



EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Andrew Berman

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

PRESIDENT

Trevor Stewart

VICE PRESIDENTS

Jessica Davis
William Abrams

SECRETARY

Allan G. Sperling

TREASURER

Adrienne Ward

PRESIDENT EMERITUS

Arthur Levin

TRUSTEES

Tom Birchard
Richard Blodgett
David Hottenroth
Anita Isola
Christina Kepple
Jeanne Krier
John Lamb
Justine Leguizamo
Leslie Mason
Ruth McCoy
Yukie Ohta
Katherine Schoonover
Jessica Dean Schiffer
Marilyn Sobel
Carole Teller
Linda Yowell
F. Anthony Zunino

**232 EAST 11TH STREET
NEW YORK NY 10003
212-475-9585
VILLAGEPRESERVATION.ORG**

December 22, 2025

Mayor-elect Zohran Mamdani
24-08 32nd Street, Suite 1002A
Astoria, NY 11102

City Councilmember Erik Bottcher
224 West 30th St, Suite 1206
New York, NY 10001

Manhattan Borough President-elect Brad Hoylman-Sigal
322 Eighth Avenue, Suite 1700
New York, NY 10001

Congressman Dan Goldman
290 Broadway, Suite 291
New York, NY 10007

State Senator Brian Kavanaugh
250 Broadway, Room 2011
New York, NY 10007

Assemblymember Deborah Glick
853 Broadway, Suite 2007
New York, NY 10003

Valerie de la Rosa, Chair, Community Board 2, Manhattan
3 Washington Square Village, 1A
New York, NY 10012

**Re: Recently-Released Plans for Development of City-Owned Land at 388
Hudson Street, Manhattan**

Dear Mayor-elect Mamdani, Borough President-elect Hoylman-Sigal,
Councilmember Bottcher, Congressman Goldman, State Senator Kavanaugh,
Assemblymember Glick, and Community Board Chair de la Rosa,

I write to express our deep concerns regarding recently-released plans for development of the city-owned site at 388 Hudson Street. While these plans were released by the outgoing administration in its final days in office, the ultimate contours of this project will be decided by the new Mayor, the City Council, and our new Borough President, following a Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) or rezoning that will require multiple public hearings and votes. Consistent with feedback we and hundreds of neighbors and New Yorkers have offered over the past nearly three years since plans for this site were first announced, we have serious objections to the plan in current form, and are deeply disappointed, but not surprised, to see that the outgoing administration chose to largely ignore the public input it received. We hope that you will not do the same.

Specifically, our concerns about the recently-released plans for development of the site are:

- **Relationship to and impact upon plans for the Tony Dapolito Recreation Center.**
Apparently this plan for development of 388 Hudson Street is still based upon the assumption that the landmarked and beloved Tony Dapolito Recreation Center across the street will be destroyed, and that all recreation facilities from that site, with the exception of those connected to the adjacent outdoor pool, will be removed from the site and placed in the new facility. Our objection to this aspect of the plan is twofold: 1) We strenuously object to demolition of the landmarked building, which while in need of repairs and upgrades due to years of neglect by the City, is still very much capable of being restored and continuing to be used for public recreational facilities. Failure to do so would destroy a beloved community space, violate the landmark protections quite deliberately bestowed upon this building in 2010, dishonor community leader Tony Dapolito for whom the center was renamed, and violate a promise made to the community years ago to restore the center; 2) By eliminating the recreation center entirely from the current site, the plan unnecessarily inflates the size of the new building at 388 Hudson Street, with what appears to be the equivalent of a more than five-story building at the base dedicated to new recreational facilities as well as significant below-ground space. Were the Tony Dapolito Recreation Center restored as the public has long called for, as was promised years ago, and as landmarks regulations should require, the grossly oversized scale of the new building would be reduced.
- **Scale and configuration of the proposed new building.** As mentioned above, the proposed tower would be of a grossly inappropriate scale for its surroundings, facing the Greenwich Village Historic District and the well-utilized J.J. Walker Park, which it would shadow. Based upon renderings released, it appears the tower would reach at least 350 feet in height if not more, making it far and away the tallest building in Greenwich Village. Throughout the “public engagement” process for this project, the number one sentiment expressed by participants (in spite of the city’s not offering height or scale as a facet of the design to comment upon) was that the building be contextual in scale, using the large bulky loft buildings which surround it to the south and west as a benchmark for massing and height. The proposed tower on a base not only violates that form but appears to roughly double the height of the largest buildings on its southern periphery, while dwarfing the iconic five story houses of St. Luke’s Place within the Greenwich Village Historic District it would face. We and others also consistently asked for a lower, bulkier building that stepped back from J.J. Walker Park and the Greenwich Village Historic District, to transition from the low-scale area to the north and minimize the building looming over park and playground across the street. That feedback was roundly ignored, and must be followed in any final approved design.
- **Inappropriateness of the proposed exterior treatment of the tower and building design.**
The monotonous pock-marked pattern shown for the facade of the tower gives the building the appearance of a high-rise office tower with measles. No apparent attempt was made to relate this incredibly conspicuous building to its context, although it will be visually prominent for dozens of blocks, and define the skyline of the area. The lack of interest in

having the structure display any attempt at harmony with its surroundings is insulting and emblematic of the contempt for public input and the surrounding community which has been a hallmark of this process. We strongly urge that this design be shelved and rethought.

- **Lack of information about guarantees of permanent affordability.** We and countless others have from the beginning insisted that this project on public land, replacing a long-promised park, must guarantee permanent affordability for 100% of its housing. This is an especially urgent issue because in early meetings with the public, HPD officials stated that the affordability of the entire project was only guaranteed for 30 years, which was followed by an unsubstantiated series of contradictory assertions about the duration and extent of guaranteed affordability. We have thus far heard nothing concrete about the duration of the affordability and how it will be ensured. Mechanisms such as deed restrictions attached to the land as well as other legal devices can provide some level of assurance that the project's affordability will remain 100% permanent, but have thus far not been provided. We have seen too many developments in our neighborhood which were ostensibly intended to remain permanently affordable going market rate as soon as a hole in the regulatory system allowed it. Relying upon a future Mayor to step in in time to prevent that from happening is not an acceptable option, as we have seen too many prior ones fail to do so. We demand that clear and ironclad mechanisms for the permanent affordability of all the housing in this development be made a pre-condition for approval of any project, and point out that such mechanisms have not yet been provided to the public.

I look forward to your response and to a continued dialogue with each of you about this project.

Sincerely,



Andrew Berman
Executive Director

Cc: Presumptive 2026 City Council Speaker Julie Menin