



March 4, 2020

**Testimony of New York City Councilwoman Carlina Rivera, New York State Assembly Member Deborah J. Glick and Senator Brad Hoylman Before the City Planning Commission, Relating to 3 St. Mark's Place, and the Application for Modification of Bulk Pursuant to Section 74-79 of the Zoning Resolution
ULURP Number: 200077ZSM**

Thank you for the opportunity to testify regarding the proposed transfer of 8,386 square feet of development rights from the landmarked 4 St. Mark's Place (Hamilton-Holly House) to the newly proposed development at 3 St. Mark's Place. The proposed massing that would be built with approval of this permit would be 20 percent larger than an as-of-right development. Also, the bulk waiver is proposed for the narrow street portion of the development site, on the St. Mark's Place frontage. This development would clearly be out of context with the landmarked 4 St. Mark's Place as well as the surrounding streetscape and character, and we urge the City Planning Commission to deny this application.

Located at the "Gateway to the East Village" – this proposed development at 3 St. Mark's Place would seriously impact and conflict with the landmarked Hamilton-Holly House, and the proposed non-complying bulk would be out of context with the historic St. Marks Place corridor, as a whole. The developers' proposed repairs and perpetual maintenance fund for 4 St. Mark's Place - where Elizabeth Schuyler Hamilton, the widow of Founding Father Alexander Hamilton, once resided – are not sufficient and do not measure up against the incongruity this proposed building would create. We do not believe that, in this case, the disadvantages to the surrounding area will be offset by the advantages of the landmark's preservation.

It's clear that the developers, in the wake of numerous concerns raised by neighborhood groups, Community Board 3, several members of the Landmarks Preservation Commission, and elected officials, have not proposed or addressed any serious "appropriate conditions and safeguards" that the 74-79 permit states should be considered in order to "minimize adverse effects on the character of the surrounding area." Little outreach has been done to impacted community members and groups, and only minimal changes have been made since this project was unveiled, and the proposed development would still penetrate the maximum front wall height and sky exposure plane.

Our offices will continue to speak out to ensure that historic streetscapes and communities are considered against out-of-context commercial development, just as we did when we fought against the construction of a hotel next to the Merchant's House Museum on East 4th Street last year.

We hope the City Planning Commission will seriously consider these concerns as you hear this item, and that the Commission will vote to deny both the transfer of development rights and the modification of bulk provisions.