CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

LAND USE SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----X

March 9, 2009 Start: 10:27am Recess: 11:15am

HELD AT: Committee Room

City Hall

B E F O R E:

TONY AVELLA Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Eric N. Gioia
Robert Jackson
Melinda R. Katz
Larry Seabrook
Helen Sears
Albert Vann
Maria Baez

Alan J. Gerson

Daniel R. Garodnick

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

David Von Sprecklesen Vice President Toll Brothers

Mimi Raygordetsky Environmental Liability Management

Lisa Gomez L & M Equity

2	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: We have these
3	new microphones finally, so please bear with us as
4	we learn how to operate them. I'd like to
5	reconvene this meeting of the Sub Committee on
6	Zoning and Franchises. We have a number of items
7	that we will be voting on, and I will go through
8	them. And then one item, the Toll Brothers
9	Project, I'm going to be asking the applicant to
10	come back and give us some further information
11	from the issues that I raised at the previous
12	meeting. First item is the Special Forest Hills
13	District, which is in Council Member Melinda
14	Katz's district. And before I call on her to make
15	the motion, I'd like to recognize the members of
16	my Committee that are here; Council Member Robert
17	Jackson, Larry Seabrook, Helen Sears, Melinda
18	Katz, Eric Gioia, and we're also joined by Council
19	Member Alan Gerson and Maria Baez. And I'm sure
20	some other members may be joining us, because Land
21	Use Committee will be meeting immediately after
22	this Committee. So I'd like to call on Council
23	Member Katz.

COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today we are voting on a Forest

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Hills rezoning that has been in the works for many vears. Many years ago, probably about two years ago or three years ago, folks in the community, businesses, started coming to me that they wanted to rezone their particular area, that they were probably going to go to the BSA in order to get variances. My area on Austin Street, for those of you that have been there to shop, and a lot of folks have been to my community to shop, you will recall from 30, 40, 50 years ago that it is mostly zoned automotive because it used to be repair shops and gas stations on Queens Boulevard in that So there was one variance given a few years area. ago where a 190-story building went up. My fear is that that would happen to a majority of the applicants coming up. So I am very grateful to City Planning and all the work that they have done over the last few years in order to try to protect our community. I also want to thank the Community Board 6 for their active participation and the many civic associations that I think made this rezoning better, the Women's Club of Forest Hills, Diane; Friends of Station Square, Susannah; Van Court, Steven Reichstein and Juan Reyes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are two-- one modification and one agreement that has been made that I would like to read into the record. There was 150 height limitation in this special district. I am requesting an amendment to it to lower the height restriction in the C4-5X. which is along Queens Boulevard, to 120 feet, so that we can have it a little bit better in the community. The highest building is 190 feet now that have gotten the variance, and they will be next door to a 220-foot building, so I think this is a very good compromise. Also in my district, ask you know in Forest Hills, it is a very senior area, and there is a grocery store on the corner of Yellowstone Boulevard and Queens Boulevard, it is a Key Food, and it is absolutely the most important, probably, retail store in that area. My seniors walk to it. And it was imperative to me that they remain, even if they do develop. I do have a letter, which I will put into the record and not read, from Richard Grobman [phonetic] of Damrick Associates [phonetic], stating and giving their commitment that the 15,000 square foot grocery store that is there, no matter what is developed or how they deal with

19

20

21

22

2	this, will remain and will be redeveloped as a
3	15,000 square foot grocery store. And during the
4	process of construction, if they're not able to
5	keep the grocery store there during the process,
6	which I understand, they will arrange an order by
7	phone home delivery program for the folks in that
8	community. So that is my amendment, the 120 feet.
9	I will give this letter for the record, and I
10	thank the Committee for their work on this. And I
11	do want to just once again thank City Planning.
12	They worked very hard on this and negotiated well.
13	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.
14	The next item we will be voting on is the East
15	Windsor Terrace Rezoning, which is in Council
16	Member de Blasio's district. He is in favor of
17	the application. There are two others, but we're
18	going to have further comments on the two others.

23 CHRISTIAN HYLTON: Christian 24 Hylton, Counsel to the Committee. Chairman 25 Avella?

Chair recommends approval of both items.

What I'd like to do is vote at this time on the

Special Forest Hills District amendment, with the

amendment, and the East Windsor Terrace Rezoning.

1	SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 7
2	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Aye.
3	CHRISTIAN HYLTON: Council Member
4	Gioia?
5	COUNCIL MEMBER GIOIA: Thank you.
6	Yes.
7	CHRISTIAN HYLTON: Council Member
8	Katz?
9	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: I'm going to
10	vote Aye on all. I also would like to disclose
11	the Counsel wants me to disclose that I am a
12	member of the Forest Hills Jewish Center. I'm
13	there most Sabbaths; you can see me there. I
14	guess I also shop a lot on Austin Street, if that
15	matters. So I vote Aye on all.
16	CHRISTIAN HYLTON: Council Member
17	Seabrook.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER SEABROOK: I vote
19	Aye.
20	CHRISTIAN HYLTON: Council Member
21	Sears?
22	[Pause]
23	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: Yes, and I
24	live in Forest Hills.
25	[Pause]

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Battery	^v Maritin	ne Build	ding. Th	is	applica	ation	is
within	Council	Member	Gerson's	d-	istrict	and	-

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: As my

Committee Members will recall, I had a number of issues with this application, so I will be voting No on it. The motion to approve will be made by Council Member Katz, and I know Council Member Gerson does want to speak on the item. This is a project that is being proposed by the City to put on top of a New York City landmark a hotel. The issue that I had with the proposal, and only really one issue, is that the addition will be totally out of context with this New York City landmark. And I just felt it was appropriate to raise my objection, given the fact that after years of working on this the applicant and the City could not have come up with a design that matched the historic architecture of the building. So Council Member Gerson, I know you want to speak on the item.

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I will synopsize what I stated at the hearing briefly. But I mean, and

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

again, I do want to reiterate my appreciation to you for the thoroughness of the fairness with which you conducted the review of this application as well as all other matters on which we've worked together, of which there have been many over the years. That being said, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the application. I believe the motion will be made by Chair Katz. And I urge an affirmative vote. The key point that Chair Avella made is that this has been worked on for years. And over the course of the years, there has been a consensus reached by the community, the community board, the Borough President, myself, all but one landmarks or historic preservation organization, and the Landmarks Commission itself. critical component of the effort to reopen and reclaim for public use the waterfront of our City and of Lower Manhattan in particular. We have painstakingly arranged for a significant public space to be included indoors. Many of you are familiar with the Winter Garden; this will be a Winter Garden on a smaller scale for cultural and other public activities, which will be important both for the economy and for the social fabric of

2	the community. On the issue raised by the Chair,
3	the glass structure was designed to comport with
4	the non-glass structure underneath. From the land
5	side it is set back. So the entire original
6	historic structure remains in full view with full
7	effect. And if anything, this project will
8	refurbish that structure. From the water side, as
9	pointed out in the hearing by experts, the glass
10	façade, better than any other façade, enhances the
11	parapets and the other rooftop ornaments, which if
12	there was a non-glass addition, would have become
13	lost and we would have lost that critical
14	component of the historic fabric. This was well
15	thought out. Reasonable people can agree to
16	disagree, as we will, but you should know, this
17	was thoroughly vetted and unanimously supported by
18	a Community Board which has a record of support
19	and concern for historic preservation and
20	landmarking, as well as by the Landmarks
21	Commission itself. I urge you; I implore you to
22	vote in favor of the application. Thank you.
23	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you,
24	Council Member. Next item we will be considering
25	for a vote is the Bond Street project, commonly

1	SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 12
2	referred to as the Toll Brothers Project. I'm
3	going to call them back. I understand they have
4	some further information in reference to some of
5	the issues that I brought up. So I'd like them to
6	come up and testify.
7	[Pause]
8	DAVID VON SPRECKLESEN: Did you
9	have specific questions you were going to ask me
10	or should we just follow up from where we were?
11	[Off Mic]
12	DAVID VON SPRECKLESEN: Okay. You
13	had the question with regard to the timing of the
14	remediation and the construction, and Mimi
15	Raygordetsky is here from our environmental
16	advisor to answer that question.
17	MIMI RAYGORDETSKY: I'm Mimi
18	Raygordetsky with Environmental Liability
19	Management. And since we met last week, we've
20	taken a very close look at our remediation
21	schedule and how it will be phased with our
22	construction schedule. And I have more
23	information for you on that. So I'll just step
24	through the phases so it's clear to everyone how

we anticipate remediation and construction to

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

proceed on this site. As I mentioned, well I guess I'll just go through the phasing. The first thing that will happen is there are a number of existing structures on the site, all of which will be demolished, and any asbestos materials within those structures will be removed from those buildings prior to demolition. All the debris will be removed from the site. After demolition we'll be installing a couple more soil borings and ground water monitoring wells beneath the former footprints of those buildings. This is a -- we're doing this at the request of the City DEP, because we weren't able to get our drill rigs inside those buildings when we did the initial phases of investigation. We are expecting to find constituents similar to those that were identified during the initial phases of investigation during that supplemental phase. And those constituents will be handled in the same manner that the previously identified constituents will be managed. If there is anything new that comes to light during that investigation, we will be working with both the City DEP and the State DEC to address those constituents. Next, the known

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hot spot locations, containing product saturated soils, and if you'll remember from our conversation last week, there are only two locations that have product saturated soil; they're contiguous to each other and they're basically on the north central portion of the Those locations will be physically excavated and removed from the site two feet below the water table, and they'll be disposed of off site in accordance with applicable federal, state and local regulations. After the hot spots are removed, a specialized remediation contractor will be coming to the site to either solidify or treat in place the residual contaminants that would remain within the footprint of the site. thing that I want to be very clear about, the on site treatment of soils coupled with the protective measures that are going to be implemented on the site, including the sub slab depressurization system and the vapor barrier are just as effective, equally as effective as complete soil removal in eliminating future exposure to any tenants on the site and people that would enjoy the parkland on the site.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Additionally advantages to solidification in place include the fact that you won't be brining thousands of trucks, filling them with soil, disturbing that soil, releasing particulates into the atmosphere and then trucking them through your neighborhoods. Now once these remedial measures are complete, the general construction phase will start, and that will include construction of the building foundation. There are two construction components that also serve remedial measures, and those are the sub slab depressurization system to alleviate or mitigate potential for any vapor intrusion, and the vapor barrier. And because those are construction measures and are part of the building foundation, they really can't be built, it's just you can't do it in advance; they're part of the foundation. So, as I didn't make clear to you when we spoke last week, the bulk of the remediation really is happening in advance of the construction phase, and the only remedial elements that will occur during construction are installation of the sub slab system and the vapor barrier.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Well that's

1	SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 16
2	good to hear. And I hope you've put that together
3	in some sort of, you know, brief description so
4	that the community can be aware of that.
5	MIMI RAYGORDETSKY: Yes. It is
6	included in the package that you all have in front
7	of you; it's one of the final pages on either the
8	right side or the left side of your packet.
9	[Pause]
10	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: Is that it?
11	Is that the part?
12	MIMI RAYGORDETSKY: I don't think
13	so.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: Can I ask you
15	a question?
16	[Pause]
17	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Because there
18	are other issues that I'm sure they're going to
19	tell you.
20	[Pause]
21	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Okay.
22	[Pause]
23	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: I just I'm
24	sorry, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to know if this
25	was the finally summary of what you were talking

1	SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 17
2	about?
3	MIMI RAYGORDETSKY: I don't think
4	that's what it looks like
5	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: [Interposing]
6	Okay.
7	MIMI RAYGORDETSKY:in final
8	printed form. It's really the last page on one of
9	the two sides of your packet.
10	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Can you point
11	out which one it is, somebody?
12	MIMI RAYGORDETSKY: In the packet.
13	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: So she doesn't
14	have to go through the whole thing. Don't you
15	have a copy of the package?
16	[Pause]
17	DAVID VON SPRECKLESEN: There was
18	also a question with regard to the affordable
19	housing and our commitment to the affordable
20	housing, and we have today Lisa Gomez with us, who
21	is our partner with L $\&$ M Equity, one of the
22	premiere affordable housing developers in New York
23	City, and also our partner in Williamsburg, where
24	we've done affordable with them.
25	LISA GOMEZ: Thanks, David. As

David said, L & M is a 25-year old affordable--2 3 primarily affordable housing developer. 4 Throughout that time we've developed about 8,000 units, most of those in the City and most of those 5 as affordable housing. We are partners on the 6 7 North Side Piers development, which also contains 8 113 on-site affordable units, which help that project meet its inclusionary housing requirement. 9 10 Those units were finished and occupied last summer, and we received thousands and thousands of 11 12 applications for those 113 units, which is pretty typical for affordable housing developments 13 throughout the City. For the Gowanus site we're 14 15 building 136 units on the two corners of 1st and 16 2nd Street on Bond Street. When completed all 17 those units will be affordable to those earning at 18 or below 80% of area median, which is currently 19 about \$60,000 for a family of four. I know there 20 have been some questions on sort of funding 21 mechanisms, so I'd like to just sort of tell you 22 about a couple of options that we can utilize for 23 this, because having two buildings actually provides us with more flexibility to finance each 24 25 one separately or both together. But, typically

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the world of affordable housing there are a number of discretionary or as of right subsidy and low interest loan programs. So we would envision using a combination of tax-exempt bonds, tax credits, and low interest loans either through HDC, HPD or the State DHCR through the Homes for Working Families or Housing Trust Fund programs. These are programs that we are very well versed We're currently financing four and building four affordable developments in Brooklyn using a variety of these subsidies. And in about the past ten years we've successfully obtained, through a competitive process, ten awards through DHCR. we're pretty good at figuring out how to put together financing. And I think one thing that's important right now in this economy is that given our track record; we have been able to finance and close affordable housing projects, even while the financial world is falling apart. And we stand behind our commitment to affordable housing, and we believe that we will be able to successfully finance and build all of these units.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: But-- and I appreciate your testimony, but it doesn't get to

2	the heart of the issue that the community raised
3	is that my understanding from the community board
4	and community representatives, is that they voted
5	in favor of the project with the guarantee that
6	the affordable housing component was going to be
7	built; that if the affordable housing component
8	isn't done, they're not in favor of the project.
9	And what they were looking for is a very firm
10	commitment. Because if you don't do the
11	inclusionary housing component, you can still do
12	the 12 stories, which is not what the community
13	wants. So again, my question is where is the
14	final written in stone commitment? That's the
15	issue that I raised on behalf of the community.
16	LISA GOMEZ: What type of final
17	written commitment would you be looking for?
18	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Well if I
19	remember, the community had raised two issues, two
20	things. I think one was a deed restriction in the
21	project or some commitment in the project, in the
22	wording of the project as part of the approval
23	process that the housing component would be built.
24	DAVID VON SPRECKLESEN: We would be

developing this pursuant to the inclusionary

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

housing program, which is done throughout this city, where there is significant incentives to doing the affordable housing. We've only come across this in one instance before, and we have done it in North Side Piers, with L & M Equity. So with the 421-A and the bulk increases, it makes it very compelling to do these projects. We're batting 1000 and we will continue to bat 1000 as we're planning on doing that in this program.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: And I don't dispute that. I don't dispute that that's your best intentions. But what the community is saying, they're in effect giving approval for additional density and additional height and only on the, you know, proviso that there is the affordable housing component. What they're saying is they don't want to be in a situation where the project is approved and lo and behold, not because you didn't try, but because the-- for some other economic reason the affordable housing component doesn't get built and then they're going to be sitting around saying, we should never have approved this project in the first place. There's got to be a way that you can commit to doing this.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I understand the situation you're in, but you know something, the community has a right, at least in my opinion, to insist on a real, firm, commitment. And you're saying just what you said at the other hearing and I don't-- again, I don't dispute the fact that you're-- it's your best intentions. But that's not what the community is They want a commitment. They want a seeking. real commitment that they can hold up and say, the developer didn't do what he was supposed to do. So far I haven't heard that. And I quess you're not willing to do it. And again, it's not disputing your commitment to do it, but if the economic situation somehow changes or the requirements of the 421-A program get changed, whatever, and it doesn't happen, then the community board, their position was really undermined and they didn't get what they wanted. And they got something that they didn't want in terms of greater density and -- I shouldn't say greater density, but the height of the buildings. So I correct myself. I saw you were going to correct me. Thank you. So, I mean unless you can say something different we agree to disagree on

1	SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 23
2	that one issue. Okay? Anything do you have
3	have you made any sort of concessions in changing
4	the plans on the height of the two towers since we
5	had the hearing?
6	DAVID VON SPRECKLESEN: We have
7	not.
8	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Council Member
9	Gioia?
10	COUNCIL MEMBER GIOIA: Thank you,
11	Mr. Chair. A few questions, and actually I have
12	some questions even following up on your
13	questions, because I think I had a different
14	understanding than what you just articulated.
15	First a few things, as you know I represent a
16	waterfront as well in Queens. And what's exciting
17	to me about projects like this is that for too
18	long the waterfront has been completely neglected
19	and unless you worked in a factory on the
20	waterfront you had little chance of ever seeing
21	the water. It's also exciting to me that in these
22	difficult economic times that someone's coming
23	forward with a rezoning to put shovels in the
24	ground that will provide great construction jobs
25	and also build new housing in New York. And I was

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

talking to some of the community folks beforehand, and the truth is if you live in a neighborhood, no one ever lights height or extra height. And as somebody who's lived in Queens my entire life, I understand that. But I also think that sometimes there need to be tradeoffs. And if we are ever going to solve the affordable housing crisis in New York and allow both working class and middle class people to live within the five boroughs, one of the tradeoffs we can make is through height. And so, while I'm not a huge fan of height and I can understand if people want less, I would be completely willing to concede on that to get affordable housing. But this is where I guess the question becomes, because, and I fully believe that there is no intention on anyone's part to confuse the community or whatever it may be, but there has been some confusion since the past hearing. And I'm reading a letter, not from you guys but from our colleague that says this project provides 460 units of housing, 130 of which will be affordable, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. that's where the confusion comes, because I think that's how the project was sold, as-- but now

2.0

2.3

2	there becomes a kind of a next clause, a maybe
3	part to it. And so this is what I want you guys
4	to just talk about a little bit in terms of the
5	and this is where you ask the question,
6	Councilman, if there is no affordable housing in
7	this project, in other words, if you don't get the
8	tax incentive from the City or from the 421-A tax
9	incentive from the State, what will this project
10	be?

DAVID VON SPRECKLESEN: It will become a different project. I can tell you I haven't even begun to conceptualize what it would look like or whether the economics would work; but we wouldn't get the FAR bonus and we wouldn't get the 421-A, so it would be a significantly smaller, different project.

COUNCIL MEMBER GIOIA: Which is why you guys want to build this exact project?

DAVID VON SPRECKLESEN: This project that we have on paper is much more profitable to us than doing something without the affordable housing.

COUNCIL MEMBER GIOIA: To clarify,
Mr. Chairman, you said that they still would get

the FAR? That's why I'm asking for clarification.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: In effect, if
they didn't do the inclusionary housing, they
would still have the ability to do the 21 stories,
the two towers. They wouldn't get additional
bulk, but they'd have the ability to do that
height.

COUNCIL MEMBER GIOIA: Can you guys walk me through that? Because you're saying you wouldn't get the bonus, but you'd still be able to build two towers? Just tell me about the FAR.

DAVID VON SPRECKLESEN: Yeah, the FAR, with the bonus the FAR is 3.6. Without it, if we don't do the affordable, it's 2.7. The way City Planning has put together the framework, the way inclusionary programs work everywhere else, the incentives are tied to bulk, not to height, except for in one instance in the Williamsburg Waterfront, where you could go from a 300 story—300-foot tower to a 400-foot tower. Other than that, it's tied to the bulk. So theoretically, yes, we could do 12 stories without the affordable, but the likelihood of that is not great, given that we have so much less FAR.

2.0

2.3

2	COUNCI	L MEMBER	GIOIA:	I	mean	it

seems to me that the community wants the affordable housing. You all want to provide the affordable housing as part of a larger project.

The rub here is that we're not in a position to guarantee the tax break; but we are in a position on the density and the FAR. SO is there a compromise to be reached here where the FAR would stay as it is unless they do the affordable and that would be the bonus?

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: There's always a compromise. If we're willing to impose upon the developer that restriction, whether or not the developer agrees to it, and whether or not the Council Member who represents this area agrees to it.

COUNCIL MEMBER GIOIA: It just seems to me that the developer in good faith wants to build this project, and we should, you know, help the neighborhood get along especially in these difficult economic times. The only question is something we can't control, and so I'm trying to bring it into something we actually can control, which is the actual zoning.

Τ.	SOB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES ZO
2	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: And I would
3	agree with you. But I don't know if we can
4	arrange that, and certainly within the next five
5	minutes by which we would take a vote.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER GIOIA: Fair enough.
7	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I mean what we
8	could do is lay this item over until Wednesday,
9	because I'm having we're having another
10	Committee meeting on Wednesday, to give us, you
11	know, further time to discuss it. Council Member
12	Katz?
13	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: We're finding
14	out the drop-dead date.
15	[Pause]
16	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: You know, if
17	I may, Mr. Chair, we can actually lay it over. I
18	would just like to point out to the Committee
19	Members and to you as well and to my colleagues
20	that, you know, the Council Member who's district
21	this is in wholeheartedly approves of this
22	project. It is important to him. And I think
23	that that's probably, if I'm not mistaken, the
24	reason that he's not here, is because he sent a
25	letter, and I think that he was under the

impression that since, you know, nobody sort of
beforehand told him there might be a problem, that
he is not here. And I have to make the assumption
that if he knew that he would be, because he's
extremely diligent and it's important to him. The
other side of it is that I understand there has
been so many different agreements already with
labor and so much work that has gone into this.
So, I guess I'm just bringing up the fact that I
was under the impression also that this is sort of
a go. I understand that there are some issues,
but I'm willing to make the discussion, if you
want to take a break for a second.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I have no objections to taking a five-minute break. Let us take a quick recess and then we'll come right back.

COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: Thank you.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I want to thank you for your additional testimony. Thank you. We're just going to wait for the vote until we get everybody back in the room. So it will just be a couple of minutes.

1	SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 30							
2	[Pause]							
3	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Mr. Chair							
4	as we wait one second, I was remiss earlier in not							
5	putting on the record a note of appreciation to							
6	Paul Nagle, our Director of Cultural Affairs, who							
7	worked very hard on the Battery Maritime Building,							
8	so I would like the record to reflect his hard							
9	work. Thank you.							
10	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: You're							
11	welcome.							
12	[Pause]							
13	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: All right.							
14	Since I will be voting against the Toll Brothers							
15	project, Chair Katz will introduce the motions on							
16	the two items that remain to be voted on.							
17	[Pause]							
18	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: You know							
19	there's such a thing as closing while you're							
20	ahead. Let me make two motions if I can, Mr.							
21	Chair, and I don't know whether you want to make a							
22	motion on the other things first, or are these the							
23	only two items now that we're voting on? Okay. I							
24	think Councilman Gerson discussed the Battery							
25	Maritime Building in quite detailed a motion							

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there, so I will just say, you know, taking all of his suggestions into account -- I also spoke personally to the Borough President who is in full support of the Battery Maritime Building, and I understand the Community Board was as well, and so I will make a motion on the Councilman's suggestion as well, and congratulate him for all the work he did to approve the three items, Battery Maritime Building, LU number 1000, LU number 1002, LU number 1006. The second motion is for the 363-365 Bond Street. I understand the issues that the Chairman and Councilman Gioia have been discussing, and I do think that they are extremely important to the project. However, overall, I believe that this project is a good thing for the district. I believe that in our economic environment today, this will create good paying jobs, and I think that that is extremely important, especially in today's economic environment that is out there. It will create affordable housing. And as you know that we always talk about if you don't have the project, you're going to get zero affordable housing, I guess. And also I just got off the phone, so that

2.0

2.3

2	everyone knows, with Councilman de Blasio. He has
3	reiterated to me his extreme support for this
4	project in his district. So with all that said, I
5	will make a motion to approve the 363-365 Bond
6	Street, LUs number 1003, 1005; and I make the
7	motion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your time.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you,

Chair Katz. And I'll ask Counsel to call the vote

on those two items.

CHRISTIAN HYLTON:

Chair Avella?

just want to take a moment to explain why I'm going to vote against both items. Without going into great detail, because I did mention it during the discussion on the items, one, I just feel with the Maritime Building that the addition to a landmarked structure is just inappropriate. If they had just done a little bit more work to make the new hotel on top of this building fit in with the architecture, I think it would have been a great project. I just think they could have done a better job architecturally. With the Toll

Brothers Project, I happen to agree with the

community on a number of levels. One, this

2	project probably should not have come forward at							
3	this time, because there is a comprehensive							
4	rezoning going on in that district, and the							
5	developer should have been told by City Planning							
6	wait until the rezoning goes ahead. There are							
7	still issues about whether the affordable housing							
8	component is going to be built; and the Community							
9	Board and the Community were very supportive of							
10	the affordable housing component, but, and							
11	approved of the project only if that actually							
12	happened; and there really is no commitment. And							
13	there was also a request that he height of the two							
14	towers be reduced from 12 stories to eight							
15	stories, and unfortunately there's been no							
16	movement on that as well. So I vote No on both							
17	items.							
18	CHRISTIAN HYLTON: Council Member							
19	Gioia.							
20	COUNCIL MEMBER GIOIA: Thank you.							
21	May I have a second to explain my vote?							
22	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Sure.							
23	COUNCIL MEMBER GIOIA: Thank you,							
24	Mr. Chair. Chairwoman Katz has a headache, so I							

will be as brief as possible. Seriously, I want

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to thank the Community members and the Community Board for what they've done on this project, because I think some of the objections we've heard is actually not particular to this project. actually, I do believe that this developer wants to build the affordable housing at this site as projected. But there's a concern, I think throughout this city, that there-- sometimes people engage in a bait and switch, say one thing and then sign something different. And I think that's something we have to be very cautious of. And when you read some of these documents, not necessarily put forth by the developer, but where it states this will do this, and then you're told, well, maybe it won't do this but for something else, it raises questions. But I really do believe that there is a full intention by this developer to do exactly what they've said they were going to do, which is to build this project. And my hope is that that is what happens. And I do think that we are in desperate need of housing in this city, especially affordable housing. as the economic slow down seems to continue unabated, we are in desperate need of good jobs,

to explain my vote, if I may? One of the

25

communities in my district is Jackson Heights. 2 3 And Jackson Heights is afforded the status of City 4 Landmarks, State Landmark and on the National Registry. So I'm very sensitive to what happens 5 for those areas and those buildings that are 6 7 landmarked. At the same time, I think what's done 8 here, and I congratulate the Community Board, City Planning, Councilman Gerson, and I can understand 9 10 the Chair's opposition to it; but I think at the 11 same time, they met the challenge of adding more to the community, of creating jobs, and having 12 that sensitivity for landmarking. And I think 13 that probably as time goes on, more and more of 14 15 that we will be looking at in coming before this 16 Committee. I also wish to say that for the other 17 project, there seems to be an agreement about all of that, and I think that we should make a note 18 19 that creating jobs doesn't mean that everything 20 goes by the wayside just to create those jobs; and 21 it's a challenge, and I think that this Committee 22 does it well in recognizing that we must do jobs, 23 we must create them for the economics of this city, and at the same time, preserving the 24 25 architectural integrity of the city. I vote Aye

Committee on Zoning and Franchises and I must remember, and Land Use will start immediately, but I must remind my Committee Members that there will be another meeting of the Zoning and Franchises Committee Wednesday morning. It is a separate meeting.

I, Erika Swyler 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.

the fit

Signature			

Date _____March 16, 2009_____