CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----- X

June 6, 2019

Start: 10:04 a.m. Recess: 10:48 a.m.

HELD AT: Committee Room - City Hall

B E F O R E: Francis P. Moya

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Costa Constantinides

Barry Grodenchik Donovan J. Richards Ritchie J. Torres Carlina Rivera

Rafael Salamanca, Jr.

Deborah Rose Rory I. Lancman Antonio Reynoso

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

Genevieve Michael

Ted Weinstein

Michael Wadman Vice President of Real Estate Development Phipps Houses

Ted Weinstein

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

JOHN VIANO: This is a microphone check.

Today's date is June 6, 2019, Committee on Zoning and

Franchises, being recorded by John Viano, City Hall

Committee Room. [pause]

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: [[gavel] Good morning and welcome to the meeting of the Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises. I'm Council Member Francisco Moya, the chairperson of the subcommittee. And today we are joined by Council Members Constantinides, Grodenchik, Richards, Torres, Rivera. We are also joined by the chair of Land Use, Chairman Salamanca, Councilwoman Debbie Rose. Today we will be voting on a number of applications previously heard by the subcommittee and we will hold one public hearing. Please also note that LU 419 for the Court Square Block 3 text amendment is being laid over. Today we will vote to approve with modifications Preconsidered LU numbers 436, 437, for the 2 Howard Avenue rezoning in Brooklyn. The proposal would amend the zoning map to zone the project area from an R6B C24 district to a C4-4L district and would include a related zoning text amendment to map the site as a mandatory inclusionary housing area utilizing options 1 and 2.

As proposed, these actions would facilitate the

1 AND FRANCHISES 2 development of a new six-story mixed use building, including retail use on the ground floor and 3 approximately 30 residential units, of which 4 approximately eight would be affordable under the MIH 5 program. Our modification will be to remove MIH 6 7 option 2, requiring the use of MIH option 1. Council Member Ampry-Samuels is in support of this 8 application, as modified by the council. Today we 9 will also be voting to approve Preconsidered LUs 10 number 420 through 423, with modifications for 11 12 separate land use actions, requested by the 13 Department of City Planning and the Department for 14 Housing Preservation and Development in connection 15 with the Special Bay Street Corridor District 16 rezoning in Staten Island. The Special Bay Street 17 Corridor rezoning property would rezone approximately 18 20 blocks in the area of downtown Staten Island near the St. George, Stapleton, and Tompkinsville 19 20 neighborhoods, to require contextual buildings and new affordable housing and to promote economic 21 2.2 development within a vibrant mixed use downtown. 23 Additionally, the proposal would facilitate new development with affordable housing, community 24

facility, and economic development components on

25

2 city-owned land. The council is modifying the zoning text application in response to concerns voiced by 3 4 community members regarding the urban design of 5 anticipated new development and affordability levels for residential development. The council is 6 7 modifying the zoning text amendment LU 421 to remove to both mandatory inclusionary housing option 2 and 8 the work force option. The final version will map 9 MIH option 1 and the deep affordability option, which 10 together require the deepest affordability possible. 11 12 The council is also modifying the bulk rules to require building heights in certain areas to more 13 closely reflect the local neighborhood character. 14 15 The council is modifying the bulk regulations within 16 subdistricts A and D, including the creation of two subareas within subdistrict D, establishing locally 17 18 appropriate density height and setback rules. council's text modifications would also include 19 20 clarifications regarding use regulations for existing public transportation facilities and bulk regulations 21 2.2 to accommodate DOE school uses in the Special 23 Stapleton Waterfront District. With regard to LU 24 423, the proposed UDAAP disposition that is a part of

the rezoning property, the council notes that HPD has

2.1

2.2

submitted a revised project summary for the future development of the disposition site at 539 Jersey

Street. The revised submission clarifies that the site will be developed with a residential component of approximately 223 units that will be 100% affordable and include a portion to be set aside for affordable senior housing. The community is represented by Council Member Debbie Rose, who has dedicated countless hours with the de Blasio administration and stakeholders for many years to ensure that these process results in the best possible outcome for her community and I would like to invite Council Member Rose to make some remarks prior to our vote. [pause]

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you so much,
Chair Moya. I want to thank you for your support for
this rezoning. You've been so helpful and
supportive. I am very excited to announce my support
for this rezoning of the Bay Street corridor in my
district. The road was long, but with the guidance
and the input from my constituents and the many
stakeholders I have secured the necessary funding and
commitments for the next chapter of the story of the
North Shore. For too long, planning on Staten Island

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

has been haphazard or nonexistent. Today we have before us a blueprint for a well-planned future. Through many negotiations over nearly four years, I am pleased to be delivering several critical community investments that respond to the needs of the existing community, while also providing a sustainable path for the future of the North Shore. First and foremost, I have secured a commitment to fully affordable housing on publicly owned property as a part of this project. The North Shore is not a gated community and I have maintained a commitment to ensure that no one feels shut out of their own neighborhood. The two phases of the Homeport site on the new Stapleton waterfront will include approximately 600 affordable housing units with 30% of the units in the first phase of development for residents making up to 50% AMI, guaranteeing that a broad spectrum of residents will be able to access new affordable housing in a desirable waterfront location. We have also secured commitments to build 100% affordable housing at 539 Jersey Street, which will have a minimum of 25% of the affordable housing on the site to serve households making less than 50% of AMI, and 90 units of senior housing. Not only

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

have we secured 100% affordable housing on the waterfront, but the School Construction Authority will build a brand new, approximately 600-seat elementary or elementary intermediate school on the site as well. I have fought hard to make sure that the much-needed school seats in our district are actually built. Along with the new waterfront school, SCA has committed to another new elementary school at the old Hungerford school site and to build a new annex for PS-13 to provide additional seats. That's two brand-new schools in addition to the one we are currently building on Targee Street. ensure that residents have access to adequate open space we have secured the building of 12 acres of contiguous, or continuous waterfront esplanade that will include open space amenities such as playgrounds, basketball court, dog runs, picnic area, pickleball, that's news to me, I don't know what it is [laughter], so don't hurt me people 'cause I don't know what pickleball is, and comfort stations [laughter]. The key connection, the proposed Tompkinsville esplanade between this new waterfront development and the ferry terminal has been long discussed, but it is now finally funded with, ah, I

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

think it's 74 million dollars to complete it. will give residents in the corridor and beyond new options for commuting and recreation. No longer will pedestrians and bicyclists need to compete for space on limited roadways. The Tompkinsville esplanade will provide a safe pedestrian-oriented space that will close the existing gaps in the North Shore waterfront and will include resiliency measures for a safe and sustainable future, a key piece in my longterm vision for a continuous North Shore esplanade that makes the waterfront publicly accessible and not just for those who can pay for it. administration has committed to 100 vouchers for North Shore families to move out of shelters into affordable housing in the North Shore. Several agencies have also committed to dedicated legal services for residents of the North Shore who may face displacement as development occurs. also secured 50 million dollars in necessary sewer infrastructure work along Bay Street to ensure new development does not create flooding or drainage This funding is separate from the 45 million in new sewers, the realignment of Front Street, and the utilities at the Stapleton waterfront. Growth in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

the North Shore should open up economic opportunities for our residents, which is why we have secured funding to reactivate 55 Stuyvesant Place for a mix of job-generating uses and guaranteed prevailing wages for all building service workers in new buildings or buildings that receive one million or more in public financial assistance. And finally, finally, finally the long-delayed rebuilding of the Cromwell Recreation Center at the Lyons Pool. those of you who are listening have no idea what that means, but to the people in my district that was huge and that was, I was told, better be the deal-breaker. So that will be located at Lyons Pool, which was damaged beyond repair in 2010, is fully funded. 92 million dollars in new funds will ensure that the Cromwell Center will be built on the Lyons Pool site with an anticipated opening of the community center in 2025. We will not and did not allow them to put this in the budget in the out years. This will be in the 2020 budget. This neighborhood anchor will provide a variety of recreational activities, identified in the previous community engagement process, and we have guaranteed that the city will work with the community on the design and programming

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

at the new center as plans are finalized. We have a series of other commitments that I don't have time to list here because Chair Matteo is rolling his eyes at me [laughter], but I believe that my constituents will be pleased with the 250 million dollar package we delivered for the North Shore. All of these commitments include many strategies to ensure that the North Shore is better equipped to deal with the new housing and population growth accompanying this development. I fought for the city to make good on their prior commitments. I fought for the best for the North Shore and fought to respond to the stakeholders who voiced their concerns. With local stakeholder support, I believe we have reached a plan that will meet the needs of our neighborhoods, but more importantly will be a roadmap to a new investment in Staten Island and create vital opportunities for the future of our borough. finally I want to thank the City Council Land Use team, who are just absolutely phenomenal, Raju Mann, Amy Levitan, John Douglas, Arthur Hand, Kevin Coat, and Kelly Rosa, who we became like roommates through this process. I want to thank you. Without their expertise and dedication to this project we would not

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2 be here this morning. I want to also say thank you to my stay, my chief of staff Christine Johnson, and 3 4 to Vince Granyani and Esa Rodgers for their 5 dedication to this project as well. I urge my 6 colleagues to vote yes on this application, and I 7 want to thank you, Chair Moya, and always the speaker 8 of the City Council, for your support during this 9 process. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you, Debbie.

Congratulations, and for the record I was rolling my eyes at Salamanca [laughter]. Ah, I just want to make a quick note here regarding LUs 436 and 437.

The council is also modifying the proposals to include the MIH deep affordability option in addition to option 1. I now call for a vote to approve with modification, ah, the modifications I described,

Preconsidered LUs 420 through 423 and Preconsidered

LUS 436 and 437. Counsel, please call the role.

COUNSEL: Chair Moya.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Aye.

COUNSEL: Council Member Constantinides.

COUNCIL MEMBER CONSTANTINIDES: Aye.

COUNSEL: Council Member Richards.

2.2

COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Congratulations to Council Member Debbie Rose on a job well done and to the chairs, I vote aye.

COUNSEL: Council Member Rivera.

COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: Aye.

COUNSEL: Council Member Torres.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: I vote aye.

COUNSEL: Council Member Grodenchik.

COUNCIL MEMBER GRODENCHIK: I vote aye on all and congratulate Ms. Rose, and pickleball is for people that are a little pickled, let's put it that way [laughter]. It's for the older crowd [laughter] but it's sweeping the nation and you're going to like it. Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER GRODENCHIK: Aye on all.

COUNSEL: I have a vote of 6 in the affirmative, zero in the negative, and no abstentions. The items are approved and referred to the full Land Use Committee.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you, and again, congratulations Debbie. This is a great day for you and the people of Staten Island.

COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you so much.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: I now will be moving to our public hearing. Today we are holding a hearing on LU numbers 424 through 427 for the Brook 156 rezoning in Council Member Salamanca's district in the Bronx. The applicant seeks approval for a zoning map amendment to rezone the existing R72 to a C62 district, a related zoning text amendment to map the site within a mandatory inclusionary housing area with MIH option 1 and option 2, approval for the disposition of city-owned property and a special permit to allow development on or over the rail yard, over the rail yard right-of-way. As proposed, these actions would facilitate the development of a new nine-story mixed use building with approximately 54 affordable housing units, approximately 1100 square feet of community facility use, and approximately 1300 square feet of open space. I now open the public hearing and I would like to turn it over to Chair Salamanca for his remarks.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: Thank you, Chair Moya.

Good morning, welcome. First, I want to thank the land use staff and HPD for working with us. Just to give you a little history as to what's happening in the South Bronx, I've been in office for a little

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

over three years and in the three years that I've been in office I've approved over 4900 units of 100% affordable housing. All mixed-income housing, ensuring that we have housing for the homeless families, and we have a portion that is 15% homeless set-aside. I see that as part of this project, you are recommending a 17% homeless set-aside. And I also believe in mixed income, ensuring that extremely low families have access to housing and also our working class families have access to housing. concerns that I have with this project is that I feel that you're, in your income bracket you're going a little too high in terms of your 90% AMI. I find it irresponsible of me to approve a project where your 90% AMI units are higher than my 30% AMI units. I've made this clear to HPD and I've made this clear to the developer and I've made this clear to the land use team. I look forward to your testimony. I look forward to having a dialogue, but, you know, me putting, setting a line on the sand, I cannot support a project where 90% AMI units are higher than the 30% AMI units and I cannot support a project where this MIH option 1 and option 2, the only MIH option that I will be supportive is MIH option 1. So I hope that

2.2

we can come to an agreement. This is city-owned

land. This is not privately owned land. And I

believe that when we're talking about city-owned land

we should make it affordable for those residents that

live in that immediate community. Thank you, Mr.

Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you, Chair.

Before we begin I just want to recognize that we have been joined by Council Member Lancman, and I just want to quickly open up the roles for a vote.

COUNSEL: Continuing vote of the land use items, Council Member Lancman.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANCMAN: Aye.

COUNSEL: A vote of 7 in the affirmative, zero in the negative, and no abstentions, and the items are approved and referred to the full Land Use Committee.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. Ted
Weinstein. Michael Wadman. Genevieve Michael. How
are you? Counsel, if you could swear in the panel.

COUNSEL: Please state your name as part of the response. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth,

the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and that you will answer all questions truthfully?

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: Genevieve Michael, yes.

TED WEINSTEIN: Ted Weinstein, yes.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you, you may

begin.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: Land Use numbers 424 to 427 are related to ULURP actions pertaining to disposition approval of a city-owned lot as zoning map change, a special permit and a zoning text amendment in order to establish mandatory inclusionary housing area for a project known as Brook 156, located at 740 Brook Avenue, block 2360, lot 3, in the Melrose section of the Bronx in Council District 17. Brook 156 will be developed by the sponsor of Phipps Houses, who proposes to construct a residential building under HPD's extremely low and low income, or ELLA program. Under the ELLA program, sponsors develop buildings in order to create lowincome rental housing for families with a range of incomes from 30% to 60% of the area median income and projects may include a tier of units with rents targeted to households earning up to 100% of AMI.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Subject to project underwriting, up to 30% of the units may be rented to formerly homeless households, referred by the Department of Homeless Housing or other public agencies. The project consists of the city-owned lot, lot 3, and adjacent privately owned lot, lot 1. Lot 1 is a former rail right-of-way and active open cut railroad trench. Both lots were designated as part of Urban Renewal Site 404 under the Mott Haven North, ah, Urban Renewal Plan, the Mott Haven Plan, in 1994. It should be noted that while the Mott Haven Urban Renewal Plan will not expire until the year 2034, the land use restrictions of site 404 did expire in 2008. Land use number 424 is related to an amendment of the zoning map. change seeks to change the R72 to C62 in order to facilitate the construction of more affordable units and would be allowed under existing zoning in a building that is consistent with the density of the surrounding area. Land Use number 425 will facilitate the construction of a nine-story building with approximately 51 affordable dwelling units, plus one unit for a superintendent. The unit mixture is comprised of 11 studios, 19 one-bedrooms, 14 twobedrooms, and eight three-bedrooms. Targeted incomes

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

will be between up to 30%, up to 80% of the area median income with up to 20% of the units targeted to 110% of AMI. Rents will be affordable to families from 27% to 87% of AMI, with up to 20% of units affordable to families with incomes up to 90% AMI, although obviously understand those conversations are ongoing. Amenities include approximately 1119 square feet of community facility space, a fitness center, and laundry room. Land Use 426 seeks approval of an amendment of the zoning resolution in order to establish a mandatory inclusionary housing area mapping option. Option 1 requires 20% of the units be affordable to 60% of AMI, with 10% required to be 40% of AMI. Proposed affordability for the project far exceeds the option 1 minimum. Additionally, HPD will be requiring at least an additional 15% of the units be permanently affordable for at least 40% of the units. Land Use number 427 seeks approval of the special permit that will allow for development over a formal rail right-of-way. As zone order to facilitate the development of the Brook 156 project, HPD is before the council seeking approval of Land Use numbers 424 to 427. [pause]

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MICHAEL WADMAN: Hi, I'm Michael Wadman, vice president of real estate development at Phipps Houses. Thank you, council members, for letting us present to you today. Given the description of the project that you just received, I'll try to focus on items that are not duplicative. You see the project location here at the corner of East 156th Street and Brook Avenue. It's just north of another Phipps Houses development called Rio Verde, quite near the La Centrale development and a lot of the other housing going up and that has gone up in Melrose. This is a key area for Phipps. We own about 2000 apartments in this general part of the Bronx. also provide a lot of social services in this area, and this is a site that we've owned since 2011, so we're pretty excited to be here talking to you about it and looking forward to resolution of any open issues and proceeding. Phipps is the largest notfor-profit housing developer, owner, and manager in New York City. We've been around since 1905 and we're committed to keeping all of our housing affordable, essentially in perpetuity. We've only lost one project to unaffordable forces when we sued by our limited partners many years ago, so you can

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

count on us to preserve this important community The zoning actions were already listed, so asset. I'll pass over those, if you don't mind, and give you a little more feel for the building. On the community facility space, I'm not sure if I heard that the number was right in the earlier presentation, it's 1100 square feet, ah, OK, all right, my apologies, good. I just wanted to make sure I was hearing that correctly. That space that we expect our social service agency, Phipps Neighborhoods, to occupy and they're focusing on identifying a form of work force development or employment training for young adults that would be housed in that location. That's one of their key issue areas. As mentioned previously, we have a lot owned by a Phipps affiliate and a lot owned by HPD. It's also along this railroad right-of-way that was described. One thing that's I think most exciting about this is that this particular site has been a real blight for, since around the time I was born in the late '60s, from what I've gathered from the records. It attracts trespassers and garbage and illegal activity, and I think removing, it's also surrounded by now redeveloped housing with good

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

neighbors who don't like the site being in the state it is. So it's going to be exciting to clear that and put some nice housing there. The bridge closure was also mentioned. This is what the site looks like, again, pretty derelict and DOT is now working on that, so that we should be able to proceed once they are done closing that tunnel. This is the shape of the building, and then a couple more of the renderings that you saw on the cover page. We think it's an attractive building that fits in with the other buildings around it. It has a very active ground floor with a community facility space we described, as well as a lobby and a community room is focused on the ground floor with windows to the street, so there will be quite a lot of eyes on the street. These are the other sides of the building. The ground floor, as I mentioned, has the community center, as well as the community facility space and a fitness center for tenants, even though it's a small building. By providing good solid amenity areas and actually an outdoor patio deck in the rear we think we are providing a very high level of amenity for the people who will live here. That's the typical floor apartment distributions, ah, lobby, so we're really

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

looking to make this not a low-income-looking building regardless of the deep affordability that we will be providing. As discussed, the conversations are ongoing on the specific median income bands. are, um, Phipps is really willing to implement whatever is agreed up, serving formerly homeless as well as 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90% of median. We think, you know, we support mixed-income housing completely and I think by providing this kind of level of mixed-income community it adds a lot to the building, as well as to the neighborhood. mentioned, we have amenities, a fair number of family-sized units. We're also looking to conduct outreach to senior citizens for the smaller units so that those units can be put to better use. the unit distribution and another just general description, since the specific affordability is still under discussion. Yeah, of course, sorry, yeah. Um, so you'll see that this slide presents very broad bands because of the ongoing discussion, so, um, the specifics will be fairly equal representation we think, again, pending the conclusion of the discussions of serving those different bands. Is it OK to proceed, or did you

2.2

want, yeah, OK. And that's just another shot of what
the building looks like, and I'd be happy to answer
any questions or proceed in any way you'd like to.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you for your testimony. I'm going to turn it over to Chair Salamanca.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: Thank you for your presentation. It's a good total number of units.

Your presentation, though, with the unit sizes, the one-, two-, and three-bedrooms, OK, 55 units, percent studio units, all right. It's good to see a good size of three- and two-bedroom units. I mean, that's an ask that we've had in the community, so I thank you for that. A question for HPD. Have you released your new term sheets already?

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: We have not formally released our new term sheets. I think, as you know, we've been considering some changes and starting to work with developers towards changes, but have not formally released them.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: So what term sheets are they working out of? Their presentation has formerly

2.2

2 homeless, 30% to 80% AMI, but HPD's presentation is 3 up to 90% AMI.

Working off of the ELLA term sheet, I think it's even our [inaudible], correct if I'm wrong, I think we've been doing a little bit of a hybrid of both, like what the current ELLA term sheet is as well as we're looking at some of the changes, I think to make the program really work. But, again, I think as far as the specific AMIs on this is just still working out where we're going to land finally.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: So, to Phipps, when you got an approval in February of 2019, in front of the community board, the presentation that you made was what AMI levels?

 $\operatorname{\mathsf{MICHAEL}}$  WADMAN: It was the slide that you see here.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: The slide that I see here? [inaudible]

MICHAEL WADMAN: The fairly broad...

CHAIR SALAMANCA: Up to 80% AMI, but yet you're here in the council asking us to approve 90% AMIs. [pause]

2.2

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: Do you know when the 90 AMIs [inaudible]?

MICHAEL WADMAN: I guess that's right, in that the at the time of the community board presentation 80% of the AMI was the highest band under contemplation.

the community to trust you when you're presenting to them a plan and you're getting their approval from 30% AMIs to 80% AMIs? You went to the borough board and got borough president approval with that same, that same plan, and you're here in the council presenting a different plan.

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: Sorry, to clarify I think the borough president's recommendation actually does have the nine units at 90 AMI.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: Does it?

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: Yep.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: OK, well, can you explain to me, did you go back to the community board and say hey, our plan changed?

MICHAEL WADMAN: We haven't yet, but we certainly could.

2.2

2 CHAIR SALAMANCA: So you originally went
3 to the community board seeking community board
4 approval. You made changes to the plan and you have
5 not gotten back to tell the community board who voted
6 on one particular plan that that plan that they voted
7 on has been changed and this is the new plan?
8 MICHAEL WADMAN: We haven't done that

MICHAEL WADMAN: We haven't done that yet, you're right.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: This is why there is a lack of trust between the community and city agencies and this agency. I'm not going to continue to beat a dead horse, but I think that is just wrong. Um, this is city-owned land, correct?

MICHAEL WADMAN: One of the two parcels is city-owned, yes.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: OK, and how did Phipps, can you explain how did Phipps get, how did Phipps, was there an RFP, ah, or did HPD just select Phipps because they have the adjacent lot next door?

TED WEINSTEIN: The site consists of these tax lots. One of them is the remainder of the abandoned railroad line, which is private and has always been private, and then next to that, sort of in between the trench and the sidewalk is this narrow

2.2

sliver. It looks likes a sidewalk. That's the cityowned. The reason, um, that this was originally done
was that it was part of an urban renewal site that
included the rest of that entire block, site 404 of
the old Mott Haven North urban renewal plan. The,
ah, the city-owned land, which is narrow and is on
the outside, like on the sidewalk side, is of no use
to anybody for development purpose other than whoever
would own the private lot, and that's generally been
a common criteria [inaudible] when we don't do a
competitive process because it just isn't of any use
or value to anybody else. If we were to RFP the
city-owned lot there's nothing they could do with it
because Phipps owns the larger lot right next to it.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: OK, all right, that makes sense. [pause] So this development would be nine stories, 55 units? It's kind of a big building for just 55 units.

MICHAEL WADMAN: It's not a big building, or?

CHAIR SALAMANCA: It's kind of, pretty normally when you get a nine-story building you get more units. Is it because of the way the lot is designed?

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING 1 AND FRANCHISES 2 MICHAEL WADMAN: Yeah, the parcels are 3 pretty small, first of all. 4 CHAIR SALAMANCA: OK. MICHAEL WADMAN: But also there are some 5 constraints on the [inaudible] building. 6 7 CHAIR SALAMANCA: All right. What is the developer fee that you'll be getting out of this 8 9 project, the dollar amount? MICHAEL WADMAN: Say it again? 10 CHAIR SALAMANCA: The dollar amount, as a 11 12 developer fee. 13 MICHAEL WADMAN: So it's typically 15% of 14 cost. I think in this case that's about 3 million 15 dollars. CHAIR SALAMANCA: What's the total cost 16 17 of the building? Of the project? 18 MICHAEL WADMAN: About 30 million. CHAIR SALAMANCA: Sorry? 19 20 MICHAEL WADMAN: About 30 million.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: 30 million. OK.

2.2 MICHAEL WADMAN: I mean, sorry, I can

double check a little more specifically.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: Please do.

21

23

24

2.2

MICHAEL WADMAN: Yeah, it's an
approximately 30 million dollar project. The maximum
allowed fee is typically 15% of that. We're
typically only paid more like 2% to 5%, sometimes a
little bit more.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: So my calcification of 15% of 30 million is 4.5 million.

MICHAEL WADMAN: Right. The budget doesn't support being paid that amount, but there will be, so much of that will be deferred and paid out of cash flow or something.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: In my conversations with HPD about moving around the AMIs and getting more of an equal distribution in the 30 and 40 and 50 and 60 and having less in the 90% AMI units, HPD mentions that there is a gap right now. Can you tell me what's the current gap now?

MICHAEL WADMAN: Yeah, the last version of the numbers we looked at the gap was about 2 million dollars.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: OK, and should, they made the changes that I'm recommend..., I'm sorry.

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: I think actually, the last version I have seen from [inaudible] 3 million.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: Three-million dollar gap? And should there be changes, the changes that I'm recommending, what, how much of a gap would that?

numbers. I think it would depend on various scenarios, but I think any change would pretty considerably add to that gap.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: All right. A question to HPD, and I've seen this before. We've approved projects here in the council where we agreed to certain AMI levels. It's gone through subcommittee, it's gone through Land Use, it's gone through the council, it's been approved, and HPD doesn't close on the project a year from now, a year and a half from now, things happen, I understand. But I've had developers come back and say, Salamanca, you approved this project a year ago, a year and a half ago.

These were the AMIs. This is what was agreed upon.

Now we have to change the AMI levels. How often does that happen?

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: Ah, I can't speak to how often it happens. I think it happens occasionally. I think the unfortunate reality is, as you know, our tax credits are a finite resource and

2.2

we end up with projects that I think are hugely
expensive or where we can't make the numbers work, so

occasionally we will have go back if things have

changed to try and reassess, but I think, you know,

our goal, ah, is for that not to happen, but, you

know, I don't know the exact number of times that it

happens.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: All right. You mention affordability of this project. Permanently affordability will be 40 years?

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: Ah, I think that's correct.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: All right.

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: I think that's correct.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: All right. No way that we can increase that permanent affordability since there's city-owned land that's attached to this project?

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: You know, I think the issue there is, ah, the 420-C tax exemption, which is what pairs with the ELLA is a 40-year tax exemption. I think we end up in, ah, rough situations if we extend affordability beyond when the tax exemption

2.2

expires. I think you end up with, ah, buildings that are going having tax flow, ah, cash flow problems.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: OK, well, I'm going to be very transparent and very honest. At the moment I'm not supporting this project. If you want support from my office, from myself, you have to remove option 2 from MIH. You have to back to the community board and see, you need to meet with them and see if you can get an updated letter of recommendation, because you did change the AMIs and there's no way that I can support a project where 90% AMI units are higher than my 30% AMI units.

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: Yeah, I just want to, because I have the borough president's recommendation in front of me that I think does reflect the 90 AMI mix, I want to make sure that and we can go back and look at what the community board approved and actually confirm whether or not there is a discrepancy there. I'm sorry I don't have that before me today.

CHAIR SALAMANCA: That's fine. Thank you all. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. I just have one quick question, if you can clarify something

zoning requirements.

2.2

for me. Can you list the minimum square footage for affordable housing units? How much for a studio, how much for a one-bedroom, two-bedroom, three-bedroom?

MICHAEL WADMAN: I don't have HPD's guidelines in front of me. These unit sizes that you saw in the slide are not the very bare minimum sizes, but they're probably in the lower half of the range that HPD provides. As you know, they, the design guidance were revised a couple years ago and they did produce smaller units than previously.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: So from my
understanding New York City sets a minimum apartment
size for affordable housing. Market-rate buildings
do not have to follow those regulations, correct?

MICHAEL WADMAN: Correct, other than

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Right. So the apartment square footage for this purpose is to measure the inside face of the walls. It says that a studio apartment minimum is 400 square feet. Is that correct?

MICHAEL WADMAN: There are different calculations of square footage. In the zoning code

2.2

that 400 is measured a different way than that 361 you see here. We're fully compliant with zoning.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: So explain that to me.

MICHAEL WADMAN: Well, there are different, I mean, the zoning code is looking at floor area as zoning defines it. It has...

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Could you speak into the mic a little bit more?

MICHAEL WADMAN: Yeah, sorry. And a way of calculating that, the type of square footage you see for the purposes of an architect talking about the square foot of the unit isn't calculated exactly the same way.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: But if we have a minimum size, correct, HPD, I'm going to you now, right? It's 400 square feet. How is it that we're then allowing a studio to zero bedroom be 361 square feet?

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: I don't have the answer to that in front of me. I can certainly follow up with you guys to make sure we're not getting...

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: I think...

2.2

GENEVIEVE MICHAEL: I mean, I'm sure there is an explanation, but...

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: [inaudible] really important. Ah, just be the requirements that I'm seeing right here, ah, what the breakdown here is much less than what the city has in terms of requirements for a minimum-size unit for affordable housing. One bedroom is 575 square feet, two bedrooms is 775 square feet, three bedrooms are 950 square feet. And then looking at also what was given to the borough president and what he had put together, we have 11 studio units at approximately 418 gross square feet for studios. The one-bedrooms were at 645, two bedrooms at 813, and the three bedrooms at 1109 square feet, and three of those units would be specifically designed to pursue the ADA mandates for the one and two bedrooms.

MICHAEL WADMAN: It sounds like we should do our research and get back to you on that.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: I think that that is really important, given the size of these units and what we're seeing here. It would be extremely important on the process and I think for the chair and his constituents. They certainly would deserve

2.2

2 to have the right to not be, ah, having less of the 3 square footage made available to them.

MICHAEL WADMAN: Very good, we'll follow up.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Thank you. [pause]
Thank you. Any other questions, Chair? Nope? I just want to take the opportunity to recognize Council
Member Reynoso. I'd like to thank the panel for coming here and testifying here today. You are dismissed, and I will now reopen the vote for Council Member Reynoso.

COUNSEL: Continuing with the vote of the land use items, Council Member Reynoso?

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Thank you, Chair. I vote age on all.

COUNSEL: I have a vote of 8 in the affirmative, zero in the negative, and no abstentions. The land use items are approved and referred to the full Land Use Committee.

CHAIRPERSON MOYA: Are there any other members of the public who wish to testify? Seeing none, I now close the public hearing on this application and it will be laid over. This concludes today's meeting, and I would like to thank the

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES	39
2	members of the public, my colleagues, counsel,	and
3	land use staff for attending. This meeting is	hereby
4	adjourned. [gavel]	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

#### ${\tt C} \ {\tt E} \ {\tt R} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt F} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt C} \ {\tt A} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt E}$

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 June 14, 2019