CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

SUB-COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----X

August 13, 2008 Start: 9:45am Recess: N/A

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

TONY AVELLA Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Joseph P. Addabbo, Jr. Simcha Felder

Eric N. Gioia Robert Jackson Melinda R. Katz Michael E. McMahon

Helen D. Sears Albert Vann

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

Dominic Answini City Planner Department of City Planning

2.0

2.3

CHAIRPERSON TONY AVELLA: Good
morning. It is still morning. Good morning,
everyone. I apologize for the confusion this
morning but we had a number of issues that we had
to resolve before we actually even started the
meeting. I'd like to reconvene the recess meeting
from yesterday.

As some of you know, we didn't have the opportunity to vote so we have a vote that has to be taken. And we have one item, which we were not able to do yesterday. We had asked City Planning to come back and talk about the modifications that we're going to agree to today regarding the Hudson Yards text, issues that myself, Council Member Melinda Katz and Council Member Eric Gioia had brought up.

While I call up City Planning to talk about those modifications, let me recognize the Committee members that are here. Council Member Simcha Felder, Mike McMahon, Helen Sears, Al Vann, Melinda Katz, Eric Gioia and I know we have a few other members that are around.

DOMINIC ANSWINI: My name is Dominic Answini and I'm a planner with the

2.0

2.3

2	Department	of	City	Planning	and	I'm	working	on	the
2	Hudgon Vard	7a +	toxt	_					

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Can you talk a little bit louder or move the mic close?

MR. ANSWINI: Yes, sir. My name is Dominic Answini, I'm a planner with the Department of City Planning. I wanted to discuss the modifications and some issues that some council members have questions about with regards to the Hudson Yards zoning modifications.

First I'd like to speak about the proposed text to modify the street wall rules on 10th Avenue and 34th Street in the Hudson Yards. On 10th Avenue between 35th and 40th Streets and also on 34th Street between 11th and 9th Avenues. There's 100% street wall requirement so the entire amount of the street wall must be at the sidewalk line. Now the proposed text that came out of the City Planning Commission would permit recesses of no more than five feet deep on these street walls above 30 feet. So from the sidewalk level up to 30 feet you would have to still have a street wall on the sidewalk. Above that, the architect, developer, etc. would be able to put, at most,

2.0

2.3

five foot recesses into the street wall.

Now the modifications, what they would do is they would raise the minimum height so instead of the recesses beginning at 30 feet the recesses on 10th Avenue would begin at 50 feet.

It would be at least a 50 foot solid street wall and on 34th Street, the street walls would begin at 60 feet, ensuring a full street wall of at least 60 feet tall. That was the modification for that particular text amendment.

I'd like to move on now to the text amendment with regards to the district improvement bonus of the Hudson Yards and also the transferable development rights that are available on the Hudson Yards. Just very quickly, the district improvement bonus is a mechanism that was put into the zoning whereby developers could make a contribution into the district improvement fund and receive additional floor area.

As for the transferable development rights, the eastern rail yards between 10th and 11th Avenues, where the LIRR stores their trains, generates development rights that can be distributed in some of the blocks in the Hudson

Yards between 10th and 11th Avenues, between 33rd and 40th Streets. What the proposal would have clarified that both for the district improvement bonus and for the eastern rail yards TDRs, a developer can get an as-of-right building permit. To obtain that as-of-right building permit it would not, in effect, kick the developer out of the bonus or TDR mechanism.

What we wanted to clarify though, is that the Council had a question as to how does one know whether the developer intends on getting a bonus or getting a transferable development rights in the eastern rail yards if they go to the Department of Buildings and merely file an as-of-right building permit.

What we've done is we've modified the district improvement bonus section. Just to point out, only the district improvement bonus section because it is impossible for a developer to get the transferable development rights without also applying for the district improvement bonus. And so the modification to the district improvement bonus would require prior to issuance of a permit for an as-of-right building that the

Department of Buildings has received a letter from City Planning notifying the Department of Buildings that City Planning has received either one, a letter from the applicant stating whether it anticipates filing for the district improvement bonus. The inclusionary [phonetic] housing program, which also is worked into the bonus in some areas of the Hudson Yards or the transferable development rights. Also, City Planning will notify the Department of Buildings if it has received an actual application for any of these bonuses or TDR programs from the applicant.

Also, the text requires that copies of these letters that the Department receives from either the applicants or that the Department sends to the DOB will also be forwarded to the local council member and the affected Community Board. So there will be notification as to whether a developer who gets an as-of-right building permit intends, at some time in the future as far as they know, to get the district improvement bonus or the TDRs.

Lastly, I wanted to address some concerns that the Committee had about the proposal

2.0

2.3

to ensure that floor area in the special Clinton district that will eventually be used as an entrance or an easement for the Number Seven extension would not count towards the floor area of an eventual development on that site.

In earlier testimony I explained that in the Hudson Yards text, the text states that a space that will be used for easement or an entrance some time in the future can be used by the developer of the space until needed by the MTA and while it is used by the developer it would not count as floor area. Unfortunately, that text was not also put into this Clinton district because there is indeed a Number Seven extension station in the Clinton district also. So I just wanted to point out that number one, the way of treating these easements does exist in the Hudson Yards area but it's not exclusive to the Hudson Yards area.

City Planning special transit land use district, which is actually put in place for the Second Avenue subway also has similar treatment of floor area that will eventually be used for entrances and easements for the Second

2.0

2.3

Avenue subway. I guess in the last ten years
there have been several opportunities that
developers have taken advantage of up and down
Second Avenue so that floor area at this time is
actually be used. In the future, perhaps they'll
be used for a station for the Second Avenue
subway, but at this time are being used by the
developers and they do not count as floor area.
That concludes what I wanted to say.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thanks. Any questions, any follow ups? Council Member Katz.

COUNCIL MEMBER MELINDA R. KATZ:

Just to clarify and I thank you for your testimony. So my concern before was that a developer would have to make an application for as-of-right while going for these bonuses and there's no place on the application that indicated that they were also going for the bonus. I thought that there should sort of be a way to do that for the community and for the City's sake. So right now what will happen is that they can't get the TDR without going to the DIB so therefore they have to notify City Planning either way if they're going for the DIB or not.

2.0

2.3

`	7.40	7 3 T C T T T T T A	T. 7
,	MR.	ANSWINI:	VAC
	1111\ •	TT1 T 1 T 1 T 1 T 1 T 1 T 1 T 1 T 1 T 1	100.

MS. KATZ: Before the Buildings
Department will issue the permit.

MR. ANSWINI: That's correct. And in fact, the text states that the Chairperson of City Planning must inform the Department of Buildings before such a building permit is issued.

MS. KATZ: Okay. And I assume that if there's no notification then there won't be any permit issued. I think that that pretty much resolves. I just wanted the community to be notified. I also didn't want to put the developer in a position where he's being dis-ingenious to the Department of Buildings and that there is some sort of system where he can go for the as-of-right. That's great.

I just would like to send a message back that this should not have been as difficult as it was. I think that in the future we sort of need to figure out how to do this so that we're not all waiting around. It's not your fault but I'm saying take the message back. And I will issue the message myself as well. But this was pretty simple and it was just something that was

2.0

2.3

2	broug	ght	up :	by	me	а	month	ago	to	City	Planning,
3	just	so	you	kr	low	Mr	. Chai	irmar	1.		

I appreciate your testimony here today and the patience of the Committee.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I would just echo the comments of Chair Katz, who is chair of the Land Use Committee that it shouldn't have been this difficult. I also appreciate the fact that modification has been made to the street wall because that was a big, important issue for many of us. Thank you.

Now because we didn't have quorum yesterday, we'll be voting on all the items that have come up between yesterday and today. What I will do in terms of procedure, I will recommend the approval on all the items except for the Rockaway rezoning. We will then take a separate vote, I will make a separate motion on that. I will explain what's going on with that when Council Member Addabbo is here, who represents part of the at district. I know Council Member Sanders is here as well.

The first vote will be on 610 Lexington Avenue. The Council Member Dan

2 COUNCIL MEMBER ALBERT VANN: Aye.

MALE VOICE: Those items passed seven in the affirmative, none in the negative, no abstentions.

to be voted on is the Rockaway rezoning. This has been a very controversial issue in one regard and that is one section of the rezoning call that's centered around a beach, 116th Street. From what we've been able to determine, and I think the council members will back me up on this, 98% of the application is overwhelming approved by the community and the Community Board. The issue has come down to this one section of the rezoning for the Rockaways that involves a up zoning to R7A. It has been a real issue for me and I know the Council Member is going to speak about it.

But what I'm going to do is recommend, myself as Chair, that the R7A part of the proposal be taken out of the application and it be left as is. The reason I suggest that is, and I said this from the very beginning, I think City Planning can do a better job when it comes to this section of the Rockaways. I think the

community, and I said this from the very beginning as well, this section of the Rockaways could be a special district, it should be a special district. So that's why I feel this way but I know the councilman would want to speak against the motion and in favor of the original application. Council Member.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES P. ADDABBO,

JR.: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I do want to thank you and your Committee for obviously the hours spent on this issue in Rockaway. It is a very important issue. Beach 116 during the summer season will have probably close to a million visitors during the beach season. Of course, the residents live with Beach 116 all the time. I want to thank you, your staff and obviously my colleagues here on the Committee for entertaining this issue more than one day.

Obviously it is, I'm not going to say controversial but it is a serious issue that we face. Let me say at this point I know there are many of my constituents who are not going to be happy with the R7A but I commend them for the work that they've done. They've put a lot of

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hours into putting forth their concerns and some of their concerns are valid. These are concerns that we can not stop talking about after R7A might be approved. We need to still consider the issues of traffic, drainage, pedestrian traffic as well and what is going to be built there. So we still have work to do.

But when the process had started a little over two years ago, I pretty much kept myself out of the process. There was a lot of house meetings, there was a lot of town hall meetings. There was, obviously, Committee meetings amongst constituents in my district and there was a lot of input on the issue. Basically I have gotten all the information and all the concerns of the constituents, I then went to Chair Burden and spoke about removing 116 out of the equation or talking about a lower zone, maybe an R6A or an R5. When you look at 116, for decades it has been kind of a blight on the Rockaway community. It is a commercial strip like I said with close to a million visitors a year but there are large buildings that have been vacant for many years. There has been an abandoned hotel there

for a very, very long time. Obviously the way it's currently zoned does not induce any kind of development.

This is an area, the Rockaway is, with a very high unemployment rate and no book store, no major retailer at all. The essentials that every community, that basically throughout the city enjoys, Beach 116 doesn't have those. We have the opportunity here now. And in looking at protecting the characteristic of the Rockaways and obviously giving the opportunity to the Rockaway peninsula of getting jobs, getting some residential but more importantly getting the commercial development. I think R7A is really the one that gives us the best opportunity.

As for taking it out of the equation for now, I believe we may lose that opportunity. We may not know when, given the upcoming Mayoral race next year or given any other timeframe City Planning may have and given the staffing levels that City Planning has, I'm not quite confident when we'll take Beach 116 into consideration once again. We have that opportunity today. It's been long over due.

right.

The vast majority of my residents in Rockaway, the ones that I could feel, that I have spoken to and have been at these meetings and Community Board, like you mentioned, voted for it. The Land Use Committee, Community Board 14 voted unanimously for it. I think the vast majority of the people want this change. Over the past seven years in Rockaway the number one complaint that I heard about was the issues about 116 and how it looks, the opportunities and the potential that it had. Here's our time. This is the time we have, the time is now to change that, grab hold of this opportunity, grab hold of this potential and do it

So, like I said, I go forward with reservation and with concerns. But these reservations and concerns must be addressed after today. Today I firmly believe that although a lot of my constituents will differ with me and I want to work with them, the vast majority of the people would want this. I hope to go forward. I hope this Committee considers my statements and goes forward with the proposal here.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Any other

2	comments before I ask Council to call the vote?
3	Council Member Helen Sears. I made a motion to
4	modify the application to take out 116th Street
5	R7A zoning. Council Member is speaking against
6	the motion, asking that the application go ahead
7	as presented by City Planning. If my motion is
8	defeated, I will then make a new motion to approve
9	the application as is because every application
LO	has to be approved in a positive manner, a
11	positive vote.
L2	MS. SEARS: Does your motion have
L3	to have a second?
L4	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: No, the Chair
L5	doesn't have to have a second.
L6	MS. SEARS: Okay. We seem to have
L7	a little disagreement here. Can that be corrected
18	by either the attorneys or somebody else? Well
19	because the Chair of Land Use seems to think it
20	needs a second. I don't know.
21	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: What's going
22	to happen if we second?
23	MS. SEARS: Well there's a vote.
24	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Either way.
25	MS SFARS: If he didn't get a

MS. SEARS: I'm not seconded it.

2.0

)	motion	than t	W WOUL	dn!+	α	with	i +
4 I	I IIIOLTOII	then v	we woul	.an ' L	ao	MTLII	1 L .

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: So second it and let's go with it. What's the big deal?

Then we wouldn't vote on it. Then we wouldn't vote on it.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: The Council to the Committee is checking. It's my understanding that no committee member has actually asked, accepting the Chair's rule, that the Chair can make the motion. However, Council to the Committee is checking.

MS. SEARS: We need to create a log.

MS. KATZ: Let me just reference, if I can.

MS. SEARS: And I can withdraw my question.

MS. KATZ: May I just have a point of information as the Chair of the full Committee. I don't believe we need a second. But I think in a regular modification, you do not need a second. But since the Council has brought it up then let her check on it. The reason I don't want to ask

the Chair is correct.

2	for a second anyway is because I would rather not
3	set that precedent for future motions by the
4	Chair. Okay? That's the answer to your question.
5	Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.
6	MS. SEARS: Otherwise I would just
7	withdraw my question.
8	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Call the vote.
9	Motion to call the vote. There's a motion on the
10	floor to call the vote, there's no discussion on
11	the motion. All those in favor to call the vote
12	say aye.
13	MANY: Aye.
14	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: The motion on
15	the floor to call for the vote, there's no
16	discussion on that motion. It's been seconded.
17	All that's in favor of calling the vote say aye.
18	MANY: Aye.
19	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Any against?
20	I ask the Council to call the vote.
21	MS. KATZ: I have a point of
22	information. If we can wait two minutes, I don't
23	see what the big deal is. So I would ask my
24	colleagues to give it two minutes. I believe that

2	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I just want to
3	say that the big point is that those of us who
4	have been sitting here since 5:10, it is becoming
5	a big point. She said it's not a big point but
6	those of us that have been sitting here since 5 to
7	10 this morning, it is getting to be a big point.
8	MS. KATZ: If I could make a
9	suggestion Mr. Chair. I could make a suggestion.
10	I would first like to comment on what Councilman
11	McMahon said, every one of us has projects in our
12	district, every single one of us has kept this
13	Committee waiting including people that are not on
14	this Committee for the benefit
15	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: [interposing]
16	No, Melinda. I'm not going toyou all are
17	keeping the Committee waiting. Not on the merits
18	of the project, I'll sit here all day, on a
19	procedural ruling
20	MS. KATZ: I'm not stopping
21	anything.
22	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA:because of
23	some personality thing here, which quite frankly
24	should have been thought of or contemplated. You
25	guys have been

MALE VOICE: Council Member

25

2	longer. Those issues are not done yet. So
3	whether or not we finish this Committee meeting
4	now or later, I just want everyone to understand
5	that there's still an issue in the Rockaways that
6	we are trying to fix. I'm not told yet whether or
7	not that has happened. So I want everyone's
8	continued patience if we can as I vote no.
9	MALE VOICE: Council Member
10	McMahon.
11	MR. MCMAHON: Just to say to our
12	Chairwoman of the greater Committee, of course we
13	all appreciate her great efforts on all these
14	issues for members. My protestation was only over
15	spending time going back and forth on procedural
16	issues. But as long as we're dealing with
17	substance and her great leadership on those
18	issues, for all members of the Council and the
19	people of the City of New York it is appreciated.
20	No.
21	MALE VOICE: Council Member Sears.
22	MS. SEARS: No.
23	MALE VOICE: Council Member Vann.
24	MR. VANN: Aye.

MALE VOICE: By a vote of one in

MS. KATZ: Just so everybody knows.

3 WE do have an agreement for Land Use but please.

4 I wasn't answering his question. I just wanted to

let everybody know we have an agreement so they

6 shouldn't leave.

MR. FELDER: Permission to explain my vote. I just want to say I vote yes. I just do want to add that our two colleagues represent this rezoning, Council Member Sanders and Council Member Addabbo. Some people have complained over the years that when members have a rezoning and they have preferences as to whether the zoning should be done or not, that colleagues most often vote in favor of those preferences. I am proud of that.

Of course, I'm the last person to say that I know exactly what would be right or wrong in Councilman Addabbo's district or Councilman Sanders district or anybody else's district. I would hope that when things come up in my own district that people have confidence in believing not that I'm perfect but that I have a little better knowledge of those items. But especially this case, that two distinguished

colleagues, I can't remember the last time or the first time that either of them have ever said that they strongly support an item and said to any of us, we're really in support of this despite the problems that may exist.

So I am very proud to have the opportunity to give them and the overwhelming community that they represent the vote of confidence in voting yes on their side.

MALE VOICE: By a vote of eight in the affirmative, none in the negative, no abstentions, L.U. 820 and 824 are referred to the full Land Use Committee.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you everyone. This finally closes this meeting of the Zoning and Franchises Meeting. Obviously everybody should stay for the Land Use Committee.

I turn it over to Council Member Melinda Katz.

I, Amber Gibson, 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	_Andr	
Date	_08/27/2008	