

# Seward Park Planning Process

Meeting 1: April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2010

## Agenda

**Review community goals**  
**Gather additional information**  
**Prepare for next meeting**



**Seward Park Sites**  
*Courtesy NYCDP*

# Who we are

**John Shapiro**, Chair, City and Regional Planning Program, Pratt Institute. Principal of Phillips Preiss Shapiro Associates for 35 years. Past President of the American Planning Association MetroNY Chapter.

**Eve Baron**, Professor, City and Regional Planning Program, Pratt Institute. Immediate past Director of the Municipal Art Society (MAS) Planning Center.

**Our goal:** Help bring the Committee one step closer to a plan that is not only worth doing, but will garner support from the constituencies that the Committee members align with.

# Tonight's meeting

**First of four** scheduled work sessions

**Purpose** is to review goals to date; get issues on the table in a guided process; decide what issues need additional study

**Ground rules** for tonight

- One speaker at a time
- Respect differences of opinion
- Respect time constraints
- Use your time wisely; avoid saying things already said

# Seward Park Planning: from urban renewal to urban revitalization

- 1955 Seward Park URA established; City condemns and acquires land
- 1965 Seward Park Extension URA established
- 1980s-90s Several unsuccessful attempts to develop Extension sites
- 1998 City issues RFP for several Extension Sites
- 2001 Developer conditionally designated
- 2003 Developer de-designated
- 2003 City presents new proposal; no progress
- 2005 SPURA expires
- 2008-present MN CB3 Land Use Planning Process and Principles**
- 2009 MN CB3 invites agency participation
- 2009 SPURA Matters report
- 2010 Time to make a plan that has the support of the whole community**

# Committee has done hard work

Spring 2009

Guiding Principles (Adopted by CB)

July

Size and scope

September

City process

December

Urban design, open space

January 2010

Parking and retail

February

Cultural/community space

# Our time is defined, so we will be focused

Spring 2009	Guiding Principles (Adopted by CB)
July	Size and scope
September	City process
December	Urban design, open space
January 2010	Parking and retail
February	Cultural/community space
April	Housing
May	Housing
June	Non-residential uses
Fall	FIRST draft of a plan and CB Resolution

# Plan must be site-specific and clear about intentions, but not fully detailed

- Scope of housing (type, affordability, etc)
- Scope of retail
- Type and amount of open space
- Amount of community facility space
- Cultural / entertainment uses
- Amount and use of parking
- Other uses
- Location of uses on various sites



# The Committee has formulated 12 guidelines that provide the foundation for a sound plan

1. Preserve the mixed-use residential character (MURC) of the neighborhood.
2. Establish a district more in keeping with current planning principles of contextual design.
3. Stabilize the mixed-income character of the neighborhood through various forms of housing, including rental and home ownership. Any low, moderate, and middle-income housing component shall remain so in perpetuity.
4. Exemplify good design and sound environmental principles.
5. Develop the area to optimize its residential potential.
6. Anchor the community with cultural and civic amenities to benefit residents (community) of all ages.
7. Any commercial development shall promote a diversity of goods, services, and price points.
8. Consider the historical significance of the Essex Street Market and feasibility and purpose of preservation or adaptive reuse.
9. Prioritize housing for current CB3 residents.
10. Maximize the potential for local construction jobs.
11. First priority should be given to Tenants at Title Vesting (TATV) – the former site tenants. The city shall make diligent efforts to locate them.
12. The RFP(s) shall be awarded pursuant to these guiding principles. Maximization of city revenue from the sale of the land shall be a secondary consideration.

# The 12 guidelines fall into 5½ categories

- 1. Comprehensive is preferred to piecemeal; practicality matters**
  - 2. The development and its urban design must be exemplary and contextual**
  - 3. Retail variety is possible and preferred; night-time uses less so**
  - 4. Desire for cultural, community and open space uses**
- ½. (Parking is secondary or supportive)**
- 5. But what about housing?**

# *looking at the guidelines closer...*

**Blue =**

**The categories derived from CB3 Committee's Guiding Principles**

**Black and bold =**

**Text taken directly from the Guiding Principles**

**Black and normal =**

Comments from Committee meeting notes and agency presentations

# 1. Comprehensive preferred to piecemeal; practicality matters

**Preserve the mixed-use character of the neighborhood**

**Exemplify good design and sound environmental principles**

**Maximizing City revenue from the sale of the land shall be a secondary consideration**

**The RFP(s) shall be awarded pursuant to these guiding principles**

- Complement and enhance the character of the LES
- Provide mixed-used development with significant residential and retail components
- Improve and increase land utilization
- Include as many sites as possible
- Can consider rezoning / more bulk, depending on potential benefits / costs
- Assure project feasibility
- Provide sufficient revenue to be financially feasible
- The development must support its own infrastructure work
- Sites are best developed by multiple developers

## 2. The development (and its urban design) should be exemplary and contextual

**Establish a district more in keeping with current planning principles of contextual design**

**Consider the historical significance of the Essex Street Market and feasibility of preservation or adaptive reuse.**

**Exemplify good design and environmental principles**

**Maximize the potential for local construction jobs**

- Maintain street walls; no “towers in the park”
- North of Delancey should be contextual
- South of Delancey can be more flexible
- Enhance neighborhood connections
- Development must be environmentally sustainable
- Incorporate green building practices, depending on cost implications
- Need for further assistance in conceptualizing the urban design parameters

### 3. Retail variety is possible and preferred; night-time uses less so

**Any commercial development shall promote a diversity of goods, services, and price points.**

- Maximize retail potential
- Support for significant retail space as part of program
- Interest in a variety of retail types and sizes that serve community needs and provide opportunity for local entrepreneurs
- Activate daytime street life; less nightclub type of scene (movie theater excepted?)
- Some favor subsidies for local businesses
- Big box stores are not preferred; “mid-box” is possible

# 4. Desire for cultural, community and open space uses

## **Anchor the community with cultural and civic amenities to benefit residents (community) of all ages**

- Need for more clear understanding of the tradeoffs
- Benefit the diverse constituencies within the local community with cultural and civic amenities
- Concern that new uses may compete with surrounding cultural uses
- Incorporate open space into the plan; amount depends on tradeoffs
- Some would sacrifice open space for more housing; others disagree
- What about residential outdoor open space?

# 1/2. Parking is secondary or supportive

***No objectives on parking in Guiding Principles, which speaks volumes***

- Garage should stay? 350 (half) of the 735 car spaces
- Replace (some? all?) surface lot spaces
- Parking on the site should not be subsidized, and certainly not in exchange for other subsidized uses
- Parking should be underground
- What about parking for the new uses?
- Truck parking on surface lots should not be prioritized over other development opportunities
- Best faith effort should be made to accommodate truck parking during construction



## 5. And what about housing?

**Stabilize the mixed-income character of the neighborhood**

**Provide various forms of housing, including rental and homeownership**

**Any low-, moderate- and middle-income housing component shall remain so in perpetuity**

**Prioritize housing for current CD 3 residents**

**First priority should be given to the former site tenants at Title Vesting; the City shall make diligent efforts to locate them**

**These and the relevant details are the subject of this and the next meeting...but as a start**

# Many ways to think about housing

**Types of housing: There are different housing types for different constituencies:**

- Senior housing
- Supportive housing / Special needs housing
- Range of apartment sizes
- Rental housing
- Ownership housing

# Many ways to think about housing affordability

## Affordability to whom?

City bases its housing programs on Area Median Income (AMI) defined by federal Department of Housing and Urban Development HUD = **\$76,800** for a family of four for the New York Area.

<b>Definitions</b>	<b>% of AMI</b>	<b>Income</b>
Luxury housing	195% +	\$ 157,000 +
Market rate (not luxury)	165% - 195%	\$ 127,000 - 157,000
Middle income	130% - 165%	\$ 100,000 - 127,000
Moderate income	80% - 130%	\$ 61,000 - 100,000
Low income	60% - 80%	\$ 46,000 - 61,000
Very low income	30% - 60%	\$ 23,000 - 46,000
Extremely low income	< 30%	\$ < 23,000

# To begin the discussion...

- What is your point of view about housing for the Seward Park sites?
- What additional information would you need about housing to begin making decisions?

# Next steps

Individual meetings over the next few weeks

Reconvene May 24 to report back on key issues and build consensus on housing

Contact information:

– Eve Baron [eve\\_baron@yahoo.com](mailto:eve_baron@yahoo.com)

– John Shapiro [johnshapiro1@me.com](mailto:johnshapiro1@me.com)

[www.nycedc.com/sewardpark](http://www.nycedc.com/sewardpark)