



Vital Brooklyn RFP Sites E, F, G & H, I, J, K, and L Addendum 3
RFP Issue Date: November 29, 2018
Addendum 3 Issue Date: January 17, 2019

Contents of the Addendum

A. Questions and Answers- Enclosed is a summary of questions and answers in response to questions sent to the HCR Vital Brooklyn RFP email address.

A. Questions and Answers- Enclosed is a summary of questions and answers in response to questions sent to the HCR Vital Brooklyn RFP email address.

All Sites

1. **Are OPWDD Integrated Supportive Housing program funds considered competitive for purposes of this RFP?**
A: OPWDD Supportive Housing capital funds are considered competitive, but OPWDD Supportive Housing rental and supportive service subsidies through the ESSHI program are not considered competitive, for the purposes of this RFP.
2. **Should buildings that include supportive housing for individuals with developmental disabilities be limited to 25% supportive housing units, even if some of the supportive housing residents in the building do not have a developmental disability, i.e., service disabled veterans?**
A: All buildings with supportive housing units should contain 50% supportive housing units, with the supportive housing units for individuals with developmental disabilities limited to 25% of the total unit count.

Sites E, F, G & H

3. **What is envisioned to happen to the existing uses at Sites E, F, G & H on a temporary and permanent basis? Will the selected developer(s) be responsible for any temporary or permanent relocation of those existing uses?**
A: Designated developers will not be responsible for relocation of existing uses. Buildings will be delivered unoccupied.
4. **Both the RFP and Attachment 4 indicate in the existing buildings on Sites E, F, G/H, the level below the 1st floor as “Basement”. We would like to confirm if this level is indeed a “Basement” or is this floor a “Cellar” according to the definition of these terms in the Zoning Resolution? It impacts how this floor is counted in terms of floor area.**
A: Levels below the first floor on Sites E, F, G & H should be considered Cellars.
5. **Will each of the sites on Sites E, F, G/H be their own individual zoning lots with lot sizes as indicated in Attachment 1 and each site using and generating their own floor area? Or are the Sites to be considered part of a larger zoning lot and if so how is the floor area divided amongst the Sites and Kingsbrook Jewish Medical Center?**
 - a. **For example: Lot G/H has 86,075 sf of existing floor area. The lot size shown is 14,384 sf. The as of right residential floor area generated is 14,384 sf x 2.2 FAR = 31,644 sf. Existing G/H buildings are overbuilt for the lot.**
A: If individual proposals are being made for each site, then each site should be considered to be on its own zoning lot. For existing buildings, the necessary floor area will be made available to permit the continued use of the building. If proposals are being made for multiple sites, one zoning lot can be assumed. If proposals are seeking to use floor area generated by the southern portion of the block (i.e. the area not associated with site E, F, G, & H), beyond what is needed

to preserve the existing buildings, additional compensation for that floor area should be proposed.

- 6. Is there any sectional information regarding existing buildings on Site G/H to show how the floors between the two buildings line up?**

A: At this time there is no additional information available.

- 7. If as-of-right zoning will allow the parking requirements to be waived, is parking still needed/ wanted for Sites E, F, G/H?**

A: No parking is needed beyond what is required by zoning.

- 8. Will easements be provided amongst Sites E, F, G/H if awarded to different developers so required light and air be maintained?**

A: Yes, easements will be provided to the extent feasible.

- 9. Sites “F” and “G/H” include the same supportive housing priorities (Service Disabled Veterans and Developmental Disabled). The populations have different Olmstead interpretations under ESSHI. If we submit a combined Proposal that includes both Site “F” and Site “G/H” can one building address Service Disabled Veterans and the other Developmental Disabilities or must both buildings include a mix of each?**

A: Not all supportive populations must be served.

- 10. Does the Kingsbrook Jewish Medical Center (KJMC) power plant currently service any of the existing buildings included in this RFP? If it does, which ones, what service (heating, air conditioning, water, electricity) and can a respondent assume that service from the power plant can continue or should this service be obtained from a new source to be incorporated into the project(s)? If service is continued, can the water, gas, electric services be separately or sub metered so as to be expensed to the new project(s). If not separate or sub metered, will there be a monthly amount established that would be reimbursed back to the KJMC from the project(s)?**

A: Proposals should assume standard utility provision and should not assume utility provision from the Hospital Power Plant.

- 11. Is the common green space provided on site F expected to be open to the hospital courtyard to the south or only to residents?**

A: Open space is expected to be an amenity for use by tenants only.

- 12. Drawing C-101 in addendum 1 and attachment 1 page 5 show different outlines for site F. Please clarify the dimensions of the site and locate the existing buildings in relation to the site boundaries.**

A: Attachment 1, Page 5 shows the correct site boundaries and site dimensions for Site F.

- 13. Site F consists of portions of both Lot 1 & Lot 5. Please confirm that Site F will be a newly drawn separate zoning lot and that no zoning floor area will need to be transferred between Site F and the remaining sites and/or the hospital. Should proposals for site F assume a zoning lot merger with sites E and G&H in order to provide legal light and air for those sites? Do the**

light and air easements mentioned in Addendum 2 question 16 include easements providing legal light and air along the south lot line of sites E, G&H? If a zoning lot merger is required for the easement can proposers assume that this would not reduce the allowable bulk on site F?

A: No zoning floor area will need to be transferred *from* Site F *to* any other site on the campus; Site F will have a zoning lot size of 57,000sf as stated in the RFP. To address any easement issues, zoning lots may be merged if needed. Proposals should state proposed zoning lot configurations in zoning analyses and design narratives.

14. Can we assume that the remainder of Lots 1 & 5, with the existing bulk on Sites E, G, H and the other hospital buildings outside of Site F, will comply with as-of-right zoning once the lots are separated? If not, please provide the existing zoning floor area for all structures on Lots 1 & 5, including the hospital buildings.

A: Proposals should assume an as-of-right zoning for Lots 1 and 5. See Question 5 for additional information.

One Brooklyn Health Bishop Walker (Site I)

15. Under the NYC Zoning Resolution there appear to be several impediments to an as-of-right development on Site I that would fully utilize the available 66,300 SF of zoning floor area on Zoning Lot 10 of Block 1163:

- The provisions of ZR 77-22, regarding Zoning Lots divided by District Boundaries, would limit the allowable FAR in the R6B portion of the lot to the combined 2.635 FAR indicated in the RFP, which results in a maximum floor area of 35,208 ZSF (13,362 SF lot area x 2.635 FAR).
- Under Section ZR 23-532, the requirement for a 60' deep rear yard equivalent located midway on the through lot (plus or minus 5') also limits the development of the rear 25' of Site I above 23' in height.
- Based on the 5-story maximum height as well as the setback and street wall location requirements under the contextual R6B zoning, and the dimensional limitations of a multi-family residential floorplate, it does not appear possible to utilize a substantial portion of the available 66,300 SF of zoning floor area on Site I.

Given these current constraints on the as-of-right development of Site I, would it be acceptable to assume a rezoning of the site to R6A, consistent with the neighboring lots to the north and west?

A: Proposals should assume an as-of-right zoning scenario. Alternative scenarios assuming other zoning may be proposed and must include zoning and massing studies and financing proposals, at minimum.

16. Since the required 40 parking spaces are for the use of the Health Center on the north portion of the zoning lot, is it acceptable to assume that parking access could be from Prospect Place using the existing curb to the east of the Health Center building to remain, rather than from Park Place?

A: Yes, proposals may assume that parking can be accessed from Prospect Place.



17. We are applying for Site I and note the market study requirements. Do the comparable listings need to be done by a third party or can we source the listings ourselves assuming they meet the comparable operations criteria?

A: As stated in Addendum 2, market comparables are required for Community Facility and Commercial spaces, and for residential rents above 80% AMI.

18. Do photo-realistic renderings need to be printed out as part of the 24"x36" hard copy architectural and urban design drawings submission?

A: Electronic-only submissions of photo-realistic renderings will be accepted.