November 15, 2010

CITYLAND

November 15, 2010 Volume 7
CITYLAND CENTER FOR NEW YORK CITY LAW
VOLUME 7, NUMBER 10

Highlights

CITY COUNCIL

NE Queens rezoning modified .149
Rezoning in Far West Village .151
BK Sanitation garage opposed .152
East Village rezoning OK’d .153
Northern Tribeca rezoned .153
Borough Park project modified .154
Central Bronx rezoning .155

BOARD OF STANDARDS & APPEALS

Trump SoHo permit challenge .155

LANDMARKS

Museum’s food kiosk denied .156
BK historic districts heard .157
New district in Ridgewood .158
Artificial ivy opposed .159
Designations in Jamaica .159

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

Meeting on waterfront plan .160

COMPTROLLER’S OFFICE

CBA task force report .160

COURT DECISIONS

Staten Island takings claim .162

CITYLAND PROFILE

Brian Cook .161

CHARTS

DCP Pipeline .151
ULURP Pipeline .154
BSA Pipeline .155
Landmarks Actions .156
Landmarks Pipeline .157
Citylaw.org New Decisions .162–63

The Landmarks Preservation Commission approved the creation of the Ridgewood South Historic District in southern Queens. See story on page 158. Image: Courtesy LPC.

Rezoning

Auburndale/Oakland Gardens, Queens

Large rezoning in northeast Queens modified

Contextual rezoning of 418 blocks in Auburndale, Oakland Gardens, and Hollis Hills modified to address concerns of private co-op. On October 27, 2010, the City Council modified the Department of City Planning’s 418-block rezoning of three communities in northeast Queens. The contextual rezoning impacted the Auburndale subarea, which is generally bounded by Station Road to the north, the Long Island Expressway to the south, Francis Lewis Boulevard to the east, and Kissena Park to the west; and the Oakland Gardens-Hollis Hills subarea, generally bounded by the Long Island Expressway, the Grand Central Parkway, Alley Pond Park, and the Clearview Expressway.

The suburban area is characterized by one- and two-family detached and semi-detached housing, with larger apartment buildings along the wider avenues. The prior zoning’s flexibility permitted development that was out-of-context with the area’s built character. The approved plan applied contextual zoning districts in order to preserve the area’s low-density residential character, while permitting limited increases in density along the area’s primary corridors.

At the City Planning Commission’s hearing, Oakland Gardens residents debated the rezoning of nine blocks adjacent to Alley Pond Park from an R3-2 to an R2A district. Opponents testified that the R2A district’s prohibition on two-family homes would limit development potential and reduce property values. (cont’d on page 151)
Jane Jacobs reappears in Roberta Brandes Gratz’s new book

The war between Robert Moses and Jane Jacobs flares anew in Roberta Brandes Gratz’s new book, *The Battle for Gotham: New York in the Shadow of Robert Moses and Jane Jacobs* (Nation Books 2010). While everyone today professes to love Jacobs, it is Moses, Gratz argues, who holds sway in such projects as Willets Point, Atlantic Yards and the Columbia University expansion. Discussion of these projects comes last in the book, but they are the book’s core. Gratz wants readers to confront what will be lost in embracing mega projects, and to envision instead what those neighborhoods might become if the existing precursors were instead allowed to grow.

Gratz is a relentless partisan of Jacobs, and laces her book with long quotes from Jacobs whom she knew and often interviewed. Gratz quotes a 2002 Jacobs letter to the effect that the highest urban values are “mixed uses, functional diversity and self-organization and organic adaptability.” She contrasts Jacobs’s values with Moses’s approach which Gratz describes as “formula-based doctrine that oversimplified what it takes to create enduring places, requires a clean slate, and ascribes no value to what came before.” An attempt to blend the Jacobs/Moses urban viewpoints, Gratz says, is a “hilarious oxymoron.”

Gratz develops her thesis by recounting her personal experiences and observations from a lifetime in New York City during which Gratz, a former reporter, participated in civic affairs, most recently as a member of the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Gratz lived as a child in an apartment house on Washington Square which NYU subsequently tore down to build the monolithic Bobst Library; she remembers the buses that used Washington Square as a parking lot, and the defeated Lower Manhattan Expressway was a personal affront. Loss of manufacturing districts in midtown caused her husband’s business to migrate to Long Island City to find space and supporting services. Controversies over the Westway and Lincoln Center are still alive for her.

Gratz favors Jacobs’s view that cities should husband diverse precursors of manufacturing, residential and commercial life, and that cities flourish by allowing these precursors to grow naturally. Large projects obliterate precursors that make for future success. This is her message: the city cannot be both Jacobs and Moses. It has to choose.

Ross Sandler
Auburndale residents and local Council Member Daniel J. Halloran voiced concern over automotive businesses located in the neighborhood’s Station Road manufacturing district. Although not included in the rezoning, residents requested that the Commission residually rezone the district in order to mitigate noise and traffic impacts.

Residents of the Windsor Park Co-op in Oakland Gardens were divided over Planning’s decision to rezone the complex from R4 to R5D. The increased floor area allowed in a R5D district would be needed to permit expansion. Council Member Halloran told the Subcommittee to address the concerns about Station Road. The focus of the hearing then shifted to the redevelopment of the Windsor Park Co-op. The Subcommittee modified the proposal by replacing the Windsor Park site’s R4 zoning with an R5 district. Chair Mark Weprin noted this was the minimum zoning change Windsor Park needed to permit expansion. After the City Planning Commission reviewed the modifications, the full Council unanimously approved the rezoning.

ULURP Process:
Comm. Bd.: QN 7, 8, App’d
Boro. Pres.: App’d
QN Boro. Bd.: App’d
CPC App’d, 11-0-0
Council: App’d, 47-0-0


CITY COUNCIL

Rezoning
West Village, Manhattan

Far West Village contextual rezoning approved

Council approved six-block contextual downzoning to reflect residential uses that predominate historically commercial area. On October 27, 2010, the City Council approved the Department of City Planning’s proposal to rezone portions of six blocks in Manhattan’s Far West Village from C6-1 to C1-6A. The contextual downzoning impacted the blocks generally bounded by the east side of Washington Street between West 12th and West 10th Streets and the west side of Greenwich Street between Perry and West 10th Streets. Except for a single lot, all the properties within the rezoning area are located in either the Greenwich Village Historic District or the Greenwich Village Historic District Extension.

The Far West Village was historically characterized by a range of

CITY PLANNING PIPELINE

New Applications Filed with DCP — October 1 - 31, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>PROJECT/ADDRESS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ULURP NO.</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>Courtlandt Crescent/Melrose Commons, BK</td>
<td>Rezone R7-2 to R8/C1-4 &amp; R7A to const., two residential bldgs; UDAMP &amp; dispo.; amend Urban Renewal Plan</td>
<td>110115ZMN; 110116HAX; 110114HJX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCP</td>
<td>20 Carroll Street, BK</td>
<td>Rezone six blocks from M1-1 to R6</td>
<td>110118ZMK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hashem Ara</td>
<td>1582 Richmond Avenue, SI</td>
<td>Rezone R3X to R3X/C1-2 for retail</td>
<td>110106ZMR</td>
<td>Eric Palatinik PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Solazzo</td>
<td>1816 Forest Avenue, SI</td>
<td>Rezone R3-2 to R3-2/C1-2 for retail</td>
<td>110122ZMR</td>
<td>Eric Palatinik PC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPECIAL PERMITS/OTHER ACTIONS

| NY Plaza Assoc.       | 4 New York Plaza, MN      | Spec. perm. for 42-space acc. garage | 110110ZSM  | Fried Frank                 |
| 11-17 Assoc. LLC      | 7 Second Avenue, MN       | Cert. to determine transit easement | 110124ZCM  | GoldmanHarris               |
| W39th Street LLC      | 330 West 39th Street, MN  | Cert. to const. 52 space acc. garage | 110122ZCM  | Kramer Levin                |
| Balio Deli            | 837 Eleventh Avenue, MN   | New enclosed cafe with 40 seats     | 110104ECM  |
| Edge 11211 LLC        | The Edge, 22 N. 6th Street, BK | Cert. change to waterfront pub. access; cert. no waterfront pub. access req.; cert. change to waterfront pub. access req.; cert. no waterfront pub. access req. | 110108ZCK; 110109ZCK; 110112ZCK; 110111ZCK |
| SBS                   | Atlantic Avenue BID, BK   | BID plan covers twenty blocks       | 110117BDK  |

Katherine Chau         | 11-22 128th Street, QN   | Auth. to dev. side-by-side dwellings | 110112ZQM  |
| 153rd St. Assocs.     | 72-25 153rd Street, QN   | Mod. spec. perm. for LSRCD facility | 880041DZSQ  | Fried Frank                 |
| 8th St. Bldg. LLC     | 111 Latourette Street, SI | Cert. to subdivide one lot into three | 110120RCR  | Calvenco Assoc.             |
| Christian Carter      | 839 Marcy Avenue, SI      | Cert. to subdivide one lot into two | 110107RCR  | Think Design Arch.          |
| Salvatore Schettina   | 738 Marcy Avenue, SI      | Cert. to subdivide one lot into two | 110123ZCM  | David Darcy                 |

The Commission modified the proposal, including applying R3X districts in the place of proposed R2A districts to the blocks adjacent to Alley Pond Park, and removing the Windsor Park site from the plan. The Commission believed that the R3X districts would better reflect the development pattern of one- and two-family detached housing found in the area. With regard to the Windsor Park site, the Commission noted that additional public outreach regarding the expansion was needed. The Far West Village was historically characterized by a range of
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of commercial, manufacturing, and residential uses that reflected the neighborhood’s proximity to the Hudson River’s working waterfront. The area is now characterized by residential uses. Three- to five-story apartment buildings with ground floor retail line the eastern side of Washington Street, and warehouse buildings along Perry and Charles Streets have been converted to residential uses. The majority of the buildings in the area are less than 80 feet in height.

The area’s prior C6-1 zoning regulations, which did not include a maximum building height, incentivized commercial development by permitting nearly twice as much commercial floor area as residential floor area. Planning proposed rezoning the area to C1-6A in order to better reflect its character and scale. The new C1-6A district’s regulations encourage residential development by limiting allowable commercial floor area and by establishing minimum and maximum street-wall heights and an overall building height limit of 80 feet.

Manhattan Community Board 2 and Borough President Scott M. Stringer supported the rezoning. The City Planning Commission unanimously approved the plan, noting that the area’s prior zoning encouraged new, out-of-scale and out-of-character development.

At the Council’s Zoning & Franchises Subcommittee hearing, residents and a representative from the Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation spoke in support. No one spoke in opposition. The Subcommittee unanimously approved the plan, as did the Land Use Committee and full Council.

ULURP Process
Comm. Bd.: MN 2, App’d, 37-0-0
Boro. Pres.: App’d
CPC: App’d, 11-0-0
Council: App’d, 47-0-0


CITY COUNCIL

Acquisitions
East Williamsburg, Brooklyn
Sanitation withdraws garage lease applications
Proposal to negotiate long-term leases for existing garage serving neighboring community district faced local opposition. On October 13, 2010, the Department of Sanitation withdrew a proposal that would have allowed Sanitation to negotiate long-term leases for two privately owned lots that it uses as a maintenance facility in East Williamsburg, Brooklyn. Sanitation has occupied a one-story garage at 525 Johnson Avenue since 1954 and an open parking lot across the street at 145 Randolph Street since 1987. The properties have been operated under month-to-month license agreements since their leases expired in 2007 and 2006, respectively. The properties are located in Brooklyn Community District 1, but the facility serves Community District 3.

Sanitation intends to relocate the facility to a site located within CD 3 at 56 Nostrand Avenue. The City Council in 2001 approved the relocation, but completion of the new garage facility has stalled due to cuts in Sanitation’s capital budget. According to Sanitation, construction of the Nostrand Avenue facility will take six years from the date that funding is restored.

Brooklyn Community Board 1 and Borough President Marty Markowitz opposed the lease applications. CB 1 instead recommended that the City take steps to implement its Solid Waste Management Plan in order to fairly allocate the responsibility for handling the City’s waste. Markowitz noted that this was the borough’s most burdened district in terms of solid waste management and recommended that Sanitation commit to prioritizing the construction of the facility in CD 3. The City Planning Commission, however, unanimously approved the applications, noting that Sanitation had been working in good faith to relocate the facilities out of CD 1.

At the Council’s Landmarks, Public Siting & Maritime Uses Subcommittee hearing, local Council Member Diana Reyna opposed the lease applications. Reyna said the community had been fighting for the construction of the Nostrand Avenue garage for years and described Sanitation’s “deliberate failure” to prioritize funding for the garage’s construction in its ten-year capital plan as a “travesty.” Daniel Klein, director of real estate for Sanitation, explained that although the Nostrand Avenue garage was a high priority, the current budget only provided funding for one garage in Manhattan. Reyna said she was unwilling “to extend further delays” in the form of lease renewals and instead wanted “solutions.” The Subcommittee’s vote was laid over to allow further discussions.

When the Subcommittee reconvened, Chair Brad Lander announced that Sanitation had withdrawn the proposal. Reyna reiterated that she was “disappointed and frustrated” with the delay in constructing the new garage, and said that she hoped to engage in
further dialogue with Sanitation to resolve the matter.

ULURP Process:
Lead Agency: CPC, Type II action
Comm. Bd.: BK 1, Den’d, 45-0-0
Boro. Pres.: Den’d
CPC: App’d, 12-0-0
Council: Withdrawn, 48-0-0

Council: 525 Johnson Ave. (C 100258 PQK – acquisition); 145 Randolph St. (C 100264 PQK – acquisition) (Oct. 13, 2010).

CITY COUNCIL
Rezoning/Text Amendment
East Village, Manhattan

East Village south of Union Square rezoned

Contextual rezoning established streetwall and building height limits for an eight-block area below Union Square. On October 27, 2010, the City Council approved the Department of City Planning’s rezoning of portions of eight blocks in Manhattan’s East Village. The contextual plan rezoned an area bounded by the south side of East 13th Street, the north side of East 9th Street, Third Avenue, and the east side of Fourth Avenue from C6-1 to C6-2A. The blocks are adjacent to the area rezoned in 2008 by the East Village/Lower East Side Rezoning plan. 5 CityLand 165 (Dec. 2008).

The neighborhood is characterized by low- and mid-rise residential and mixed-use buildings with a uniform street wall. A handful of taller and bulkier buildings can be found along Third and Fourth Avenues. The area’s C6-1 zoning, unchanged since 1961, was inconsistent with the built character of the neighborhood and permitted tall and slender tower development, including setback dormitory buildings like those constructed in the neighborhood by New York University and the New School.

In response to the community’s concerns about the recent out-of-context development, Planning proposed applying the C6-2A district to the area. The new zoning district establishes a 120-foot maximum building height, and requires a 60- to 85-foot streetwall height. In order to encourage the creation of affordable housing, the City’s Inclusionary Housing Program will now apply to the area. 7 CityLand 74 (June 15, 2010).

At the City Planning Commission’s August 25 public hearing, Manhattan Community Board 3’s Susan Stetzer testified that dorms and hotels, particularly along Third Avenue, were “piercing our skyline” and changing the nature of the community. Local Council Member Rosie Mendez, Borough President Scott M. Stringer, State Senator Thomas K. Duane, and Assembly Member Deborah Glick, all sent representatives to express their support for the plan. The Commission unanimously approved the rezoning.

At the Council’s Zoning & Franchises Subcommittee hearing, Council Member Mendez reiterated her support and thanked Planning for following through on the community’s request to rezone the area. The Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation’s Elizabeth Finkelstein testified the plan would prevent the development of out-of-scale dormitories and hotels.

Review Process
Boro. Pres.: App’d
CPC: App’d, 11-0-0
Council: App’d, 47-0-0

Council: Third Avenue Corridor Rezoning (Oct. 27, 2010).

CITY COUNCIL
Rezoning/Text Amendment
Tribeca, Manhattan

North Tribeca contextual rezoning approved

Contextual rezoning establishes new height and bulk regulations in Special Tribeca Mixed Use District’s northern portion. On October 13, 2010, the City Council approved the Department of City Planning’s North Tribeca Rezoning proposal. The plan impacted a 25-block area generally bounded by Canal Street to the north, Walker and Hubert Streets to the south, Broadway to the east, and West Street to the west.

Planning’s proposal replaced the area’s M1-5 zoning with a C6-2A contextual mixed-use district to better match the neighborhood’s increasingly residential and commercial character. Newly created subareas within the Special Tribeca Mixed Use District now provide tailored height and bulk regulations to ensure that future development conforms to existing scale. The City’s Inclusionary Housing Program will also now apply to the centrally located A6 subarea that includes the Holland Tunnel rotary.

Planning also proposed a rezoning text amendment that limits retail establishments to 5,000 sq.ft. along narrow streets and 10,000 sq.ft. on wide streets. Ground floor spaces in separate buildings along the narrower streets cannot be combined for specific use groups, including schools and retail and service establishments. Hotels with more than 100 rooms will no longer be permitted without the City Planning Commission’s approval. A limited group of existing light manufacturing uses, such as jewelry making and woodworking, are still permitted. The special district’s unique loft regulations have also been eliminated, and citywide residential conversion regulations will now govern northern Tribeca.

At the City Planning Commission’s hearing, representatives for Manhattan Community Board 1 and Borough President Scott M. Stringer expressed support for the rezoning. The Commission unanimously approved the plan. 7 CityLand 136 (Oct. 15, 2010).

At the Council’s Zoning & Franchises Subcommittee hearing, local Council Member Margaret Chin expressed support, but also
questioned whether Planning’s inclusionary housing goals were realistic in the designated area. Edith Hsu-Chen, director of Planning’s Manhattan Office, explained that the Holland Tunnel rotary area’s unique layout would allow it to withstand an increase in floor area. Council Member Diana Reyna took issue with the prohibition on new light manufacturing uses. Reyna doubted that the alleged protections for existing manufacturing uses would be effective against landlords who, in her opinion, would choose residential development over industrial uses.

The full Council unanimously approved the rezoning.


CITY COUNCIL

Rezoning/UDAAP

Borough Park, Brooklyn

Rezoning for Culver El housing project modified

Council modified plan in order to retain manufacturing zoning and to prevent residential use on block occupied by department store. On October 13, 2010, the City Council modified the Department of City Planning and the Department of Housing Preservation and Development’s Culver El Proposal in Borough Park, Brooklyn. The proposal rezoned seven blocks historically used for manufacturing and will permit the Southern Brooklyn Community Organization (SBCO) to build a 68-unit affordable housing development on two City-owned lots formerly occupied by the elevated BMT Culver Shuttle line.

The rezoning area is generally bounded by 36th and 39th Streets to the north and south, Old New Utrecht Road and 14th Avenue to the east, and 12th Avenue to the west. SBCO will build seventeen four-story buildings along the south side of 37th Street between 12th Avenue and Old New Utrecht Road to create the affordable housing under HPD’s New Foundations homeowner program. The units would have a fifteen-year resale restriction.

Planning proposed replacing the area’s M1-2 and M2-1 zoning districts with mixed-use M1-2/R6A and M1-2/R6B districts. It also proposed rezoning a portion of the block between 36th and 37th Streets and 13th and 12th Avenues from M1-2 to R5 and applying a C4-2A district to the entire block to the east that is occupied by a Bergament department store.

Local Council Member Brad Lander and Brooklyn Borough President Marty Markowitz generally supported the rezoning and the proposed housing project, but also expressed concerns. Both officials believed that the affordable units should be created under the City’s Inclusionary Housing Program to ensure permanent affordability. Lander also suggested that the Bergament block be removed from the rezoning or rezoned to C8-2, which prohibits residential development.

The City Planning Commission unanimously approved the proposal without modification. 7 CityLand 120 (Sept. 15, 2010).

At the Council’s Zoning & Franchises Subcommittee hearing, Lander claimed that rezoning Bergament’s block to C4-2A would permit a large residential development without an affordable housing component. He said that applying a C8-2 district would recognize the existing use, but not permit as-of-right, market-rate housing. Lander also said that two buildings on the corners of 38th Street and 14th Avenue should retain their manufacturing zoning, and he again suggested that SBCO lengthen the affordability term for the housing project.

Lander said that as a matter of policy, the City should require affordable housing whenever it rezones a manufacturing district for residential use. He also said the City should require permanently affordable housing when disposing of any City-owned property.

Attorney Laurence A. Levy, representing the owner of the Bergament lot, noted that the City’s stated goal for the rezoning was to create housing and that changing the lot’s proposed zoning from C4-2A to C8-2 would undermine that goal and deprive the owner of the best

ULURP PIPELINE

New Applications Certified into ULURP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COMM. BD.</th>
<th>ULURP NO.</th>
<th>CERTIFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>433 Broadway</td>
<td>Special permit</td>
<td>MN 2</td>
<td>1001012ZSM</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951 Park Ave.</td>
<td>Rezoning; UDAAP</td>
<td>MN 11</td>
<td>110096HAX; 110097HMM</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiebout Ave.</td>
<td>UDAAP</td>
<td>BX 5</td>
<td>110091HAX</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Tremont Apts.</td>
<td>Special permit; UDAAP; disposition of City prop.</td>
<td>BX 6</td>
<td>1101002ZSM; 110101HAX; 110103ZSM</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maujer/Ten Eyck</td>
<td>UDAAP</td>
<td>BK 1</td>
<td>110095HAX</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 New York Plaza</td>
<td>Special permit</td>
<td>MN 1</td>
<td>110119ZSM</td>
<td>10/25/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 W. 44th St. Garage</td>
<td>Special permit</td>
<td>MN 4</td>
<td>090377ZSM</td>
<td>10/25/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtlandt Crescent</td>
<td>UDAAP dispose of City prop.; rezoning; amend Urban Renewal Plan</td>
<td>BX 3</td>
<td>110114HUX; 110115ZKM; 110118HAX</td>
<td>10/25/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll St. Rezoning</td>
<td>Rezoning</td>
<td>BK 6</td>
<td>080225ZMK</td>
<td>10/25/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Carroll St.</td>
<td>Rezoning</td>
<td>BK 6</td>
<td>110118ZMK</td>
<td>10/25/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingswood Office Ctr.</td>
<td>Rezoning</td>
<td>BK 15</td>
<td>100232ZMK</td>
<td>10/25/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
use of the land. Levy said the owner was willing to sign a restrictive declaration ensuring that any residential development would include at least a twenty percent affordable housing component. The hearing was closed without a vote.

When the Subcommittee reconvened, Chair Mark Weprin announced that the proposal had been modified. The Bergament block would now be rezoned to C8-2, and the two lots on the eastern edge of 38th Street would retain their manufacturing designations. In addition, SBCO agreed to increase the affordable housing project’s affordability term from fifteen to 30 years.

The Subcommittee, Land Use Committee, and full Council approved the proposal after the City Planning Commission reviewed the modifications.

Review Process
Comm. Bd.: BK 12, 32-2-2
Boro. Pres.: App’d
CPC: App’d, 12-0-0
Council: App’d, 48-0-0

CITY COUNCIL

Rezoning/Text Amendment
East Tremont, Bronx

Central Bronx rezoning OK’d

Rezoning of 75 blocks along the Third Avenue and Tremont Avenue corridors will expand permissible uses to reflect existing development. On October 13, 2010, the City Council approved the Department of City Planning’s 75-block rezoning in central Bronx. The plan impacts the east-west commercial Tremont Avenue corridor bounded by Daly and Webster Avenues, and the north-south industrial Third Avenue corridor which is generally bounded by East 189th and East 175th Streets. A third area, the Neighborhood Preservation Area, borders Third Avenue to the west and extends to Park Avenue between Cyrus Place to the north and Tremont Avenue to the south.

Planning proposed the rezoning to encourage development along the two mixed-use corridors while preserving the residential character of the Neighborhood Preservation Area. The proposal applied commercial and special mixed-use districts in the industrial corridor, which allows new residential and commercial uses on vacant and underutilized lots while also protecting existing light manufacturing uses.

Bronx Community Board 6 and Borough President Ruben Diaz Jr. supported the plan, and the City Planning Commission unanimously approved the rezoning. 7 CityLand 138 (Oct. 15, 2010).

At the Council’s Zoning and Franchises Subcommittee hearing, Council Member Diana Reyna voiced concern over whether the special mixed-use districts would adequately protect existing manufacturing uses. Reyna said she had seen a lot of manufacturing districts in the City “disappear,” and feared that the dilution of these districts would create a change from living wage jobs to minimum wage jobs. Reyna called for the monitoring of zoning changes impacting manufacturing uses in order to better understand the correlation between land use and small businesses.

The full Council unanimously approved the proposal.

Review Process:
Comm. Bd.: BX 6, App’d, 22-0-0
Boro. Pres.: App’d
CPC: App’d, 11-0-0
Council: App’d, 48-0-0
Council: Third Avenue/Tremont Avenue Rezoning (Oct. 13, 2010).

BOARD OF STANDARDS & APPEALS

Appeal
SoHo, Manhattan

Trump SoHo defeats new permit challenge

Community group argued developer improperly deducted elevator shafts on mechanical floor from floor area calculations. In May 2007, Buildings issued a building permit to the BayRock/Sapir Organization LLC to build a 42-story condominium hotel, known as Trump SoHo, at 246 Spring Street in Manhattan. The lot’s
M1-6 zoning prohibited residential development. Therefore, Buildings’ approval required that the developer file a restrictive declaration prohibiting anyone from living in any of the building’s units for more than 29 consecutive days in any 36-day period or for a total of more than 120 days in a calendar year. Later that year, the SoHo Alliance community group unsuccessfully appealed the issuance of the permit, claiming that the building would violate the zoning resolution’s regulations for transient hotels. 5 CityLand 74 (June 15, 2008).

In August 2008, Buildings approved the developer’s plan to add a 43rd and 44th floor to the building. The Alliance challenged Buildings’ issuance of the permit, arguing that the project exceeded the maximum floor-area regulations. Buildings refused to revoke the permit, and the Alliance appealed to BSA.

At BSA, the Alliance argued that the developers improperly deducted portions of the building from floor area calculations, including the elevator shafts and stairwells on a floor that was used entirely as mechanical space. The zoning resolution explicitly includes elevator shafts and stairwells in its definition of floor area, but it excludes space used for mechanical equipment. Following a longstanding practice, Buildings permits the exemption of mechanical-floor elevator shafts and stairwells from floor area calculations. The Alliance argued that Buildings did not have the authority to narrow the zoning resolution’s definition, and that an informal past practice should not legitimize an incorrect interpretation of the zoning resolution.

BSA denied the appeal, finding that the project did not exceed the floor area limitations and that Buildings was within its authority to permit the developer to exclude the mechanical-floor elevator shafts and stairwells from its floor area calculation. BSA agreed with Buildings and the developer’s assertion that it would be unreasonable to exclude all the mechanical space on a floor but include the voids left by the stairs and elevators. That Buildings had not memorialized its policy was not a compelling reason to nullify its rational interpretation of the zoning resolution.

BBA: 246 Spring St., Manhattan (315-08-A) (Oct. 5, 2010) (Stuart A. Klein for SoHo Alliance). CityAdmin

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Certificate of Appropriateness
Upper East Side, Manhattan
Guggenheim’s sidewalk food kiosk rejected

Museum sought to have its own food kiosk; claimed it would reduce concentration of food cart vendors outside main entrance. On October 19, 2010, Landmarks rejected a proposal to build a small, curvilinear food kiosk in front of the landmarked Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum on Manhattan’s Upper East Side. The Guggenheim and Restaurant Associates, which manages the museum’s Wright Restaurant and its third-floor cafe, proposed building the free-standing kiosk along the Fifth Avenue facade underneath the museum’s cantilevered overhang. Guggenheim representatives claimed that the kiosk would alleviate the congestion caused by the high number of sidewalk food carts that congregate in front of the museum.

Guggenheim CEO Mark Steglitz testified that the museum wanted to provide patrons and neighbors with high-quality food at a lower price than its indoor options. Steglitz said the kiosk, by limiting demand, would also minimize the “carnival-like atmosphere” outside the museum created by street vendors. He also said it would complement the
Architect Andre Kikoski explained that the double-skinned kiosk would feature stainless steel covered by clear cast resin and be approximately thirteen feet long, nine feet tall, and six-and-a-half feet wide. The kiosk’s service counter would face the museum’s book store, and customers would queue along the structure’s blank, outward-facing rear wall. Kikoski said the location was chosen because it was unobtrusive and near a power source.

A representative of the architectural advocacy group Docomomo testified that the kiosk would obstruct “the most iconic view” of the museum and adversely alter the experience of entering the building. A member of the Carnegie Hill Neighbors community group sympathized with the museum, but said any kiosk should be smaller and movable so that it could be stored elsewhere after closing. Manhattan Community Board 8’s landmarks committee also opposed the proposal.

Commissioner Fred Bland said the kiosk compromised the visual experience of a “near sacred place,” and Commissioner Joan Gerner said it detracted from one of the most prominent examples of modern architecture in New York City. Commissioner Diana Chapin liked the kiosk’s design, but said its location was inappropriate. Chair Robert B. Tierney agreed that the proposal detracted from the museum and that Landmarks’ tests of appropriateness had not been met.

Landmarks unanimously voted to deny the proposal.

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Designation Hearings
Brooklyn
Three new Brooklyn historic districts considered

Broad support voiced for extending Park Slope district, creating new district in Wallabout neighborhood, and protecting row of buildings in Crown Heights. On October 26, 2010, Landmarks considered designating three new Brooklyn historic districts. Landmarks held separate hearings on the proposed Park Slope Historic District Extension, the Wallabout Historic District, and the Park Place Historic District.

The proposed Park Slope extension would encompass 582 buildings located southwest of the original Park Slope Historic District. The district would be generally bounded by 7th and 15th Streets and Seventh and Eighth Avenues. It would also include some properties along Bartel-Pritchard Square and Prospect Park West. The proposed extension features a mix of rowhouses and apartment buildings, many dating to the 1880s, and other notable structures including two 19th century firehouses and the 1879 Ansonia Clock Factory. 7 City-Land 125 (Sept. 15, 2010).

At the hearing, numerous elected officials and their representatives supported designation, including Borough President Marty Markowitz, and Council Members Brad Lander and Stephen Levin. Residents testifying in support noted the area’s architectural quality and the importance of protecting the area from out-of-context development. The Historic District Council’s Nadezhda Williams expressed hope that Landmarks would protect an even larger area, but she called the extension “a strong first step” toward protecting Park Slope’s historic architecture.

The owner of a three-family building on 7th Street across the street from New York Methodist Hospital was the lone dissenting voice. Matthew Urbanski argued that landmarking was “an exclusionary action” that would prevent the middle class from purchasing property in the neighborhood.

The proposed Wallabout Historic District comprises approximately 55 buildings along Vanderbilt Avenue between Park and Myrtle Avenues near the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The area’s name derives from the Walloons of southern Belgium, who first settled the area. The proposed district is characterized by single-family wood-frame houses dating to the early- and mid-1800s. The lowland area’s proximity to the
East River was considered undesirable, and Wallabout was settled by working class people who built simpler houses than the stone and brick buildings that characterize the more prosperous inland neighborhoods.

Council Member Letitia James, whose district includes Wallabout, supported designation. James noted that the area featured New York’s largest concentration of pre-Civil War buildings. She said the area had suffered from the demolition of historic structures and out-of-scale development. Assembly Member Joseph Lentol called the district “a beautiful area rich in history and architecture.” Commissioner Christopher Moore, who resides in the area, stepped out of his official role and spoke in support on behalf of the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture. Moore suggested adding “Navy Yard” to the district’s name, noting the Brooklyn Navy Yard’s historic importance to the City and nation from the War of 1812 to the Vietnam War. Daniel Kimiabkhsh, the owner of a recently constructed seven-story building at 122 Vanderbilt Avenue which Landmarks staff characterized as “nostyle,” asked Landmarks to carve out his property from the district.

The proposed Park Place Historic District comprises thirteen rowhouses on Park Place between Bedford and Franklin Avenues in the 1870s and 1890s. The two-story homes feature three different facade designs, as well as triangular-, flat-, and arch-gabled roofs. Landmarks speculated that Walter Coots, architect of the buildings in the Alice and Agate Courts Historic District, also designed the buildings along Park Place.

Council Member Letitia James supported designation and encouraged Landmarks to consider expanding the district to include the surrounding historically significant buildings in Crow Hill. Members of the Crow Hill Community Association also spoke in support, as did the Landmark Conservancy’s Andrea Goldwyn who praised the “unusually intact and cohesive streetscape.”

Landmarks did not schedule a vote for the proposed districts.

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Designation
Ridgewood, Queens
Ridgewood South Historic District approved

New district in southern Queens provided high-quality housing to largely immigrant community in the early 20th century. On October 26, 2010, Landmarks approved the creation of the Ridgewood South Historic District in Ridgewood, Queens. The district comprises more than 200 buildings, and is generally bounded by Woodward Avenue, a line midway between Onderdonk and Seneca Avenues, and Catalpa Avenue and Woodbine Street near Brooklyn’s Bushwick neighborhood. The action follows the designation of the Ridgewood North Historic District in September 2009.

Between 1911 and 1912 Louis Allmendinger and the G.X. Mathews Company designed and constructed the rowhouses that characterize the neighborhood. The buildings, known as “Mathews Model Flats,” offered high quality tenement housing and attracted working class German immigrants, among others, from nearby Williamsburg and Bushwick. The Romanesque Revival and Neo-Classical buildings found throughout the district are clad in yellow and amber Kreischer brick, manufactured in Staten Island. The district also includes the St. Matthias Church complex, built between 1909 and 1926. At a September 2009 public hearing, elected officials, preservationists and residents expressed broad support for the new district.

At the October meeting, Commissioner Diana Chapin, Landmarks’ Queens representative, noted that the community “long awaited” designation and said the district represented a “solid example” of what is worthy for designation. Chair Robert B. Tierney noted that Ridgewood South was the twenty-second historic district designated since 2003, which sets a record for the number of districts created during the tenure of one mayor.
Tierney asked Santora to consult with Landmarks staff and return with necessary alterations.

LPC: 47 West 8th St., Manhattan (11-0368) (Oct. 19, 2010).

LANDMARKS PRESERVATION
COMMISSION

Certificate of Appropriateness
Greenwich Village, Manhattan

After-the-fact, illegal restaurant facade considered

Restaurant owner replaced stucco, altered windows, and installed fake ivy without obtaining Landmarks' approval. On October 19, 2010, Landmarks considered a proposal to legalize facade alterations to the storefront of a Greek Revival townhouse at 47 West 8th Street in the Greenwich Village Historic District. The four-story townhouse was built in 1845, and the first two stories of its facade were altered in the early 20th century using stucco. The Rabbit in the Moon restaurant currently occupies the space. The restaurant owner, Michael Santora, replaced the stucco with stone cladding, altered the ground floor entrance, removed a display window on the second floor to create a dining balcony, and installed artificial ivy.

At Landmarks' hearing, Santora testified that he was unaware that separate Landmarks approval would be required after his engineer filed a self-certified application with Buildings. He explained that the exterior stucco was in disrepair when he purchased the property and the stone cladding matched the original stucco. Santora said he intended to grow ivy to replace the artificial ivy and claimed the renovated facade had become “a defining part of the restaurant.”

Chair Robert B. Tierney told Santora that he had been “misled,” and the Commissioners vowed to report the engineer to Buildings. Manhattan Community Board 2’s Jane McCarthy opposed legalization, as did John Moody of the 8th Street Block Association, who said the alterations were “not in keeping with the block.” The Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation’s Elizabeth Finkelstein also spoke in opposition, noting that the stone face and artificial ivy had no precedent in the district.

The Commissioners believed that the artificial ivy was inappropriate and found the work impossible to approve as presented. Commissioner Diana Chapin said the work included “several atypical features” but suggested it could be legalized if modified. Commissioner Roberta Brandes Gratz argued that there was no precedent for balcony restaurants in the area and recommended that it be returned to a window. Commissioner Libby Ryan pointed out that the neighborhood was home to many “kitschy” storefronts, while Commissioner Joan Gerner noted that the alterations did “provide character” to the restaurant.

The Rabbit in the Moon restaurant, with artificial ivy, at 47 West 8th Street in the Greenwich Village Historic District. Image: CityLand.
Commissioner Christopher Moore noted that the bank was “a real anchor in this community.”

The Queens General Courthouse, at 88-11 Sutphin Boulevard, was built in the Modern Classical style in the late 1930s through a combination of City and Federal Public Work Administration funds. Designed by Queens-based architect Alfred H. Eccles and William W. Knowles, the limestone-clad courthouse’s prominent elements include a two-and-one-half-story colonnaded portico, ornamented relief panels, and balconies with balustrades. At the February hearing, the Department of Citywide Administrative Services’ Mitchell Paluszak called the building “one of the jewels” of the agency’s portfolio. Landmarks unanimously approved the designation.

LPC: Jamaica Savings Bank, 146-21 Jamaica Ave., Queens (LP-2393); Queens General Courthouse, 88-11 Sutphin Blvd., Queens (LP-2404) (Oct. 26, 2010).

DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING

Hearing
Citywide
City’s waterfront plan vetted at public meeting

Comprehensive plan for managing the City’s shoreline unveiled for public comment. On October 12, 2010, the Department of City Planning held a public meeting to present its Vision 2020 Comprehensive Waterfront Plan draft recommendations. Vision 2020 is Planning’s response to a local law mandating the creation by the end of 2010 of a comprehensive plan for the City’s 578 miles of shoreline. The proposal builds on the City’s original 1992 waterfront plan and is part of a broader Citywide initiative to establish a long-term blueprint for the City’s shoreline, known as the Waterfront Vision and Enhancement Strategy. Vision 2020 was created after a public-input process that was formally commenced in April 2010. 7 CityLand 59 (May 15, 2010).

Vision 2020 provides broad programmatic goals for the City’s waterfront and targeted recommendations for specific portions of the City’s shoreline, referred to as “reaches” by Planning. The six programmatic goals include expanding the public’s access to the waterfront and waterways, increasing waterborne transportation and on-water recreation, and supporting port and other maritime industries on the working waterfront.

The site-specific recommendations for the 22 local reaches were based on long-term studies by Planning and local stakeholder input provided during borough-wide public workshops. The draft recommendations included, for example, potentially building a maritime support service hub in Sunset Park, improving canoe portages around waterfalls in the Bronx River, and supporting continued evaluation of tidal energy opportunities around Roosevelt Island.

The October meeting hosted a diverse audience of more than 250 people and featured comments from local residents and representatives of community and business groups. Environmental justice issues were mentioned by several groups in attendance. The New York City Environmental Justice Alliance’s Eddie Bautista noted that the clustering of Significant Maritime Industrial Areas (SMIAs) in minority communities unfairly burdened local residents with pollution. Adam Liebowitz, director of the South Bronx’s The Point Community Development Corporation, requested that the City include “stronger language and a true commitment” to reducing communities overburdened by SMIAs. Tameka Jones, from the United Puerto Rican Organization of Sunset Park, urged Planning to ensure that adequate buffers between SMIAs and nearby communities are provided.

Other speakers commented on protecting the aquatic environment and offered ideas on how to enhance the waterways for recreation and transportation. The Roosevelt Island Residents Association’s Matthew Katz noted the need for waterfront access points and alternative transportation as residential development continues to increase on Roosevelt Island. Regional Plan Association’s Rob Pirani supported the idea of greenways connecting the waterfront and said that the plan should be expanded to include connectivity with upland communities along the waterfront as well. Pirani also echoed the concerns of community members adjacent to SMIAS, but noted that these areas, and the “reservoirs” of jobs they represent, should be strengthened through the use of zoning or deed restrictions.

Planning accepted public comments on the draft recommendations until November 12, 2010, and will release the final plan before the end of the year.


COMPTROLLER’S OFFICE

Task Force Recommendations
Citywide
Community Benefit Agreements report released

Task force proposed a framework for negotiating future Community Benefit Agreements related to publicly assisted development projects. A Community Benefit Agreement (CBA) is a private agreement negotiated between developers and community groups in order to garner support for real estate development projects. In exchange for community support, a developer may agree to provide amenities, such as infrastructure improvements or wage guarantees which are not required by the City’s land use review process. Since 2005, CBAs have been negotiated in con-
Brian Cook discusses land use under the Manhattan Borough President

Brian Cook, Director of Land Use for Manhattan Borough President Scott M. Stringer, first developed an interest in land use while pursuing a degree in Metropolitan Studies from New York University. Cook stayed on to pursue a master’s degree in Public Policy with the hopes of learning how international governments shape land use policy. During his studies, however, Cook says he was “fascinated” by a course that centered on New York City’s Uniform Land Use Review Process (ULURP), and this led him to focus on land use at the local level. Cook secured an internship with former Borough President C. Virginia Fields. The internship developed into a job as Field’s public policy advisor, and when Stringer took over, Cook was reassigned as a dedicated urban planner. Last July, Stringer appointed Cook to be his Director of Land Use following the departure of former director Anthony Borelli.

Adding value to ULURP. Within the land use context, Cook describes Stringer’s office as the balance between local community concerns and borough-wide obligations. By applying technical expertise, the office strives to harmonize development with neighborhood issues, always considering how to create “true benefits” for the community when reviewing a project.

According to Cook, Stringer primarily relies on the zoning regulations and a project’s environmental impact statement when forming his advisory ULURP recommendations. Cook believes the office adds value to the land use process by not only combing through the impact statement, but by also taking a thorough look at the technical assumptions behind it. Cook emphasizes that Stringer’s goal is to form a recommendation that it is “responsible to the law and responsive to the community.”

Empowering the community. Cook believes that the community boards play a critical role in the land use process because no elected official on the borough or citywide level knows a neighborhood as well as its local community. In order to strengthen this local perspective, a large part of Stringer’s community board reform agenda is to equip the community boards with urban planners so that the community has the technical expertise “to have a real conversation” within the land use dialogue. An illustrative initiative is Stringer’s Community Planning Fellowship Program, which places a graduate student in urban planning with each of Manhattan’s twelve community boards.

In working closely with the community boards, Stringer’s office will assist them in understanding a technical land use issue or determining whether concerns are connected to the environmental review process. But one thing the office will never do, explains Cook, is tell the boards what to do. Cook says that Stringer seeks only to assist, not influence, the community in its deliberations, and notes that Stringer’s goal is to issue his own recommendation guided by the community board’s independent decision.

Taking the politics out of planning. One of Stringer’s recommendations to the recent Charter Revision Commission involved altering the voting structure of the City Planning Commission. Cook explains that Stringer would like to amend the City Charter to require a supermajority of nine commissioners to approve a project when both the local community board and the borough president have recommended disapproval. Cook and Stringer believe this change will give the local community boards’ recommendations greater weight and incentivize developers to resolve conflicts prior to appearing before the Commission and City Council. Cook acknowledges that the Commission applies “heightened skepticism” when reviewing projects that lack local support, but he says that Stringer would like to see that skepticism “institutionalized” to avoid situations where the public feels that neither the community’s concerns nor the borough president’s concerns were considered.

Stringer has also pushed for a Citywide comprehensive zoning plan. Cook says that an inherent problem with the City’s land use process is its “piecemeal” approach toward planning. Individual agencies participate in the land use process without considering how their actions impact the City on a comprehensive level. No single agency considers the “big picture” when, for example, the Commission approves a rezoning, the Department of Sanitation selects a sanitation facility site, the Department of Education chooses a location for a new school, or the Department of Buildings issues permits. Cook says it is unrealistic for the Department of City Planning to produce a comprehensive plan when it lacks the authority to direct other agencies’ planning actions. Therefore, Stringer has recommended creating a new independent agency, called the Independent Planning Office. As envisioned by Stringer, this entity would be responsible for coordinating the planning agendas of City agencies and community boards and creating a cohesive planning policy for the City.

Once a comprehensive plan is formed, Stringer recommends that it be ratified through a public review process to ensure that the plan truly represents the public’s outlook for the future of the City.

— Eugene Travers
sight into the creation of CBAs, City Comptroller John C. Liu convened a task force to propose a comprehensive framework for CBAs connected with City-assisted projects that would increase transparency and encourage broad participation. The task force presented its recommendations to Liu on September 29, 2010.

The task force characterized CBAs as the “unfortunate byproduct” of the City’s failure to adequately consider the community’s needs. According to the task force, CBAs are needed because the Department of City Planning “seldom examines” Citywide needs comprehensively when reviewing projects and leaves it to the Council to address them on a “piecemeal basis.”

The task force recommendations would apply to “major projects.” This would include any project requesting at least 500,000 sq.ft. of additional floor area as permitted as-of-right, relying on more than $75 million in publicly subsidized financing, or covering more than 27 acres of land. Immediately after a developer submitted a project’s environmental assessment statement to the City, the local council member and borough president would schedule a series of public forums. The elected officials and the local community board would then create a negotiation team, and an independent consultant would be assigned to assist the team during negotiations with the developer. So that the CBA’s terms could be evaluated during the City’s land use review process, the negotiations would need to be finalized prior to Planning certifying the developer’s application as complete.

The task force recommended that the Comptroller oversee and monitor the implementation of all CBAs, noting that the negotiated terms would have an indirect financial impact on the City. The report also recommended that the Comptroller propose legislation to the Council codifying the task force’s recommendations.


COURT DECISIONS

Heartland Village, Staten Island
City must pay for paving private property

DOT paved over portion of Staten Island property owner’s land. Foxwood Forest Lenca LLC owned a 15,700 sq.ft. parcel of land abutting Forest Hill Road on Staten Island. The land was undeveloped, and the portion along Forest Hill Road consisted primarily of grass and other vegetation. In 2008, the Department of Transportation entered Foxwood’s property and paved over this grassy area. According to DOT’s borough commissioner, the paving was done to address unsafe roadway conditions on Forest Hill Road.

Foxwood sued the City, claiming that the City’s actions constituted a de facto taking of its land even if performed to remedy alleged safety concerns. Foxwood also claimed that drivers traversed and parked on the paved portion of its land as if it were part of Forest Hill Road. The City countered that it did not deprive Foxwood of its use and enjoyment of its land, arguing that Foxwood could still enter and leave its property and implying that Foxwood had a duty to clearly mark the lot line of its property.

Justice Joseph J. Maltese ruled in favor of Foxwood, finding that the City had intruded onto the property for a public purpose, which deprived Foxwood of the land’s use and value. The court scheduled a pre-trial conference on the issue of damages.


New Decisions Added to CITYLAND www.citylaw.org – October 2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RES. NO.S</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>486-88</td>
<td>Sugar Hill, MN</td>
<td>Dispose of surface easement; acquire surface easement; rezoning (C8-3, R7-2 to RBA)</td>
<td>10/13/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>2053 Seventh Ave., MN</td>
<td>UDAAP by HPD (1 lot)</td>
<td>10/13/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-01</td>
<td>100 W. 163rd St., BX</td>
<td>UDAAP by HPD (2 lots)</td>
<td>10/13/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498-99</td>
<td>3500 Park Ave., BX</td>
<td>Rezoning (M1-5 to OS-2A); rezoning text amendment</td>
<td>10/13/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>North Tribeca Rezoning, MN</td>
<td>Rezoning (M1-5 to OS-2A); rezoning text amendment</td>
<td>10/13/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497</td>
<td>Crossing at S. Blvd., BX</td>
<td>Withdraw revocable consent petition</td>
<td>10/13/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>High Hawk Rezoning, BX</td>
<td>Rezoning (C8-3 to R7-1/C2-4)</td>
<td>10/13/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>DOS Dist. 3 Garage, BK</td>
<td>Approve motions to withdraw</td>
<td>10/13/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>1664 First Ave., MN</td>
<td>UDAAP by HPD (2 lots)</td>
<td>10/13/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492-93</td>
<td>108 W. 114th St., MN</td>
<td>UDAAP by HPD (1 lot)</td>
<td>10/13/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bold indicates the decision is covered in this issue. The symbol † indicates that the decision was covered in a previous issue. City Council decisions available in hard-copy format at the Center for New York City Law.
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### CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ULURP NO.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington/Greenwich Sts. Rez.</td>
<td>Rezoning (C6-1 to C1-6A)</td>
<td>MN 2</td>
<td>C100437ZMM</td>
<td>9/29/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Ave. Corridor Rezoning &amp; Text Amendment</td>
<td>Rezoning (C6-1 to C6-2A); zoning text amendment (inclusionary housing)</td>
<td>MN 3</td>
<td>C100420ZMM; N100419ZRM</td>
<td>9/29/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Yds./W. Chelsea Follow-Up</td>
<td>Zoning text amend. (fac. no. 7 subway ext.)</td>
<td>MN 4</td>
<td>N100424ZRM</td>
<td>9/29/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look Building</td>
<td>Landmark designation</td>
<td>MN 5</td>
<td>N110036HKM</td>
<td>9/29/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885 Ave. of the Americas</td>
<td>Special permit (201-space garage)</td>
<td>MN 5</td>
<td>C080524ZSM</td>
<td>9/29/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumfi House</td>
<td>Landmark designation</td>
<td>MN 6</td>
<td>N110036HKM</td>
<td>9/29/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence House I</td>
<td>UDAAP by HPD (26-unit bkld.); special permit (F.A.R.)</td>
<td>BK 9</td>
<td>C100326HAK; C100325ZSM</td>
<td>9/29/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubumdale-Oakdale Gdns.–Hollis Hills Rezoning</td>
<td>Rezoning (418 blocks)</td>
<td>QN 7, 8, 11</td>
<td>C100409ZMQ</td>
<td>9/29/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 East 70th Street</td>
<td>Special permit (height, side yards)</td>
<td>MN 8</td>
<td>C100108ZSM</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB 11 Office Space</td>
<td>Acq. of office space (CB 11 offices)</td>
<td>MN 11</td>
<td>N110075ZXM</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470 Vanderbilt Office Space</td>
<td>Acq. of office space (NYCHA offices)</td>
<td>BK 2</td>
<td>N110074ZPK</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51st Cavalry Brigade Armory</td>
<td>Landmark designation</td>
<td>SI 1</td>
<td>N110046HKR</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Church Complex</td>
<td>Landmark designation</td>
<td>SI 1</td>
<td>N110045HKR</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BOARD OF STANDARDS & APPEALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>CASE NO.</th>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>482 Greenwich St., MN</td>
<td>Amend variance (increase units)</td>
<td>App'd</td>
<td>124-05-BZ</td>
<td>Greenberg Traurig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 Spring St., MN</td>
<td>Revoke permits for condo hotel</td>
<td>Denied</td>
<td>315-08-A</td>
<td>Stuart A. Klein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2241 Westchester Ave., BX</td>
<td>Ext. time to obtain C of O (Planet Fitness)</td>
<td>App'd</td>
<td>164-04-BZ</td>
<td>Sheldon Lobel PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2512 Avenue R, BK</td>
<td>Enlg. 1-fam. dwelling (f. area, yards)</td>
<td>App'd</td>
<td>100-10-BZ</td>
<td>Fredrick A. Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882 E. 12th St., BK</td>
<td>Vested rt. to continue development</td>
<td>App'd</td>
<td>10-10-A</td>
<td>Fredrick A. Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2302 Avenue S, BK</td>
<td>Leg. side yard const., enlg. dwelling</td>
<td>App'd</td>
<td>99-10-BZ</td>
<td>Feldman Saks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1364 52nd St., BK</td>
<td>Const. 4-story synagogue</td>
<td>App'd</td>
<td>325-09-BZ</td>
<td>Sheldon Lobel PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Sullivan St., BK</td>
<td>Ext. time to obtain C of O, enlg. variance</td>
<td>App'd</td>
<td>16-92-BZ</td>
<td>Sheldon Lobel PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74-21 Queens Blvd., QN</td>
<td>Dismiss for lack of prosecution</td>
<td>App'd</td>
<td>179-07-BZ</td>
<td>Sheldon Lobel PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-45 Kissena Blvd., QN</td>
<td>Ext. of term (eating &amp; drinking est.)</td>
<td>App'd</td>
<td>138-10-BZ</td>
<td>NYC EDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14 44th Dr., QN</td>
<td>Ext. time to compl. const., obtain C of O</td>
<td>App'd</td>
<td>136-01-BZ</td>
<td>Eric Palatnik PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 Forest Ave., SI</td>
<td>Ext. of term (Citgo station)</td>
<td>App'd</td>
<td>60-90-BZ</td>
<td>EPDSO Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>LANDMARK/HISTORIC DISTRICT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CASE NO.</th>
<th>APP'D</th>
<th>ISSUED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>390 Fifth Ave., MN</td>
<td>Gotham Building</td>
<td>Replace windows</td>
<td>11-3210</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/8/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rockefeller Pl., MN</td>
<td>1 Rockefeller Plaza</td>
<td>Create outdoor cafe, mod. storefront</td>
<td>11-3463</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/19/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 W. 54th St., MN</td>
<td>Allen Starr Residence</td>
<td>Legalize flagpoles</td>
<td>11-3499</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10/20/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park, MN</td>
<td>Loeb Boathouse</td>
<td>Replace bar and shed</td>
<td>11-3262</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riegelmann Bdk., BK</td>
<td>The Parachute Jump</td>
<td>Reconstruct plaza surroundings; install fencing, bird control</td>
<td>11-3472; 11-3448</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/21/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277 Water St., MN</td>
<td>South St. Seaport HD</td>
<td>Replace storefront</td>
<td>11-2913</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/30/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406 Broadway, MN</td>
<td>Tribeca East HD</td>
<td>Replace infill, install signage</td>
<td>11-3319</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/14/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Spring St., MN</td>
<td>SoHo-Cast Iron HD</td>
<td>Replace storefront infill</td>
<td>11-3087</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/5/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Greenwich Ave., MN</td>
<td>Greenwich Village HD</td>
<td>Replace storefront infill</td>
<td>11-2848</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/4/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1140 Broadway, MN</td>
<td>Madison Sq. North HD</td>
<td>Install infill, signage</td>
<td>11-2948</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/29/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 W. 68th St., MN</td>
<td>Upper West Side/CPW HD</td>
<td>Legalize rooftop addition</td>
<td>11-3368</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/15/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 W. 72nd St., MN</td>
<td>Upper West Side/CPW HD</td>
<td>Inst. acoustical panels at HVAC</td>
<td>11-3040</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/1/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 W. 73rd St., MN</td>
<td>Upper West Side/CPW HD</td>
<td>Const. 2-story rear addition</td>
<td>11-3135</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/5/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 E. 33rd St., MN</td>
<td>Carnegie Hill HD</td>
<td>Restore facade</td>
<td>11-2970</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9/30/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 E. 33rd St., MN</td>
<td>Carnegie Hill HD</td>
<td>Alter front and rear facades</td>
<td>11-3151</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/6/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274 Clinton St., BK</td>
<td>Cobble Hill HD</td>
<td>Const. rear deck, alter areaway</td>
<td>11-3016</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/1/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-01 37th Ave., QN</td>
<td>Jackson Heights HD</td>
<td>Repl. 2 storefronts, inst. marquee</td>
<td>11-2538</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10/1/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bold indicates the decision is covered in this issue. The symbol † indicates that the decision was covered in a previous issue. City Council decisions available in hard-copy format at the Center for New York City Law.*
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The Landmarks Preservation Commission designated the Queens General Courthouse in Jamaica, Queens as an individual landmark. See story on page 159.
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