

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

May 15, 1989/Calendar No. 4

C 880604 HUK

IN THE MATTER OF the plan for the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area, located in Community Districts 1 and 3, Borough of Brooklyn, pursuant to Article 15, Section 505, of the General Municipal Law of New York State and Section 197-c of the New York City Charter.

The proposed Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Plan would facilitate the development of new industrial and residential uses within the area bounded by Walton Street, Broadway, Whipple Street, Throop Avenue, Park Avenue, Marcy Avenue, Flushing Avenue, Harrison Avenue, Wallabout Street, Union Avenue, Lorimer Street and Harrison Avenue. A total of 19 urban renewal sites are proposed in the plan. Six sites (Sites 6, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17) are for residential use, four (Sites 5, 8, 9 and 10) are for residential and/or commercial use, seven (Sites 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 7A and 7B) are for industrial use, and one site (Site 12) for use as open space and one for (Site 15) public and semi-public use. The application for the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Plan was submitted by the Department of Housing Preservation and Development on February 12, 1988, and revised on August 8, 1988.

The application certified by the City Planning Commission on December 5, 1988, stated that the following properties are to be acquired for the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area:

SITE 1: Property comprising the two blocks bounded by Lorimer Street, Harrison Avenue, Wallabout Street and Union Avenue; Tax Block 2245, Lots 35, 40, 42, 43, 44, 47, 48, 136 and 149; Tax Block 2249, Lots 23, 37, 41 and 122; and the bed of Walton Street between Harrison and Union avenues as formerly mapped, proposed for industrial use. On March 20, 1989, the applicant modified Site 1 by splitting it into Site 1A,

consisting of all of the property on Tax Block 2245 and the portion of Walton Street as proposed to be demapped, and Site 1B, consisting of all of the property on Tax Block 2249.

- SITE 2: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Walton Street, Throop Avenue, Wallabout Street and Harrison Avenue; Tax Block 2250, Lots 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11, proposed for industrial use.
- SITE 3: Property comprising the entire block bounded by Wallabout Street, Throop Avenue, Gerry Street and Harrison Avenue; Tax Block 2266, Lots 1, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 46, proposed for industrial use.
- SITE 4: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Gerry Street, Throop Avenue, Bartlett Street and Harrison Avenue; Tax Block 2269, Lots 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49 and 50, proposed for industrial use.
- SITE 5: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Gerry Street, Broadway, Bartlett Street and Throop Avenue; Tax Block 2270, Lots 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 29, proposed for residential and/or commercial use.
- SITE 6: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Gerry Street, Broadway, Bartlett Street and Throop Avenue; Tax Block 2270, Lot 10, proposed for residential use.
- SITE 7: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Bartlett Street, Throop Avenue, Whipple Street, Flushing Avenue and Harrison Avenue; Tax Block 2272, Lots 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 45, 46, 147, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 108 and 57, proposed for industrial use. On March 20, 1989, the applicant deleted Site 7 and replaced it with Site 7A, consisting only of city-owned Lot 11, and Site 7B, consisting only of city-owned Lots 49, 51, 52, 53 and 108. Lots 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 45, 46, 47, 54, 55, and 57 were also deleted from the list of properties proposed to be acquired pursuant to the urban renewal plan.
- SITE 8: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Bartlett Street, Broadway, Whipple Street and Throop Avenue; Tax Block 2273, Lots 3, 4, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28 and 29, proposed for residential and/or commercial use.
- SITE 9: Property comprising the entire block bounded by Delmonico Place as formerly mapped, Hopkins Street and

Tompkins Avenue, Tax Block 1721, Lots 1, 4, 5, 6 and 8; a portion of the block bounded by Flushing Avenue, Throop Avenue, Hopkins Street and Delmonico Place as formerly mapped, Tax Block 1722, Lots 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58 and 59; and the bed of Delmonico Place between Flushing Avenue and Hopkins Street as formerly mapped proposed for residential and/or commercial use.

- SITE 10: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Flushing Avenue, Throop Avenue, Hopkins Street and Delmonico Place as formerly mapped; Tax Block 1722, Lots 32, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45, proposed for residential and/or commercial use.
- SITE 11: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Hopkins Street, Throop Avenue, Ellery Street and Tompkins Avenue; Tax Block 1726, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 127, proposed for residential use.
- SITE 12: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Hopkins Street, Throop Avenue, Ellery Street and Tompkins Avenue; Tax Block 1726, Lot 11, proposed for open space.
- SITE 13: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Hopkins Street, Throop Avenue, Ellery Street and Tompkins Avenue; Tax Block 1726, Lots 20, 21, 31, 32 and 34, proposed for residential use.
- SITE 14: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Ellery Street, Tompkins Avenue, Park Avenue and Marcy Avenue; Tax Block 1730, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69 and 70, proposed for residential use.
- SITE 15: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Ellery Street, Tompkins Avenue, Park Avenue and Marcy Avenue; Tax Block 1730, Lots 47 and 48, proposed for public and semi-public use.
- SITE 16: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Ellery Street, Delmonico Place, Park Avenue and Tompkins Avenue; Tax Block 1731, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 39, proposed for residential use.
- SITE 17: Property on a portion of the block bounded by Ellery Street, Throop Avenue, Park Avenue and Delmonico Place;

Tax Block 1732, Lots 1, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 30 and 31, proposed for residential use.

As certified, HPD's application stated that between 200 and 300 residential units are proposed to be developed on Sites 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17, through the New York City Housing Partnership. The units are to be subsidized by the New York State Affordable Housing Corporation and New York City. In addition, the housing now on Site 6 is proposed to be rehabilitated. HPD also noted that it has proposed that the New York City Housing Authority develop Sites 5 and 8 as public housing. HPD also stated that as part of this residential area, open space is proposed for Site 12 and that discussions have been taking place between HPD and various community groups in the area to select a sponsor for the space. Site 15, designated for "Public/Semi-public Use," is to be used to supply accessory parking space for the adjacent fire station. Sites 1, 2, 3, and 7 (later revised to Sites 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 7A and 7B) designated for "Industrial Use," are to be marketed as single-story manufacturing buildings with mezzanine space. Developers are to be selected through a request for proposals process and approved by the Public Development Corporation on behalf of the city. HPD stated that up to approximately 300,000 square feet of industrial space, and some 300 to 500 permanent jobs, may be generated on the industrial sites.

In conformance with the Zoning Resolution, the land use controls for Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area industrial sites permit manufacturing and heavy commercial uses in manufacturing districts with the exception of "building materials or contractors' yards (open and enclosed)" and "produce and meat markets." In addition, the plan prohibits "uses identified under Use Group 18 in the Zoning Resolution; provided, however, that uses set forth in Use Group 18A ('Manufacturing Establishments') and electric power or steam generating plants which meet all M1 zoning district performance standards in accordance with Section 42-20 of the Zoning Resolution shall be permitted; and provided further, that any portion of an M3 zone for which a Use Group 18 use currently exists or has existed at any time after August 1, 1981 may be used for any use set forth in Use Group 18A ('Manufacturing Establishments') or for electric power or steam generating plants."

The Urban Renewal Plan further provides that controls to cover floor area, lot coverage, off-street parking and loading are to be as set forth in the Zoning Resolution.

In addition to the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Plan, the following actions are the subject of related reports of the City Planning Commission, dated May 15, 1989:

- N 880603 HGK: Designation of the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area as comprising the area generally bounded by Walton Street, Broadway, Whipple Street, Throop Avenue, Park Avenue, Marcy Avenue, Flushing Avenue, Harrison Avenue, Wallabout Street, Union Avenue, Lorimer Street and Harrison Avenue (including Tax Blocks 2245, 2249 through 2251, 2266, 2268, 2269 through 2274, 1720 through 1722, 1726, 1730, 1731 and 1732).
- C 880605 HDK: Disposition of Sites 5, 6, 8 through 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 of the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area for redevelopment for residential use and for residential and/or commercial use, in accordance with the controls of the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Plan.
- C 880606 HDK: Disposition of Sites 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 4, 7A and 7B of the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area for redevelopment for industrial use, in accordance with the controls of the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Plan.
- C 880488 MMK: Proposed changes to the City Map for the elimination, discontinuance and closing of Walton Street between Union Avenue and Harrison Avenue; the discontinuance and closing of Delmonico Place between Hopkins Street and Flushing Avenue; and the delineation of a sewer easement between Flushing Avenue and Ellery Street. The changes would facilitate the redevelopment of Sites 1A, 1B, 9 and 12 of the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area.

Concurrent with the review of the above-described actions relating to the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area, the following actions for properties adjacent to the urban renewal area are the subject of reports of the City Planning Commission:

- C 890005 PSK: Selection and acquisition of privately owned property on all of the two blocks bounded by Wallabout Street, Harrison Avenue, Bartlett Street, Flushing Avenue and Union Avenue (Tax Block 2265, Lot 14 and Tax Block 2268, Lot 1).

C 890006 HDK: Disposition of the property on the two blocks bounded by Wallabout Street, Harrison Avenue, Bartlett Street, Flushing Avenue and Union Avenue (Tax Block 2265, Lot 14, and Tax Block 2268, Lot 1) to the Public Development Corporation for subsequent disposition to a developer for industrial development.

The two blocks proposed for selection, acquisition and disposition by the two above-described actions (C 890005 PSK and C 890006 HDK) are directly south and west of Sites 1A, 1B, 3, 7A and 7B of the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area.

Revisions To Applications

In a letter to City Planning dated February 15, 1989, two months after certification, HPD stated that Sites 5 and 8 are no longer proposed for development by the New York City Housing Authority, but are still proposed to be developed to provide low-income housing. HPD also stated that the sites are to be submitted for inclusion in the New York State Housing Trust Fund Turnkey Program. HPD also stated that a portion of Site 14 (140-42 Tompkins Avenue, Tax Block 1730, Lot 33) previously proposed for rehabilitation is to be demolished; it has been determined that it is unsuitable for rehabilitation.

On March 20, 1989, at the request of PDC, HPD submitted a modification of the urban renewal plan, and the revised disposition of the sites proposed for industrial redevelopment

(C 880606 HDK) to reflect the deletion of the following privately owned properties from Site 7: Block 2272, Lots 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 45, 46, 147, 54, 55 and 57. These properties are to be removed from the list of properties to be acquired pursuant to the urban renewal plan, and from the list of properties to be disposed as part of the related disposition. The remaining city-owned properties on Block 2272 comprise new Sites 7A and 7B, specifically located as follows:

Site 7A: Property on the southerly side of Bartlett Street between Harrison and Throop avenues; Tax Block 1722, Lot 11.

Site 7B: Property on the northwesterly corner of the intersection of Flushing Avenue and Whipple Street; Tax Block 1722, Lots 49, 51, 52, 53 and 108.

Sites 7A and 7B are designated for industrial use.

In addition, HPD also subdivided Site 1 into Sites 1A and 1B to allow the timely development of a portion of the former Site 1. Site 1A is to consist of the property proposed for acquisition on Tax Block 2245 and the portion of Walton Street as proposed to be demapped, while Site 1B is to consist of the property proposed for acquisition on Tax Block 2249. The land use designation of Sites 1A and 1B remains industrial.

In a letter to City Planning dated April 4, 1989, HPD said that the text of the urban renewal plan would include height limitations for the proposed new residential buildings. The

turnkey low-income housing proposed for Sites 5 and 8 would be limited to a maximum of six stories; and the New York City Housing Partnership housing proposed for Sites 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 would be limited to a maximum of four stories. HPD also stated that the text of the plan would include a requirement that street trees be planted approximately every 25 feet along residential frontages as part of the residential development.

AREA AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Plan is a joint initiative of the Public Development Corporation (PDC), the Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD), and the Pfizer Corporation, a pharmaceutical and organic chemicals manufacturer located in the area. The proposed plan covers two community districts (1 and 3) and is comprised of seven industrial sites, 10 residential sites, one park site, and one public/semi-public site within a 20-block area.

The 20 blocks proposed for the urban renewal area are a mix of residential, commercial and industrial uses. The area is characterized by large assemblages of unimproved land in which parking, open storage and auto repair uses predominate. This 20-block area is a pocket of deteriorated land with a mix of scattered uses. It is surrounded by stable residential, commercial and industrial uses. Woodhull Hospital, a 489-bed facility serving people in both community districts is directly

east. Within two blocks of the project, to the south and west, are Marcy Houses, Sumner Houses, and Tompkins Houses, with a total of approximately 5,000 units of public housing. The Pfizer Corporation, an industry that employs approximately 650 people, is west of the urban renewal area. To the east, Bushwick Houses and Hylan Houses have a total of 1,500 units of public housing. Lindsay Park, a large Mitchell-Lama co-op with about 2,700 units, is also east of the urban renewal area. To the north, there is a mix of residential and industrial uses. A large intermediate school is adjacent to the urban renewal area on Walton Street.

Under the proposed plan, the city would acquire 74 privately owned vacant lots, six privately owned vacant buildings, and 28 privately owned occupied buildings. The people who live in 94 residential units would have to be relocated. Thirty commercial concerns would also have to be relocated.

The Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Plan area industrial sites will be developed during Phase I of the project. During Phase II, the two blocks bounded by Wallabout Street, Harrison Avenue, Bartlett Street, Flushing Avenue and Union Avenue (Tax Blocks 2265 and 2268) will be developed. At present, these two blocks are used by Pfizer for its power plant and some of its administrative offices. At a future date, if acceptable to

Pfizer, these facilities will be relocated to private property owned by Pfizer within the urban renewal area. These two blocks will then be available for industrial redevelopment similar to that proposed for the urban renewal area industrial sites. In anticipation that these blocks will become available, applications for their selection and acquisition and for their disposition to PDC for subsequent disposition to facilitate industrial redevelopment, are the subject of applications being considered concurrently (C 89005 PSK and C 890006 HDK).

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

These applications (N 880603 HGK, C 880604 HUK, C 880605 HDK, C 880606 HDK, C 880488 MMK, C 890005 PSK, C 890006 HDK) were reviewed pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and the SEQRA regulations set forth in Volume 6 of the New York Code of Rules and Regulations, Section 617.00 et seq., and the New York City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR) procedures set forth in Executive Order No. 91 of 1977. The designated CEQR number is 86-304K.

The applicant prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and the Department of Environmental Protection and the Department of City Planning submitted to the Commission for its consideration the results of their study of the potential environmental impact of the proposed action. A Notice of

Completion was issued on December 5, 1988. Pursuant to the SEQRA regulations and the CEQR procedures, a joint public hearing was held on the DEIS on March 22, 1989. This joint public hearing was held in conjunction with the public hearings on the related ULURP and urban renewal items (N 880603 HGK, C 880604 HUK, C 880605 HDK, C 880606 HDK, C 880488 MMK, C 890005 PSK, C 890006 HDK). After the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was certified and before the FEIS was completed, it was revealed that hazardous materials were stored at several locations in the Broadway Triangle project. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was completed, and a Notice of Completion of the FEIS was issued on May 4, 1989. The Notice of Completion for the FEIS identified the following significant adverse effects, certain unmitigated impacts and proposed mitigation measures:

"Land Use and Socioeconomics

The acquisition of parcels would necessitate the direct displacement of 94 households (212) residents, 30 businesses employing approximately 109 persons and 1 store-front church. The residential displacement impacts would be mitigated by the relocation assistance offered by the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development. This assistance would include compensation for condemned property, relocation and moving payments, and assistance in finding alternative accommodations. Many of the residents to be displaced would qualify for relocation to public housing in the surrounding community. Those unable to qualify for public housing would most likely find housing in the new and rehabilitated moderate income units planned for the surrounding community boards by the New York City Housing Partnership (995 units), or by the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (3,000 in rem units). The 30 businesses to be displaced would receive relocation assistance, and would most probably be able to relocate the space in the same area.

Open Space

The projected residential population increase of 509 persons would exacerbate the existing condition of inadequate open space in the study area. The existing open space ratio is .26 acres per thousand residents for active open space, and .05 acres per thousand for passive open space. The future build condition would remain the same as the existing condition. Any incremental impacts resulting from the project population would be mitigated by the reconstruction of the P.S. 148 playground (Blueberry School) by Department of Housing Preservation and Development.

Historic Resources

Archaeological documentary research has indicated that much of the project area is covered with 7 to 14 feet of land fill, and suggests that archaeological resources may be found under undeveloped backyard areas, or under building foundations... Further documentary research is being conducted, and archaeological field work may be conducted on certain sites before development.

Traffic and Transportation

During the morning peak hour under the future build condition, increased volume on northbound Throop Avenue results in LOS D at the Throop Avenue/Flushing Avenue intersection. The V/C could be mitigated to LOS C if four seconds of greentime from the westbound Thornton Street approach were allocated to the northbound Throop Avenue approach.

Air Quality

The impacts of specific stationary fuel combustion sources could not be analyzed at this time, and it is possible that there may be some significant impacts at certain sites due to specific stationary sources. Potential significant impacts could also result from process emissions. For certain process emissions impacts may not be sufficiently mitigated either by existing standards or technology, and may impact adjacent residential uses.

Noise

The ambient noise environment would exceed 45 dBA and would be a potentially significant noise impact in the residentially zone areas. In order to mitigate potential impacts, double glazed windows and alternate means of ventilation would be required to attenuate the indoor residential noise environment to 45 dBA. If such measures are not provided to new residential units, this impact would remain unmitigated.

Hazardous Materials

Potential impacts from the presence of elevated levels of benzene, toluene and leachable lead exist. Appropriate remediation methodologies would be determined after further testing, but include:

1. Capping the materials in-place with clean fill and asphalt or concrete, or soil excavation and off-site disposal for the area containing leachable lead; and
2. Soil excavation and off-site disposal, soil excavation and on-site soil treatment, including aeration and treatment of vapors and groundwater pumping and treatment for the area containing the underground storage tanks.

Remediation plans would be developed, submitted and approved by DEP and all other appropriate regulatory agencies. Such plans must be implemented prior to construction."

UNIFORM LAND USE REVIEW

On December 5, 1988, the City Planning Commission certified as complete the above-described applications for the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Plan, dispositions of ten sites for residential redevelopment and seven sites for industrial redevelopment, the amendment to the City Map, and the site selection and acquisition and disposition of property adjacent to the urban renewal area (respectively, C 880604 HUK, C 880605 HDK, C 880606 HDK, C 880488 MMK, C 890005 PSK and C 890006 HDK). These applications were duly referred to Brooklyn Community Boards 1 and 3, and the Brooklyn Borough Board, in accordance with Articles 3 and 4 of the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) rules.

Community Board 1 Public Hearing

Community Board 1 held a public hearing on January 17, 1989 and adopted a resolution on February 7, 1989 recommending disapproval by a vote of 33 in favor and none opposed with 5 abstentions.

In submitting its recommendation to the City Planning Commission, the board acknowledged the need for a mixed residential/industrial development in this neglected area and registered its support for the general concept of the plan. However, in a February 8, 1989 letter to the Chairperson of the City Planning Commission, the community board expressed its specific concerns and made recommendations concerning the redevelopment of the Broadway Triangle Area:

"Sites 5 & 8 - HPD's firm commitment to develop these sites for low-income housing and submit them to the state for inclusion in the Housing [Trust] Fund's Turnkey Program is a most significant development that is most welcome. In order to maximize the number of housing units that can be developed here, all other portions of those blocks not being utilized for residential use must be incorporated into the plan, acquired and targeted for low-income, residential development.

Site 7 - While PDC's decision to omit the acquisition of this property, from this site at this time, represents a step in the right direction, the fact that Site 7 is still targeted for industrial development remains a most significant open point of disagreement. We strongly believe that this site must be developed for low-income housing and intend

to pursue this viewpoint during the balance of the ULURP process...

Other Low-Income

Housing Concerns - While we deal here with the initial BTURA plan, we are not unmindful of the fact that additional amendments will, in time, be made that will affect the presently 'cued' portions of the primary project area. In our view, the commitment to construct significant numbers of low-income housing units in this area must be clearly made at this time in order to ensure the balanced future development of this community.

Relocation Plans - While both HPD and PDC relocation plans offer more specificity than had previously been provided, the inclusion of more detailed guarantees to the relocatees along the lines stated in our recommendation is still necessary before these plans can be deemed acceptable.

Industrial

Development Plan - The lack of a commitment to provide incentives to identify and include local businesses within the new developments is a serious flaw that needs to be corrected."

The board also questioned projections in the DEIS concerning the rerouting of a specific section of Graham Avenue and asked that the section be restudied now that the rerouting has taken place.

In a letter to the chairperson dated March 8, 1989, the board said that it has "been encouraged by the positive response of the agencies", adding that "while a number of open issues continue to exist -- especially our firm desire to see Site 7 developed for residential purposes -- we believe that the overall plan has improved the degree that we can now adopt a more

positive position." The board noted that it had voted on March 7, 1989 to recommend approval by a vote of 30 in favor and none opposed with 1 abstention.

Community Board 3 Public Hearing

Community Board 3 held its public hearing and voted on February 6, 1989. The vote was 14 in favor of the project and 10 opposed with 9 abstentions. The board did not make any recommendations at that time nor did it forward the results of its vote to City Planning. However, in a letter to the chairperson dated March 29, 1989, the board said that its "long-standing policy position has been to foster economic and housing development" and that the "Broadway Triangle Development Project is recognized as such." The board noted that its substantive concerns included housing affordability, minority participation in the contracting/construction process, and eventual usage of the residential and commercial sites. The letter also included a list of the board's concerns:

"Points of Concern

1. Concerned that the housing be affordable and attractive.
2. Facade concerns (exterior); matching the exterior of buildings with type and nature of buildings in district area.
3. Greater economic mix; i.e. commercial outlets on Flushing Avenue side of Community Board 3 facing Community Board 1.

4. Certification as to the actual number of people/families involved in the relocation.
5. Monitoring the human side of the relocation, placement and return of those eligible.
6. Fair share allocation to residents of district for the proposed new apartments, new homes and commercial opportunities.
7. NYC Partnership (housing) ongoing will be for the board to review the actual housing plans.
8. Involvement of community based organizations of Community Board 1 and Community Board 3.
9. The park (Blue Berry) concerns involve the conceptual plans and ongoing maintenance. We recommend that Pfizer Chemical Co. to adopt the Blue Berry park site.
10. Minority participation in the contracting/construction process and usages of the residential and commercial sites.
11. At Site 13, the mattress factory, that PDC address those needs and concerns."

The letter concluded by noting that "on Friday 2/17/89, a Community Board 3 Executive Committee Meeting was held; we reviewed the various aspects of the project. The review was favorable with the above listed concerns."

BOROUGH BOARD HEARING

On February 21, 1989, the Brooklyn Borough Board held a public hearing and unanimously approved the project with recommendations. The recommendations included the "development of a residential, industrial, and commercial relocation plan, creation of economic incentives to retain existing local

businesses, implement an outreach effort to further employment opportunities for local residents."

City Planning Commission Public Hearing

On March 1, 1989, the City Planning Commission scheduled March 22, 1989 for a public hearing on this application (C 880604 HUK) and the above-described related actions in, and adjacent to, the urban renewal area (N 880603 HGK, C 880605 HDK, C 880606 HDK, C 880488 MMK, C 890005 PSK and C 890006 HDK). A combined public hearing was duly held on March 22, 1989.

There were three speakers in favor of this project and three speakers opposed. Three property owners within the proposed urban renewal area opposed the taking of their properties. One of the three actively uses the property to be acquired, and the other two said that they had plans to develop their properties.

The co-administrator of All Saints Church spoke in favor of the general objectives of the proposal while presenting the concerns of area property owners. One property owner whose home will be acquired said he shared many of the problems of other property owners in the area and was speaking in favor of the project because he thought it would alleviate some of these problems. Speaking on behalf of Community Board 1 in support of the application, the chairperson of the board's Land Use

Committee urged the Commission to support the board's preference for using a portion of Block 2272 for residential use. He also urged the Commission to take a strong stand for the low-income component of the project. He stated that the majority of the board's initial concerns had been met. There were no other appearances, and the hearing was closed.

CONSIDERATION

The Commission believes the proposed actions are appropriate. The Commission notes that the proposed urban renewal area is characterized by large assemblages of unimproved land with a mix of scattered residential, commercial, and industrial uses and that the project would bring a more coherent character to the area by consolidating similar land uses and separating incompatible uses. No zoning changes are proposed for the area.

The urban renewal plan would permit the city to acquire privately owned properties to add to large assemblages of city-owned property for the development of approximately 200-300 residential units and approximately 300,000 square feet of industrial space. The proposed industrial development is expected to generate a net increase of 500 jobs. HPD has determined that most of the private property to be acquired is deteriorated or underutilized. However, some businesses and

residences must also be acquired to create a critical mass of property to allow for this development. The Commission notes that HPD has made a firm commitment to apply for New York State Housing Trust Fund Turnkey Program monies to provide 75-80 low-income units within the proposed urban renewal area. In response to community concerns, HPD is studying the possibility of enlarging the sites proposed for low-income housing. In addition, the Commission believes that the westerly portion of Block 2272, originally designated for industrial development, should be re-examined as a potential housing site prior to any disposition of city-owned property on that block.

The Commission finds that the relocation issue raised by both community boards has been adequately addressed in HPD's commitment to earmark approximately 110 units of housing being developed through its Special Initiatives Program for people who will be relocated from the proposed Broadway Triangle project. The issue is also being addressed through HPD's commitment to the development of low- and middle-income units in the area. The Commission stresses the necessity for HPD and PDC to continue to work with the owners of commercial and industrial uses that must relocate and with local businesses that want to move to the area. The Commission also realizes that the creation of special incentives to encourage the industrial developments to be marketed to locally based businesses is not within the scope of

this plan. However, the Commission stresses the importance of having PDC target industrial development to local businesses wherever appropriate and practical.

In response to the Commission's concerns regarding the development and maintenance of Site 12, which is designated for open space in the urban renewal plan, the Department of Parks and Recreation sent a letter to the Public Development Corporation dated May 9, 1989. The letter states that the Parks Department is willing to accept jurisdiction over the property "providing that:

1. The funds for design and construction are provided with no impact on the Parks Department current capital budget.
2. The property will be mapped as parkland.
3. Pfizer, Inc. will make a contribution toward the maintenance of the property."

In its letter the Parks Department agreed to submit a ULURP application to map the site as parkland.

A letter from PDC dated May 10, 1989 to the City Planning Commission states that the first and third conditions will be met as follows:

"All three conditions of [the letter from the Parks Department] will be satisfied, since under OMB's current arrangement HPD will absorb all of the capital budget requirements for development of the park. Pfizer's senior management has confirmed to us that Pfizer is prepared to negotiate a lump sum contribution which would be used to help defray part of the park's maintenance costs. Design of the park will commence in Fiscal Year 1990 and construction

will be timed to coincide with the completion of the new housing which will surround it in 1991 or 1992."

Community Board 1 questioned projections on the DEIS concerning traffic on Graham Avenue. The Commission notes that the traffic analysis in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) addresses the board's concerns.

The FEIS disclosed potential impacts from certain hazardous materials in two sites designated for industrial use. In a letter dated May 10, 1989, the Public Development Corporation responded to the Commission's concern about these potential impacts. The letter says "... if and when these properties come into public ownership, in connection with their development, PDC will cause the appropriate testing and remediation measures to be carried out [and] PDC will assure that proposed remediation measures are submitted to the Department of Environmental Protection and any other agencies having jurisdiction so that an approved protocol will be implemented prior to construction."

The proposed urban renewal plan would improve the industrial base in north-central Brooklyn while providing much-needed housing for both low- and moderate-income families. Accordingly, the Commission finds the creation of an urban renewal area and the disposition of properties for industrial and residential

development appropriate and consistent with land use and zoning in the area.

RESOLUTION

The City Planning Commission finds that the proposed Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Plan is an appropriate plan for the area involved.

The City Planning Commission certifies that the Urban Renewal Plan for the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area complies with provisions of Sections 502, 504, and 505, Article 15, of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York, conforms to the comprehensive community plan for the development of the municipality as a whole and is consistent with local objectives.

The City Planning Commission certifies its approval of the Urban Renewal Plan for the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area, pursuant to Section 505, Article 15, of the General Municipal Law of the State of New York.

RESOLVED, that having considered the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), for which a Notice of Completion was issued on May 4, 1989, with respect to this application

(CEQR No . 86-304K), the City Planning Commission finds that, consistent with social, economic and other essential considerations:

- (1) From among the reasonable alternative thereto, the actions to be approved are ones which minimize or avoid adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent practicable; and
- (2) The adverse environmental impacts revealed in the Environmental Impact Statement will be minimized or avoided to the maximum extent by incorporating as conditions to the decision those mitigating measures that were identified as practicable; and be it further

RESOLVED, by the City Planning Commission, pursuant to Section 197-c of the New York City Charter, the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure adopted by the Commission on June 1, 1976, and Section 505, Article 15, of the General Municipal Law, that the proposed Urban Renewal Plan for the Broadway Triangle Urban Renewal Area, submitted by the Department of Housing Preservation and Development on February 12, 1988, and revised on August 8, 1988, is approved (C 880604 HUK).

The above resolution, duly adopted by the City Planning Commission on May 15, 1989 (Calendar No. 4), is filed with the Secretary of the Board of Estimate, pursuant to Section 197-c of the New York City Charter.

SYLVIA DEUTSCH, Chairperson
DENISE M. SCHEINBERG, Vice-Chairperson
SALVATORE GAGLIARDO, MARILYN M. MAMMANO, Wm. GARRISON McNEIL,
DANIEL T. SCANNELL, Commissioners