a
deliver there to look at the length of the
frontage road. It is in fact one of the reasons
why the frontage road is as long as it is in order
to be able to be sure that we can accommodate the
number of vehicles on site without blocking the
Chelsea Piers egress.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Thank you, and just one last question. The chairs for the Tribeca, are those permanent or temporary?

MALE VOICE: Those are temporary.

They are folding chairs similar to what they have done in the Chelsea - - before they would be set

2 up for specific screening and then broken down and 3 stored.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay, and then that front area that you have on the top here. Is that going to be green? It looks green. That is not grass?

really is in that front zone that there will be areas of lawn that people can use and relax on.

There will be areas that have hard surface where there could be benches and other seating up there.

So the idea really is to provide a space that will work for the community when Tribeca is there or not, so it should be a calm place for people to hang out and enjoy the river when Tribeca is not using the space.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: And what do you envision the hours of operation for the pier to be? Is it 24-7? - night and just sit out on the rooftop?

NOREEN DOYLE: So I will speak to that, and Greg can elaborate. Hudson River Parks operating hours are 6am to 1am; however, each of our tenants has different programs that they do.

2.

We for example if I very much doubt that the
retail complex would open at 6am or 7am, and what
we have discussed is that essentially when the
pier is open, we expect the public open space to
be open. So because they are going to have
restaurants, the rooftop will be open in the
evenings when the restaurants are open, but we
would not insist that they stay open in February,
the rooftop at 10pm if they really have no
customers then.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay.

Great. Is that marina as you envision it to be or

those are public docks or will they have to pay to

dock their boats there?

GREG CARNEY: It's a combination.

Again, we have a small boat launch that was already part of the original program at the head house side of the project in other words closer to the West Side Highway, and the marina itself will be a privately operated marina available for slip rentals.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay.

Alright. 'Cause you have a docking those small boats will there be - - what do they call those

you. Council Member Reyna has a question. COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to take a moment to

23

24

25

understand a few things, and I am going to jump

around for the sake of time. In and around the development area, are there going to be any bike racks so that we encourage what would be transportation mode by cyclists?

of our main focuses for the front head house space is to actually partner with a sports oriented—a more generally sports oriented retailer or operation that specifically can cater to the bicycle users, the runners, the more typical users of the green space in the park, and they have talked about incorporating a valet operation, so if one wanted to they could literally drop a bike and go into the project, come and go as they want, and there will also be passive bike racks.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: At the moment is this area being considered as part of the bike share program?

NOREEN DOYLE: No, the Hudson River Park has worked with the bike share program. This area currently because this pier is vacant doesn't probably have enough business for them, but we are looking at a few places in the park for the bike share program, and it would be an ideal spot I

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 think in the future.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Correct. I just wanted to take a moment to understand the loading and unloading opportunities. Is this development going to encourage what would be unloading and loading by barge?

NOREEN DOYLE: Probably not. I can explain why based on Hudson River Park experiences. Hudson River Park Trust has rebuilt a number of piers, 900 foot long piers in the park and we do use barges during construction for things; however, it costs a lot of money to load and unload the barges because it's longshoremen essentially for every aspect of those movements, and so it makes sense in some cases for construction particularly of the new piers that are being rebuilt from scratch, but for the small types of movements that would be for the project once it's operational, and also because of the historic structure. It is fortunately in very good condition. It does need a lot of money to make this project happen, but the pier itself unlike almost every other pier that we have built into a public pier is actually very sound, and so

it doesn't need the same kind of concrete piles
and everything else. In fact it is mostly not
even supported on piles, so the barge aspect of it
is less practical here, and Greg, maybe you have
something else to add?

GREG CARNEY: I would just add as

Noreen mentioned during the construction phase our

expectation we will make use of a barge just to

eliminate any more than necessary intrusion on the

bike path in the front of the project because we

don't have a large staging area to work from, so

that may provide a platform to do that.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: But the platform is only during the construction phase, so that the barge capacity will not continue after commencing what would be the completion of the construction itself?

GREG CARNEY: Correct. That is the plan now.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And the marina is incorporated into this particular development, but I didn't hear much in the presentation regarding the marina. Is there a permit already issued for the marina?

NOREEN DOYLE: No, separate from
these approvals the applicant has to go to both
the Department of Environmental Conservation on
the state side and the Army Corps of Engineers on
the federal side, neither of which can act until
the final environmental impact statement process
or the environmental review process is completed.
We actually have meetings scheduled with both of
those agencies within the next month, so permits
cannot be issued until after they have gone
through their respective permitting processes.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And then once you have those process in place, a permit will be issued on behalf of what would be the state and the federal government, but as far as the city is concerned, you still have an additional process to go through?

MOREEN DOYLE: I am sorry. I misunderstood your question then. No, the marina is part of the ULERP application from the perspective of the submissions that we have made to the city. From a business deal perspective Hudson River Park Trust and Young Woo have contemplated that the marina might follow in kind

of a second phase of the project's operations once they have gotten the retail aspect up and running, but there is no additional city approval as far as I am aware for the marina.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: It is my understanding that the Department of Small Business Services is the dock master, so I am assuming that there has to be some type of permitting.

NOREEN DOYLE: There is not actually. We go through the Department of Small Business Services when we are constructing the piers in order to get kind of the equivalent of a Department of Buildings approval. In this case, and this is almost beyond my knowledge level, but I think that this is going through the Department of Buildings, right, because of the kind of more robust commercial uses here. Greg, am I correct?

Ross on that. I know just to add some flesh to the marina, we have planned it. It is 141 slips. We have given some thought to the mix of boats and the operations to the extent they interface with the promenade and the public space around the pier

GREG CARNEY: I'd probably turn to

2	and that the land side mostly in communication
3	with City Planning just to make sure we have
4	thought through what may add to the kinds of
5	things we were talking about before loading and
6	unloading, so to the extent it is brought into the
7	project those two things can work together.
8	Permitting, Ross, you might help me on that.
9	ROSS MOSCOWITZ: Council Member, it
10	would go before the Department of Buildings.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Before the
12	Department of Buildings.
13	ROSS MOSCOWITZ: Yes. Just like
14	any other project.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Not the
16	Department of Small Business Services despite the
17	fact that they are the dock master?
18	ROSS MOSCOWITZ: Correct.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Okay. And
20	as far as the construction of this particular
21	development and post construction, what is the
22	MWBE opportunities that have been put into place
23	for this development?
24	NOREEN DOYLE: The Trust is subject
25	to MWBE state requirements for MWBE participation,

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and we have exceeded our 20 percent goal for a number of years running, and the Governor is extremely serious about this as you probably are all aware, and I personally spend a lot of time on In the state system the operations MWBE issues. side of it is not actually subject to MWBE participation, but we have talked about because it's not a state dollar spend if that makes sense, so there is no state money being spent, but we have talked quite a lot with Young Woo about opportunities along the way for MWBE participation. One opportunity we see is that because the containers themselves are in some cases as few as 160 square feet they essentially become like a micro enterprise opportunity, which we think has the possibility to appeal to a lot of people that are trying to enter the business or retail market, so while we haven't formalized that as an MWBE requirement, because the small pod nature of them is really the foot in the door opportunity, we think that that is in spirit what we are being asked in part to try to achieve in terms of creating opportunities for nonestablished businesses to be able to enter the

2 market.

OREG CARNEY: I would just add not only is that the concept today in spirit, but that was our experience in Brooklyn at Dekalb Market where we ended up particularly because of the emphasis on fashion and art, we ended up having quite a large concentration of women owned businesses that started their business or expanded their business in that particular location, and so far the conversations are very similar here for the pier.

understand the established criteria that you would be building around the MWBE commitment to this project just to have a better following as to what we should be making sure is the environment we are building because this is long term development, and if we don't do it right from the very beginning it gets lost in translation, and so I want to make sure that we have an ability on paper that you can submit to this committee regarding the MWBE commitment for this project, and not only for what would be construction, but post construction. I don't know the number of small

businesses that you anticipate would be taking advantage of this space. Is that something that you already have forecasted?

mix. In the container market there are approximately 325 containers, and based on our assessment of how the market will probably populate, it will be somewhere between 150 and 200 smaller businesses, and then of course the rest of the program will round out around the container market.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Sure. And the actual 150 small business that will take place throughout the space, is that going to be an open call similar to what they do with Grand Central Station?

GREG CARNEY: Yeah, there has actually been quite a bit of conversation about this. We are thinking of multiple channels. One would literally be online, so you could enter into an application process, a reservation process for specific spaces, demonstrate your concept and your business plan so that we can sort of properly curate the actual mix of tenants in the space, and

then also using traditional brokers. Doing a version of the open call, we went through again a very similar process in Brooklyn, and in that case again smaller scale. I think we had 40 tenants, and we had 500 some applications.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: So this could be considered to be space——I forgot the terminology now. It gives the startup of a small business that step up process, and they don't necessarily have to remain here, but it could be the starting point for what would be offline to get online and then expand growth.

model exactly. In fact part of the whole concept is to take away a lot of those barriers for someone to start a business in a traditional storefront in Manhattan. In this case it's to remove some of the legal barriers, the design barriers, just the process of getting to an occupancy agreement. We are trying to take all of that away and make it as easy as possible, and the two measures of success or the reasons for someone leaving may be because they are either too successful, they get too big in that container

based market or their concept doesn't work and they go the other way, but that sort of change and turnover is part of what we encourage. We want to see that in the market, to keep it interesting and sustainable.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And do you believe that you will be able to retain that turnover effect so that space does become available, and it doesn't constrict you from the true spirit of that mission?

GREG CARNEY: For sure, and that really is the key to success of the model. We step back a little after the initial leasing and curation of that mix, and the idea is to let it kind of flow on its own, and let that internal community of tenants sort of figure out where the mix needs to be, what works, what doesn't work, what is more successful, what isn't too refer other businesses into that model or to ultimately decide maybe they are better served in a different location, but we take care of it on the front end. Of course we don't go away, but we may take a step back, and then the community of merchants itself helps sustain that model.

2	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Which brings
3	you to what your land use lawyer has mentioned as
4	far as the permit of 100,000 square feet issue.
5	MULTIPLE VOICES: Yes.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And I notice
7	thatmy last comment. As far as the accompanying
8	conditions from the community board I believe it
9	was, I don't know if you have a copy of the list
10	of those conditions. There were five points that
11	were mentioned if these have been met? From the
12	community board, correct.
13	NOREEN DOYLE: We believe that we
14	have provided the assurances through several
15	vehicles that we have put in writing to the local
16	Council Member and to the City Planning
17	Commission, but we can go through them now.
18	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: If you want,
19	maybe you can get us in writing for Council Member
20	Reyna a layout of the responses before the Land
21	Use Committee meeting.
22	NOREEN DOYLE: Sure.
23	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: So she can
24	understand and see in writing exactly what it is

instead of going through it all now.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2	Unfortunately, I have three members who have to
3	leave so we won't be able to vote today if we
4	continue.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: And the MWBE 6 aspect--

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: [interposing]

If you could do that all too before the Land Use meeting...

NOREEN DOYLE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Sorry about that, Council Member Reyna. Alright. Are you finished? I'm sorry. Okay, great. Sorry about that. We just have some members that have to leave. We got a late start as you know. So we thank you. Nobody else is here to testify on this matter I don't believe, so we are going to close this public hearing. We are going to move to couple to following items; Land Use for Pier 57, which is Land Use 783, 784, 785, and 786. We are also going to couple with that the Land Use number 787, which was the AirTrain text amendment we heard earlier today. Furthermore, Land Use number 788, which was a sidewalk café is going to be an approval motion to file pursuant to a letter of

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

Signature	Kimberley	Uhlig
Date	4/16/13	