February 22, 2007

Hon. Christine Quinn  
Speaker, New York City Council  
224 West 30th Street  
New York, NY 10001

Hon. Scott Stringer  
Manhattan Borough President  
One Centre Street, 19th floor  
New York, NY 10007

Congressman Jerrold Nadler  
201 Varick Street, #669  
New York, NY 10014

State Senator Thomas K. Duane  
322 Eighth Avenue, #1700  
New York, NY 10014

Assemblymember Deborah Glick  
853 Broadway, Suite 2120  
New York, NY 10003

Re: Trump SoHo Condo-Hotel, 246 Spring Street

Dear Speaker Quinn, Borough President Stringer, Congressman Nadler, Senator Duane, and Assemblymember Glick:

I write to bring to your attention yet another example of the developers of the proposed Trump SoHo Condo-Hotel at 246 Spring Street advertising the planned development as a “residence,” which would directly violate zoning restrictions for this site. Such advertisements by the developers have been repeatedly brought to the City’s attention, and yet we have been repeatedly told by various city officials that the developers had been admonished about such advertisements and that they had been removed or discontinued. However, the attached advertisement in this week’s New York Magazine (listing the Bayrock Group, one of the developers of the project, as the contact) refers to the development’s “residences,” and also says that “when not occupying residences owners can opt for a revenue-sharing program whereby the unit becomes part of the hotel’s general inventory” (i.e. it can be rented out). This indicates that leaving these units open to transient occupancy is an option for owners, rather than a requirement, as the City has been insisting it would be. Additionally, on its website, the Bayrock Group refers to the “living spaces” in the development, again implying that units will be used primarily as places where people live, rather than as a “transient hotel,” as the City’s zoning requires.

As you know, the City’s zoning explicitly prohibits the development of residences and residential hotels at this location and in all manufacturing zones.
That is why we and scores of community and business organizations from across the city contend that this development violates the zoning and should not be permitted by the City, as it would open the door to a flood of previously prohibited luxury high-rise development in manufacturing zones and would eliminate the public approval process which developments that do not conform to the underlying zoning should be subjected to. As of today no building permits have been issued for the development, but both the Department of City Planning and the Department of Buildings, the two agencies with oversight over this project have stated that they see no conflict between a “condo-hotel” development such as this and the site’s zoning restrictions.

To be clear, however, the problem here is not that the developers continue to, in spite of repeated admonitions not to do so, advertise their development as a “residence.” This development will in fact be a residence; the problem is that the City has not yet recognized this, claims that it can be a “transient hotel” as allowed by the zoning, and is still allowing for the possibility of this development receiving building permits. Currently city agencies are saying that a voluntary restrictive declaration that the developers will sign will ensure that this development will be used only as a transient hotel. We believe that experience has shown that such an agreement will have little or no efficacy or enforceability, and that these advertisements show that the developer has every intention of violating those terms, and every expectation of getting away with it. However, even in the highly implausible case that the terms of the restrictive declaration were to be abided by, it still would allow owners to occupy their units for 100-150 days a year. That is not a transient hotel; that is a second home. Even on that basis, we continue to believe that the building permits for this development must not be approved and this development must not be allowed.

You have each expressed concerns in the past regarding the developers’ advertisement of their project as a residence, and have claimed this must be corrected for good faith negotiations to continue regarding the terms of approval of the building permits by the City. While we disagree about whether there is any room to negotiate given what we see as the inherent conflict between this project and the zoning restrictions for this site, I hope that you will take seriously this latest flagrant violation by the developer and question whether any process can move forward under these circumstances. In light of the clear and ever-increasing evidence that this developer has every intention of violating the zoning and having the Trump SoHo Condo-Hotel function as a residence, we are calling upon the City to reject permits for this development and not allow it to move ahead. I urge you to do the same.

Sincerely,

Andrew Berman
Executive Director