CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----- X

September 20, 2016 Start: 10:03 a.m. Recess: 10:32 a.m.

HELD AT: 250 Broadway - Committee Rm,

16th Fl.

B E F O R E:

DONOVAN J. RICHARDS

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Daniel R. Garodnick

Jumaane D. Williams

Antonio Reynoso Ritchie J. Torres Vincent J. Gentile

Ruben Wills

Corey D. Johnson David G. Greenfield

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

Antonio Lopez Applicant Altus Café [gavel] Alrighty. Good morning, I am Council Member

Donovan Richards, chair of the Subcommittee on Zoning

and Franchises and today we are joined by Council

Member Ritchie Torres, Antonio Reynoso, Dan

2

1

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: We're ready?

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

unfortunately.

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

24

Garodnick, Vincent Gentile and Council Member Corey Johnson. We have two items for our consideration today. If you are here to testify on the Barnett

hearing on that item; the applicant has withdrawn the application. Sorry, no fireworks today,

Avenue application, we will not be having a public

We will start with Land Use Item No. 458, Altus Café, an application for an unenclosed sidewalk café located at 4325 Broadway in Council Member Rodriguez district in Manhattan. The applicant has agreed to address some of the community issues with noise generated by the café and Council Member Rodriguez now supports approval of the application.

I will now open the public hearing for Land Use Item No. 458 and I'll call the applicant, Antonio Lopez from Altus Café to come up. Thank you. Good morning and you'll hit that mic and just state your name for the record and who you're representing.

[background comments]

ANTONIO LOPEZ: Antonio Lopez, uhm representing Altus Café on 4325 Broadway.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alrighty, so uh can you speak to the application and what are some of the changes that were made, uh can you just state those on the record and then uh we'll... if any of my colleagues have questions, we'll...

ANTONIO LOPEZ: Uhm at the moment we have not uhm gotten approved by the Department of Consumer Affairs; we submitted all the paperwork; we've just been on standby. Uhm we produced uhm a platform and we tried it, but it's not really... it's not allowed no more by the City, from my understanding, so we have to get another method in order to use the sidewalk café, 'cause the... the sidewalk is on a slope.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alright. And were there any concerns with the community board uh in your application...

ANTONIO LOPEZ: Uh...

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: and what were the issues Council Member Rodriguez had, if you can just speak to some of those and how you're correcting those.

ANTONIO LOPEZ: Okay. Uhm when I... I met with uh Council... he just requested to close at 12, uhm Monday to Friday; usually also on the weekend, uhm Sundays to open uh 12 to 12, uhm and just work out with the neighbors uhm above me. And basically... and uh also the... the 34 Precinct, which uh is uh down the block, it's a block away from us. So the uhm, the inspector from that precinct is actually uhm, in good standing with us, or we're in good standing with the precinct.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay. Any of my colleagues have any questions on this application?

Okay, seeing none. Thank you, sir for your testimony. Are there any people from the public, any individuals from the public who wish to testify?

[background comment] Yes, any... Yes and Council Member Rodriguez supports this application. Okay, seeing none, I will now close out the public hearing on Land Use Item No. 458. Thank you, sir for your testimony.

2.2

2.3

We will now move on to a vote on Land Use Item No. 438, a special permit application submitted under Section 74-711 of the Zoning Resolution that would facilitate a 17-story building with commercial and residential use and the restoration of historic buildings in the Ladies Mile Historic District in Manhattan. The special permit would allow for changes in building form that would accommodate the building design approved by the Landmarks Preservation Commission.

Over the course of the public discussion on this application it has been argued extensively that it is a test case for applying Mandatory

Inclusionary Housing requirements to special permit applications.

In our public hearing on this application we listened to testimony arguing both, that MIH should be applied as a condition of this special permit and that MIH requirements are not applicable in this case.

Section 74-32 of the Zoning Resolution, which was approved by the Council last March under the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing text amendment, states that we shall apply the MIH requirements where

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.3

a special permit approval would allow for a significant increase in residential floor area. The application we are now considering involves a series of waivers to height and setback regulations that regulate the exterior dimensions of the proposed building. The waivers they are seeking are partially a reflection of the fact that they are in an historic district which constrains their development site.

The public policy goal of the section of the Zoning Resolution is to provide relief and encourage the restoration of historic buildings.

There are two key considerations, which taken together are the reasons we don't believe MIH can be appropriately applied here.

First, the maximum floor area permitted on the site will not change as a result of this approval; in fact, the applicants are proposing to build less floor area than what the zoning district currently permits.

Secondly, the applicant has demonstrated that it would be able to develop as much or more residential floor area than is being proposed under the special permit on an as-of-right basis without needing any zoning waivers at all from us.

We are well aware of the need for affordable housing in the city and I know Council Member Johnson is well aware of the needs in this neighborhood in particular. The Council will be scrutinizing these types of applications very carefully to ensure that we apply the MIH program consistently and we'll be looking carefully at the facts of each application to determine whether future special permit applications lead to a significant increase in housing.

I'd like to acknowledge the many voices that urged us to look carefully at this application, and although we may have reached a different conclusion than some of you in this case, your work on this issue helped focus all of our attention on this critical question on the need of where MIH should be applied.

So with that being said, I wanna thank

Council Member Johnson and the many advocates and

many people and the applicant for really being

thoughtful here and moving this application along and

for also doing something historic and ensuring that

historic buildings obviously are restored and putting

a huge investment in there. So Council Member

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

Johnson, congratulations on hard work and uh allow

you to take it from here.

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you Chair Richards. Good morning Chair Richards; members of the subcommittee and those in attendance today.

Today we are voting on an application in my district that has generated a great deal of attention related to whether the Mandatory

Inclusionary Housing program should be applied to this development.

After a great deal of consideration, I am recommending that this subcommittee and the Council approve this application because the development will contribute to the character and quality of historic architecture in the Ladies Mile Historic District and because the applicant has committed to working with me and my community to find a way to protect our limited supply of affordable housing.

Section 74-32 of the Zoning Resolution states that the provisions of MIH should apply where a special permit application allows for a significant increase in residential floor area, as the Chair said. The creation and preservation of affordable housing, both in this neighborhood, East Chelsea-

25

4 which we the Council find ourselves, it is a goal

5 that the applicant shares and is contributing

6 towards. Furthermore, the application of the Section

priority and I am glad that despite the impasse at

10

7 74-711 permit, this application will provide a

8 | significant service to historic preservation as well.

9 74-711's permits were intended to incentivize good

10 design and restoration of historic buildings in

11 exchange or flexibility with zoning regulations.

12 This proposal is a good example of how 74-711 waivers

13 can result in improved development and restoration,

14 as a developer is obligated through this permit to

15 provide extensive preservation services to an

16 | important piece of the Ladies Mile Historic District.

I must add that I am disappointed that in

18 considering this application the Department of City

19 Planning, who I have a great relationship with,

20 especially Chair Weisbrod, have made a determination

21 that if MIH was carried out here, moving forward it

22 would effectively exempt whole swabs of my district

23 and others and stronger markets. It's my belief that

24 | it is these very communities that can best afford to

provide affordable housing that is so needed by our

2

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

deal with SEIU 32BJ, both for this site on 18th Street and for an additional site on 92nd Street,

city and it is these communities which are most in need of the economic integration that affordable housing creates and because of current zoning in existing development, these communities have too few opportunities to advance affordable housing under MIH and ZQA.

It is my belief that this City Council, this municipal legislature, our interpretation should mean something, yet I regret to say that resolving the issue of whether or not MIH was applicable in this circumstance was not left to the Council; it was left to the Department of City Planning; instead we must accede to the City Planning Commission's determination of scope; they ruled that MIH is not in scope, which limits our ability to effectuate MIH as intended.

But I am pleased that the applicant has nevertheless committed their financial support, significant financial support, in encouraging affordable housing development in this neighborhood and will also be providing high-road building service jobs throughout their portfolio; they have signed a

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 where there had been controversy in the past over

3 what the future was gonna be, and so I am glad that

4 through this process, this very difficult process, we

5 have been able, even with MIH not being applied,

6 we've been able to get a significant contribution

7 towards an affordable housing fund that will go right

8 to the local community and provide good, high-quality

9 jobs and preserve an historic building in a

10 neighborhood that is seeing rapid development.

I lastly wanna thank Manhattan Community
Board 5, which spent an enormous amount of time on
this application. I wanna thank Borough President
Gale Brewer for her hard work and advocacy in trying
to get the best deal possible for the community and
for raising the visibility of this issue and both of

So I wanna thank you Chair Richards for a long hearing a couple of weeks ago on this application and members of the subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to speak today.

them for their commitment to affordable housing.

Lastly, I wanna say I know that there are advocates that are disappointed in the fact that I am recommending approval of this application, with all the negotiated points that I just mentioned; I will

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 just say that, again, we are constrained in what we 3 can do; the City Charter provides that the Department of City Planning and the City Planning Commission, 4 which has ultimate authority over determining what is in scope and what is out of scope, the City Council 6 7 does not have authority on that; I think we maybe should have a little bit more authority; that's 8 something for a future charter revision commission, but I wanna say that I am committed to affordable 10 11 housing on every project in my district; I think I have shown that over the last two-and-a-half years; 12 this is a small project, an important project and a 13

So thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak today and I would ask all of my colleagues on this committee to please vote in favor of this application.

project that we are gonna see some benefit to local

affordable housing in the neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you Council Member Johnson and you did a heck of a job with the cards you had.

Alright, any of my colleagues wanna speak on this application? Alrighty. Alright, seeing none, we will now ask to... to call the vote. We will

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 14
2	now move on Oh okay, I will couple on a vote to
3	approve Land Use Nos. 458, Altus Café and Land Use
4	No. 438, Adorama Special Permit. Counsel, please
5	call the roll.
6	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Chair Richards.
7	CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Proudly vote aye.
8	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
9	Gentile.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Aye.
11	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
12	Garodnick.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Aye.
14	Congratulations Council Member Johnson.
15	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
16	Reynoso.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: I vote aye.
18	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
19	Torres.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: I vote aye, but
21	out of deference to the local Council Member, not out
22	of valid I just wanna be careful; not validating
23	City Planning's interpretation of the text amendment;

I continue to disagree with it.

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 15
2	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: By a vote of 5 votes
3	in the affirmative, 0 in the negative and 0
4	abstentions, Land Use Items 438 and 458 are approved
5	and referred to the full Land Use Committee.
6	CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alright, we'll
7	hold the vote open for 15 minutes? Alright, 15
8	minutes.
9	[pause]
10	COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Continue vote on Land
11	Use Items 438 and 458. Council Member Williams.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: I vote
13	abstaining on Land Use 438 and aye on all the rest.
14	With that, the hearing is now closed.
15	[gavel]
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date September 23, 2016