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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Built by hand over 14 years, and spanning the width of the East River, the Brooklyn Bridge was an engineering feat started by John Roebling and finished by his son’s wife, Emily Roebling. It is a bridge with a storied history, of great size and beauty, which has an iconic presence the world over.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2018, professors assisted by graduate students from Pratt Institute were retained by Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation and the Brooklyn Bridge Park Community Advisory Council to create a Vision Plan focusing on the area situated under the Brooklyn Bridge, on the Brooklyn side. As of this writing, this parcel of land is one of the last raw spaces in what has become the expansive 85-acre Brooklyn Bridge Park, which stretches along 1.3 miles of the East River and sees 5 million visitors in summertime alone. The two-acre study area (“The Brooklyn Bridge Space” and “Space”) is bounded by the River Cafe to the west, St Ann’s Warehouse to the east, the East River to the north, and Water Street to the south.

MAP 1: SITE LOCATION
Because of the unique nature of the Space, its pivotal position linking Brooklyn Bridge Park’s piers and Fulton Ferry Landing to the southeast and the Empire State Park to the northeast, the constraints imposed on the area by its location under the bridge, and the considerable local interest in the future design and use of the area, BBPC and the Brooklyn Bridge Park Community Advisory Council (“CAC”) jointly contracted with professors and graduate students from Pratt Institute’s School of Architecture (“the Pratt team”) to conduct a community engagement process leading to this Vision Plan for the area.

View of the Brooklyn Bridge with the Purchase Building directly below the bridge and a part of the Empire Stores in the foreground, circa 1950. Source: Time Magazine
A working group consisting of the BBPC and select members of the CAC Design Committee (as appointed by the Council) assisted the Pratt team in conducting background research, and Pratt prepared an independent analysis of the site (presented in Section 3). BBPC and CAC also identified local community groups and people with an interest in the future of the area. The Pratt team carried out interviews with these stakeholders to obtain a spectrum of outlooks about the area from those most familiar with it. The team also conducted a community workshop, attended by approximately 80 participants, that included a walk-through of the area followed by breakout sessions at which participants were invited to discuss the alternatives for the area. A summary of the interviews and workshop can be found in Section 4. Key findings and recommendations are presented in Sections 5. The report ends, in Section 6, with thoughts about the governance of the space, mindful of how the Space can evolve over time.

The community engagement process revealed several key findings:

1. The Space is, notwithstanding its small size, highly complex in terms of its parts, access, and constraints. Its most notable and central feature - the plaza-like area under the Brooklyn Bridge - is a unique place in several respects. Because of the bridge tower and the canopy of the bridge approach road overhead, this part of the site has a unique “room-like” feel that exists nowhere else in the park. The site also has views of the Brooklyn Bridge, the world-famous New York City skyline, the East River and river activities.

2. Because of its location at the junction of the Furman Street end of the park and the Water Street side, as well as being the closest site to the ferry dock, the Space plays an important role in connecting the northern and southern parts of Brooklyn Bridge Park, and in pedestrian circulation.

3. The Space presents an opportunity to celebrate the history of the Brooklyn Bridge and its designers and builders - including Emily Roebling, whose efforts in the bridge’s construction have arguably been under-appreciated.

4. Brooklyn Bridge Park has become a regional destination, with more visitors than were anticipated before the park was developed. This has been the result of various factors including additional ferry service, an increase in residential development, the revival of Fulton Ferry Landing and DUMBO as a business and residential community, and the increasing popularity of Brooklyn as a tourist destination. The increase in visitors has put
pressure on local transportation and other local infrastructure.

The community engagement process revealed a consensus on the need to celebrate the uniqueness of the Space (“not just another part of the park”) and to celebrate its history.

However, the process also revealed an inherent conflict between the Space as a place of passive enjoyment (such as socializing and pedestrian circulation) on the one hand, and on the other hand as an opportunity to locate activities (such as ice-skating and the hip-hop festival) that do not take place in other parts of the park. The Pratt team’s recommendations are therefore designed to address this conflict by thinking of the Space, not as one place at one time, but as an aggregate of its “sub-places” that may have different activities during different seasons. It might, for example, be a quiet respite from the busier parts of the park during the peak summer months, but become more active in the winter. Similarly, while the Space may serve as a busy pedestrian route between the southern portion of the park (including Fulton Ferry Landing and the piers) and the northern portion (Empire Fulton Ferry, which includes Jane’s Carousel), some of the “sub-places” can serve as permanent refuge from the business of the park, while others allow for programmed activities. The design of the Space thus demands thoughtful solutions to its differentiated parts, and to recognize that changes over time - both short- and long-term - should not be precluded by permanent design features that limit possibilities for future change.

Finally, in the long-term, what happens in the Space should be informed by community input. To ensure this the current governance model must be reformed to allow more significant and representative participation by the local community, and a more meaningful mechanism for community opinion to be built in to the decision-making process of the park administration.
OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY THEME

HISTORY AND ART
History should be conveyed through both static and dynamic means.

GATEWAY / CIRCULATION
The Space will become an important gateway and pass-through because of its proximity to and visibility from the base of Fulton Street at Fulton Landing, the primary portal to the park.
• The Esplanade.
• The Ferry Link.
• Water Street Sidewalk.

A CIVIC SPACE
The Space should serve as the nexus and gathering place that clearly conveys a sense of welcome and inclusivity for a diversity of people.

FOOD AND DRINK
Food is the most assured way of indicating that a place is welcoming and inviting.

LANDSCAPING AND LAYOUT
It is important to visually and aesthetically connect both parts of the park, north and south of the bridge.

PASSIVE AND ACTIVE USES
A balance of passive and active uses are recommended for the Space, though with variation by season.

SEASONAL USES
The programming and activation of the site throughout the year should be responsive to the relative level of activity and to the types of users prevalent in other sections of Brooklyn Bridge Park.
• Summer.
• Fall and spring.
• Winter.

FLEXIBILITY
Because of the proposed seasonal transformation of the Space, the design and storage provided for the space should leave plenty of opportunity for a wide variety of programs and activities.
The Brooklyn Bridge under construction circa 1881. Source: 6sqft
The Brooklyn Bridge Space is located directly under the Brooklyn Bridge, within the Fulton Ferry Historic District (established in 1977), and is an area of exceptional historical interest.

This site was originally a crossing point for Native Americans. During the 17th Century, the Dutch - the first European colonizers - arrived and settled in the surrounding area. A ferry to Manhattan located here, owing to the site’s advantageous location between the cliffs of what is now Brooklyn Heights and the marshland of what is now the Brooklyn Navy Yard, at the foot of a slope, with Fulton Street as a principal route into the interior of Long Island. Fulton Landing, as it was called, flourished with numerous stables, taverns, inns, shops, and farmers’ markets. During the Revolution, the ferry played a crucial role in the evacuation of Washington’s army to Manhattan on the night of August 26, 1776, after its decisive defeat by British forces at the Battle of Brooklyn.

In the 18th century the study area did not actually exist - not even Water Street, but lay under the waters of the East River. Front Street toward the northeastern end of the area was the last street above the water line. The shoreline of today is the result of landfill operations between 1780 and 1850, which made way for expanded commerce, warehouses, and industry - much of it relating to the building and outfitting of ships: carpenters, a chandlery, smiths, coopers, a paint shop, and a cloth factory.

The map shows the Fulton Landing and its greater environs circa 1776, when the ferry was new; the ferry was advantageously situated between the cliffs of Brooklyn Heights and the Wallabout marshland. Source: Brooklyn Historical Society
The year 1814 saw the introduction of a steam-propelled ferry on the Fulton Ferry line to New York. The new ferries could carry several hundred passengers, as well as horses and wagons. The trip across the East River took about eight minutes and the boats were capable of forty crossings a day. By the 1830s, plans for the commercial and industrial development of this area had advanced to such a degree that Old Fulton and Water Streets were widened in the expectation of increased trade and traffic. The Brooklyn Eagle - Brooklyn’s foremost newspaper - had long occupied its own large building on Old Fulton Street. Walt Whitman was a frequent contributor to its pages and served as editor from 1846 to 1848. At its zenith, the ferry carried 50 million passengers a year.

After 14 years of construction, the Brooklyn Bridge bridge opened on May 14th, 1883. It was the largest suspension bridge built to date, the first of the city’s great river spans, and was hailed as the “eighth wonder of the world.” At least 20 workers died in connection with the bridge, ironically including its designer, John Roebling. His son Washington took charge as Chief Engineer, but also suffered injuries. It was Emily Roebling, Washington’s wife, who managed the work. As said by then Mayor Abram Hewitt at its inauguration, the bridge is “an everlasting monument to the sacrificing devotion of a woman and of her capacity for that higher education from which she has been too long disbarred.”

Immigration is central to the story of the bridge. John Roebling hailed from Germany, and the laborers from Ireland, Italy, and Germany. The bridge spurred the rapid growth of immigrant neighborhoods in Brooklyn - with both Irish and Italian neighborhoods taking root immediately nearby. The bridge was a gateway not just to Brooklyn but also to opportunity, and was instrumental in the city’s burgeoning diversity.

The Brooklyn Bridge under construction. The Fulton Ferry building is shown on the left. The site is at the foot of the tower, behind the (still largely extant) commercial buildings. Circa 1880. Source: Museum of the City of New York.
The Brooklyn Bridge also transformed the Fulton Ferry Landing. It supplanted the ferry, and Brooklyn’s new downtown emerged along the upper part of Old Fulton Street. Fulton Ferry’s commercial activity was obsolete. But shipping, warehousing, and industry continued to flourish. In 1869, the monumental Empire Stores were built. Now housing commercial uses, these warehouses were once used for general storage of such raw products as coffee, sugar, and molasses. A sugar refinery conveniently stood directly across the street. The great privately owned warehouses on Water Street were representative of the type that once lined the waterfront and earned Brooklyn the nickname “the walled city.”

Over time, shipping activity moved to larger sites more convenient to freight rail, and the waterfront area fell into neglect. Many industrial buildings became vacant. A number were demolished to make way for the Brooklyn Queens Expressway. The piers became derelict. The overall area was largely abandoned.

In the 1970’s a revival began when the adaptive reuse of two industrial buildings - the Brooklyn City Railroad Company and the Eagle Warehouse - brought new life to Fulton Ferry. Michael “Buzzy” O’Keeffe opened the River Cafe, and Olga Bloom founded Barge Music, straddling two sides of Fulton Ferry Landing. Many thought the idea of bringing a restaurant and classical music venue to a forgotten industrial area was crazy, but Buzzy and Olga prevailed, convincing the City to grant the needed approvals. The River Cafe and Barge Music are now Brooklyn institutions.

Views of the Empire Stores - actually warehouses, circa the first and second halves of the 20th century. A piece of the site is barely visible just to the left of the tower. Source: Brooklyn Bridge Historical Society (left) and 6sqft (right).
In the 1980s, in response to the decision of the Port Authority to sell the port facilities for housing, residents from Brooklyn Heights and other adjoining communities responded with proposals for a park. The BBP Coalition was started by then head of the Board of Governors of the Brooklyn Heights Association (BHA) in 1983-84 as part of this response. The political leadership of the borough, city, and state joined together to make the plan a reality, forming the Brooklyn Bridge Park Development Corporation (“BBPDC”). BBPDC commissioned the landscape design firm Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (“MVVA”) to prepare the plan. The Brooklyn Bridge Park Community Advisory Council (“CAC”) was created to provide the primary forum through which the community could provide feedback and comments to BBPDC on its major initiatives and policies.

Construction of the park began in 2008. Brooklyn Bridge Park runs 1.3 miles, from Jay Street north of the Manhattan Bridge, to Pier 6 and Atlantic Avenue in the south, boasting magnificent views of the East River, New York Harbor, Manhattan, and the Brooklyn and Manhattan Bridges. Piers 1 through 6 have since been remade into park spaces for visitors to enjoy active and passive uses. The park also includes Empire Fulton

*The River Cafe with the bridge behind it. Source: The River Cafe*
Ferry, John Street, and Main Street, as well as the Civil War-era Empire Stores and the Tobacco Warehouse. Elements of the park plan and its implementation have proved controversial. The financing model required development of commercial and residential buildings to provide cross-subsidies. The park has become a citywide and tourist destination, in contrast to the original vision of many local residents. Advocacy, planning, and construction of the park has been accompanied by a radical gentrification of the adjoining Fulton Ferry / DUMBO / Vinegar Hill neighborhoods, from industry, artist lofts, and working class residences to luxury commercial and residential uses.

This varied history provides the context for the planning of the last part of the park to be designed and
programmed - the area beneath the iconic Brooklyn Bridge. But some things abide. The bridge has been celebrated in photography, song, postcards, and painting - famously by Italian immigrant Joseph Stella. As Hart Crane wrote in a letter to his mother, anticipating in 1924 his famous ode to the Bridge:

*Just imagine looking out your window directly on the East River with nothing intervening between your view of the Statue of Liberty, way down the harbor, and the marvelous beauty of Brooklyn Bridge close above you on our right! All of the great new skyscrapers of lower Manhattan are marshaled directly across from you, and there is a constant stream of tugs, liners, sail boats etc [sic] in procession before you on the river! It’s really a magnificent place to live.*

The same might be said of being in Brooklyn Bridge Park and on the site, today.

*Joseph Stella, The Brooklyn Bridge, 1922. Other famous artworks of the bridge include major works by Berenice Abbott, Marsden Hartley, John Marin, Georgia O’Keefe, Edward Steichen, and Arthur Stieglitz. Source: Pinterest*
SITE CONDITIONS
The site is immediately bounded by the tower of the Brooklyn Bridge and the East River to the north, the River Café and Pier 1 to the west, Water Street to the south, and St Ann’s Warehouse to the east. Photo: Google Earth
The Brooklyn Bridge Space is located directly under the Brooklyn Bridge, within the Fulton Ferry Historic District (established in 1977), and is an area of exceptional historical interest.

The proximity to water presents an opportunity for the site. Climate change will lead to increasing temperatures across the city, making breezy waterfront parks all the more important for vulnerable populations lacking air conditioning at home or at work. In terms of sunlight, the bridge provides additional protection and shade during the hot summer months, and lets light into the space in the winter when the sun is lower in the sky. This will, however, limit the types of plantings that can be included below the bridge.

The site is immediately bounded by the tower of the Brooklyn Bridge and the East River to the north, the River Café and Pier 1 to the west, Water Street to the south, and St Ann’s Warehouse to the east. While this small area “reads” as one space, there are multiple parts to the Space. There is the area directly under the bridge and responding to its geometry (called by some the Brooklyn Bridge Plaza); the Water Street frontage (which may or may not be considered part of the Space); the tiny area to the immediate east of the tower and overlooking the water; the portion of the esplanade behind the tower, which is accessible from the prior space on the east and a “hidden” (now blocked) gate in front of the River Cafe; and there is the elevated garden adjoining the River Cafe, and to its immediate south, the area currently occupied by Luke’s Lobster. (Refer to Map 8 in Section 5.)

Access into and through the Space seems easier than it is. The area in front of the River Cafe is privatized in actuality (by a dozen parking spaces, a service building with kitchen, and fencing) or in image (the raised, front garden). Luke’s Lobster hut and outdoor seating create an obstacle at the resulting bottleneck. Further, there is a water storage tank under the adjacent hill to the east (officially called Empire Fulton Ferry Lawn), making it impractical to reduce or segment the hill, though the lawn could be extended into the study area if desired. Access from Water Street is just the opposite: it is so wide open as to dissipate the sense of place.
These are the edges of the site; within the site, there are natural routes that people would prefer, as illustrated on the following page in Map 4: Desire Lines Through Site.

Like most of Brooklyn Bridge Park, the site is at risk to significant flooding from storms, which will worsen in the future. During Hurricane Sandy, for instance, major flooding occurred in the area. It was reported that the River Cafe was flooded by 4 feet of water.

Though under two acres in size, the Space’s jurisdictional situation is highly complex. The New York City Department of Transportation (NYC DOT) requires access to the tower and under the bridge for repairs. Reportedly,
NYC DOT is considering a study of the dangers of falling objects and debris from the bridge approach to the space below, requiring further access and some sort of protection under the bridge’s span (as presently the case at the Manhattan Bridge). As well, St. Ann’s Warehouse requires access for its back-of-the-house operations (set deliveries, etc.) along New Dock Street.

The River Cafe also needs access to its kitchen, presently via a hard-to-see roadway in addition to that used to drop off patrons at its front door (where valet parking attendants are available). The River Cafe also occupies its space with separate leases from the NYC Department of Citywide Administrative Services and the NYC Department of Parks and Recreation. Meanwhile, the
NYC DOT has fenced off the perimeter of the tower, and requires obstructions (hills, bollards, etc.) to forestall unsupervised vehicular access to the site. Thus, multiple and sometimes contradictory jurisdictional needs must be satisfied to arrive at a cohesive plan.

What the Space lacks in size, it makes up for in grandeur. Its setting directly under the Brooklyn Bridge and inclusive of its tower brings a monumental sense to the site. The vistas are extraordinary. The bridge towers overhead, and views out towards Manhattan are framed by the bridge’s spectacular display of engineering and design. It is important to consider these vistas in the design of the space. Further, the bridge communicates the
history of the Space and continues to be an iconic landmark for New York City. Both the tower and the bridge amplify the importance of whatever happens to occur in front of and underneath them - whether it be a meeting place, an arrival point, a market, or a gateway. While there are constraints that have been identified here, there are many more opportunities to be built upon, given the impressive nature of the space.
MAP 6: CONSTRAINTS MAP

The map illustrates in red areas that limit the use of the Space.
The space under the Brooklyn Bridge provides a phenomenal perspective of both the Bridge and the East River. The proximity to the Bridge footing provides a monumental scope of the Bridge, while its location on the East River offering sweeping views as far down as the Statue of Liberty up to Midtown Manhattan. At this point, however, these treasures are still off limits as NYC DOT needs to take down the fencing which surrounds the space and to empty the area of miscellaneous equipment leftover from installing security measures around the bridge foot.
A community workshop was held on the evening of May 16th, 2018 at the Dock Street School. Photo: Pratt Institute
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

METHODOLOGY

This is the last, raw space in Brooklyn Bridge Park, which is also historically and architecturally the most significant site in the park. (The park is, after all, named for the bridge that looms above - not for the ferry, the waterfront, the port, etc.) On the part of the variety of stakeholders, constituents and constituencies that make up the community: all of their expectations that have yet to be fully realized or can be expanded upon are loaded on this small site, representing only 2 percent of the park. Adding to the intensity, residential constituencies bring to bear a history in which they feel promises and representations have not been honored; while others feel that whatever has happened in the past should not prejudice what should be done in the future; and so on. Further, it needs to be recognized that the park’s neighbors bear the burden of noise and congestion of activities in the park, and would prefer less to more; local businesses benefit from the park as a destination, and would prefer more rather than less; the administration is managing a regional park that, by mandate, must be economically self-sufficient; local elected leaders respond to a variety of constituents and policy concerns; Homeland Security, the New York City (NYC) Department of Transportation, the River Cafe restaurant, the St. Ann’s Warehouse theater, the Historic Districts Council, etc. are, as they should, single-minded in their eponymous goals; and so on.

Mindful of the multifaceted definition of “community,” and how different constituencies best make their perspectives known, the outreach was comprised of four overlapping components.

First, the Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation (“BBPC”) and the Design Committee of the Brooklyn Bridge Community Advisory Council (“CAC”), as well Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (“MVVA”) provided background and data on the site in an iterative process. Of course, the outlook of the park’s administrators, the community watchdog group, and the park’s designers were insinuated in these discussions.

Approximately 41 different individuals or entities within the surrounding communities of the site were identified as stakeholders that should be
interviewed. While most of these stakeholder were initially identified by BBPC and the CAC, others were added throughout the process in an attempt to create a holistic list of people that could broadly reflect opinions of the area (see Appendix 1). After contacting each stakeholder, 25 unique interviews were held on a confidential basis. Interviewing people and groups that represent residents, local businesses, arts entities, and others in the area helped give a deeper meaning to how people consider and use the park, as well as an understanding of what it means to live and work in proximity to such a world-renowned destination.

Third, the interviews and research (reported on in Section 4) culminated in a community engagement workshop. Approximately 80 residents and

At the Community Engagement Workshop, participants were randomly placed into groups of about 10 people each. The groups were then taken through a “Place Game” that asked different questions of the site. Each group was also assigned a season, or time of day, as a lens through which to look at the possibilities of the site. Third, the interviews and research (reported on in Section 3) culminated in a community engagement workshop. Approximately 80 residents and business owners came together to brainstorm ideas for the site; the vast majority appeared to be residents from the immediate neighborhoods. Photo; Pratt Institute
business owners came together to brainstorm ideas for the site; the vast majority appeared to be residents from the immediate neighborhoods of Brooklyn Heights, DUMBO, Fulton Ferry Landing, and Vinegar Hill. The workshop included an introduction to the site, its history, and how comparable spaces have been used, culminating in a walk-through of the area employing an evaluation sheet to stimulate thinking about the Brooklyn Bridge Space from an experiential perspective.

These were followed by ten break-out sessions, in which participants were invited to discuss the alternatives for the Space. People were distributed randomly to groups that focused on different aspects of how the Space might be programmed - by season, by night or day, etc. Similar questions were posed. (The lists of questions posed for the site visit and the break-out sessions are provided in Appendix 2.)

All of the ideas and observations were recorded on large sheets of paper. (A sample is provided here.) Subsequently, the break-out session participants were invited to put five “sticky dots” on the ideas generated in their session that were most important to them, which someone from the group would use to publicly summarize his or her group’s priorities to all of the attendees. Most of the group presenters had a chance to do so; the several who did not do so (for reasons of time) submitted their summaries to the Pratt team. In addition, people were given the opportunity to add another five dots to any of the ideas generated by the ten groups. There was no limit on the number of dots that could go on any one idea or thought. The results are presented in Appendix 4.
Meanwhile, the Pratt team frequently discussed the research and outreach with the CAC Design Committee; made multiple presentations of work-in-progress to the CAC; and consulted several times with BBPC and MVVA, each. The research and outreach findings were presented to a joint meeting of representatives of the CAC Design Committee and BBPC; and then the recommendations were presented to a joint meeting of the CAC with BBPC staff in attendance. The CAC Design Committee also submitted written comments on these presentations. In essence, this iterative interaction comprised the fourth component of the outreach, allowing those who have had the most long-standing and intense relationship with the park and its planning to provide frequent, interactive, and highly detailed input.

Also, all methodologies are subject to limitations of time, budget, and good will. We wish we could have done even more. The workshop accidentally ended abruptly, not allowing the last few break-out presenters to speak, nor the Pratt team to summarize what it heard. One CAC member
pointed out that an actual survey of residents would provide clear cut statistical results - though it would not have allowed for the interaction and exploration afforded by interviews and the workshop. The CAC Design Committee officially alleged that the roughly eight businesspeople attending the workshop (according to the entry sign-in sheets) were rallied to be vocal (e.g., only “vote” for) the ice-skating rink. However, the methodology allows for this as it means that constituents are invited to indicate what is important above all else to them. (Remember: the sticky dots are not the equivalent of votes, but representations of emphasis and preferences.)

It is important to note that there was highly unusual controversy with any observations (even implications) that ran contrary to a preferred position on one or another party’s part. Some of these were accommodated, for instance the use of Brooklyn Bridge Space instead of Brooklyn Bridge Plaza (emphasis added) because the latter - while the official name of the space - might imply a hardscape that invites events. We regret that we did not incorporate mediation into the methodology, since a good amount of the disagreements were because of fundamental differences of goals and interests, rather than the best program and design with which to realize shared goals.

The team’s greatest methodological regret was that there was not the foresight to reach out to the low-income, largely minority residents of the public housing at the far end of Vinegar Hill from the park; nor to assure that parents of the nearby Public Middle School 313 | Dock Street School (where the workshop was held) were as informed of the workshop as apparently local residents and businesspeople were. It should be noted that there was limited racial diversity and diversity of age at the workshop.

Yet, the methodology - through its research informed by the expertise of the administrators, resident advocates, and the park’s designers; interviews with an inclusive list of stakeholders; a well-attended participatory workshop; and an iterative process of feedback - is fully consistent with the outlook of the Pratt team that planning is done with communities, not for them, let alone “to” them.
PRATT TEAM FINDINGS

What then is the result of this multifaceted approach to “community” and “engagement?” No clear consensus emerged, but it is possible to discern dominant and lesser themes. These are summarized below.

As well, a list of preferences is provided below based on specific references in the interviews and workshops. These are ranked mindful of (1) how many times an idea or observation was raised in both interviews and the workshop, (2) how much importance interviewees placed on an observation or idea, and (3) in the workshop, how many “sticky dots” were associated with that idea or observation. The ranking is not scientific; these are meant to inform, nor dictate the recommendations. They portray the range of thoughts, and their relative weight, inclusive of the entire community, without empowering any one constituency in the community above the others. They inform, rather than dictate, the recommendations that follow in the next chapter.

It should be emphasized that the outreach focused on activities rather than design, on the basis that form should follow function, and that it was not within the mandate of this study to produce designs, but rather to provide guidelines for MVVA who would be the designers. The interviews and workshop were therefore steered to talk about activities - active, such as participating in events and ice skating; as well as passive, such as socializing and strolling. Design principles (not solutions) were only discussed to the extent that they illustrated or logically followed from the preferred activities.

The Pratt Team did not expect concurrence. Indeed, if there were consensus from the start, or if it were easy, there would have been no need for the delay, added effort, and inevitable controversy associated with the recommendations of this study. The Pratt Team did hope, however, that by employing a variety of outreach approaches, it might hear from the full variety of constituencies that together constitute “the community,” without delegitimizing any for any reason. It was further hoped, as discussed in the next section, that there would be a way to meld the compatible and best ideas put forward by the various interests and perspectives brought to the fore in the outreach, mindful of the preference ranking and principles presented here.
## PREFERENCE RANKINGS:

### Activities & Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Installations and Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Un-programmed, spontaneous, less is more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice skating in winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and educational events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food vendors, picnics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice sculptures, winter art, hot chocolate, winter events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food drives, social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local business / BID events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small concerts, low-impact music events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family programming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Physical Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Views, No Permanent Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting of the bridge and anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty gardens (e.g., rose, community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History wall, separation from sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape, also historic materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping / green</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seating: Unique and Changing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bathrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety features (e.g., lighting, emergency kiosk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benches, benches that face each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic tables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONNECTIVITY

MEETING PLACE, CIVIC, GATEWAY, CROSSROADS
Sightlines to and from the site, water views
Connects the north/south parks

CONCEPTS

HISTORY, ESPECIALLY EMILY ROEBLING
Not a destination ("passive")
Iconic site
Inclusive, mix of uses, welcoming, "smiling"
Supports local businesses
Mindful of impact on neighbors
Predictability of outcomes, governance

PRINCIPLES:

The Pratt team, with input from the Clients, distilled the findings from the interviews and workshop into a set of principles for the project:

• Honor the bridge and its history—its magnificent design, innovation, builders (including those who died), and all Roeblings (especially Emily).
• Assure that the Brooklyn Bridge Space is welcoming to all: families and singles, seniors and students, rich and poor, nearby residents and tourists. Any food, goods, etc. served here should be affordable and culturally diverse.
• Maintain and enhance the Space as a connector between the north and south parts of the park, and as a gateway into the park. Also, enhance the space as a gateway to the park, with information and amenities for visitors. Movement through the site should be easy, efficient, and safe. Uses in the space should not obstruct these purposes.
• Provide both active and passive uses. Mindful of nuisance impacts on the adjoining residential neighborhood(s), large events should be the exception, not the rule. Instead, the opportunity for spontaneous and small events, socializing, strolling, learning about the bridge, and other passive activities should be emphasized in programming and design.
• Pursue programming that changes with the seasons, and can also change over time. Make sure that the Space is open and the design flexible, with no permanent structures in the space (except perhaps restrooms and a small cafe). Feature art in programming and design. Yet assure that it “reads” park, i.e., has significant landscaped features.
RECOMMENDATIONS
The entrance to Brooklyn Bridge Park at the base of Fulton Street. Photo: Pratt Institute
Using the professional planning and urban design skills of the Pratt Institute Design Team, the recommendations presented here meld the epic achievement and architecture of the Brooklyn Bridge (detailed in Section 2), the research revealing the genius of the place as well as its specific opportunities and constraints (summarized in Section 3), and the rankings and principles that were derived from the community outreach, to the extent that they can be reconciled (presented in Section 4). The intent is to arrive at a plan that balances “active” and “passive” activities, and is inclusive of both, within the carrying capacity of the Brooklyn Bridge Space (“Space”). This approach is counter to what has been thought by many to be either a wholly passive space “greened” to preclude events, and a full event space of undifferentiated hardscape. We intend something that is better than, not just a compromise between, those two reductive schemes.

The Pratt Team further hopes that by presenting its own recommendations for the Space, it might point out a way to resolve differences between the interests of constituencies. While the study was commissioned by the Brooklyn Bridge Park Community Advisory Council and Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation (the “CAC” and “BBPC,” respectively), and both were engaged, the Pratt Team’s recommendations are those of the team only, not the study sponsors, however much we hope that they will concur on its “big ideas” as well as many of its details. Any critique of the team’s recommendations is therefore welcome, but we urge that it be done in a collegial way that does not preclude a conversation within the greater community, not limited to the CAC and residents, reflecting the good will of both the CAC and BBPC to actively listen and respond in a spirit of accommodation. (This last point speaks to governance, which is addressed in the next and last section of this report).

The Space and its opportunities are complex, and so too is our plan, notwithstanding the small size of the site. The plan is explained in two parts below: first, by theme (e.g., historicity, connections), then by programming sub-area (i.e., the area along the waterfront, the area along Water Street, etc.).
The team is presenting a long-term vision and, in light of the planning principle that a site like this cannot be properly evaluated and planned for in isolation, some recommendations involve adjoining areas that may otherwise be considered out of the scope of this work (Water Street, Luke’s Lobster, the River Cafe, and the garden adjoining the River Cafe) and involve further planning and negotiation with directly interested parties, and may have to await future changes. Part of the site is also under the jurisdiction of the Landmark Preservation Commission as it sits within the Fulton Ferry Historic District.

Necessary repairs to the Brooklyn Bridge span overhead may delay major capital improvements, allowing more time to work out these longer term recommendations. Most importantly, the Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation (“BBPC”) has steered the park through decades of major improvements, development, and controversy - with a long-term vision that has led to the development of the Space - one of the few areas left to be incorporated into the Park. The same ambition might be set for the last raw space in the park, especially given its singular importance as a connector, a gateway, a meeting place, and the location of the iconic bridge that has given the park its name.
THEMES

HISTORY AND ART

The history of the Brooklyn Bridge and this part of Brooklyn should be celebrated at the Space. History should be conveyed through both static and dynamic means. Special consideration should also be given to Emily Roebling, who supervised the bridge construction during the incapacitation of her husband - perhaps by naming the entire Space for her.

Permanent interpretive displays can describe both the evolution of the site and depict the great events that happened there, while interactive programming and art, such as a temporary light show display on the tower (facing Brooklyn and/or Manhattan) can make the history more accessible.
come alive for visitors. The Brooklyn Historical Society is a logical entity to partner with for this effort, ensuring a high curatorial standard, and building on their presence in the Empire Stores.

Art has a role to play here. The waterfront setting, easy access, unobstructed views, and sheer drama of the tower and bridge span above invite equally dramatic art installations. The art may often respond to the site’s history - whether through the invitation to or inspiration of the artist. One resident, for instance, has already designed and proposed a statue commemorating Emily Roebling. A number of residents proposed using artistic lighting to help people reimagine the bridge and its history, much as a cathedral was used as the backdrop for a video-art projection depicting the history of San Antonio or as Olaf Eliasson’s New York City Waterfall drew attention to the bridge.

Art installations should be designed to serve the space respectful of the inherent beauty of the site and its magnificent setting, rather than thinking of the space as serving the art (as with Socrates Sculpture Park in Queens, for instance). The beauty of the spot makes it unnecessary to create a new identity through art. Although permanent art installations that are unobtrusive and enhance the experience of the site and its views may be considered, the majority of art installations should be temporary, considered a form of event, and should be subject to the same criteria as to size and timing indicated below for active, passive, and seasonal uses.
**GATEWAY / CIRCULATION**

Once this area directly under the bridge reopens, it will surely become an important gateway and pass-through because of its proximity to and visibility from the base of Fulton Street at Fulton Landing, the primary portal to the park. As an “elbow” in the park, the site is also an important passage point between the two primary districts of the park on either side of the bridge, making circulation through the space one of its predominant features. It is a crossroads, where many paths come together.

As such, the team proposes three primary walkways to and through the site to accommodate visitors who are

---

**MAP 7: PROPOSED CIRCULATION**

Three main connections across the site are proposed: the Esplanade, the Ferry Link, and the Water Street Sidewalk.
just passing through as well as those spending an extended period of time in this awe-inspiring place. These routes should not generally be obstructed by events, certainly not in summer. In addition, while crime is apparently not an issue now, lighting should be considered with safety in mind.

The three recommended routes are as follows:

**The Esplanade.** One path, along the waterfront, should link the existing esplanades coming from the north and the south, and provide stopping points for viewing the water, the skyline, and the bridge and its dramatic tower, particularly at the area north of the tower that has been off-limits for years. This esplanade could include clear wayfinding signage and interpretive exhibits detailing and highlighting the history of the bridge and the immediate environs. This pathway should be developed in partnership with the River Cafe as it would pass in front of the restaurant and its parking lot, and share the space with vehicles entering the site.

**The Ferry Link.** In order to accommodate the growing number of park visitors and commuters who will be arriving at the Fulton Ferry Landing and those entering at the base of Fulton Street, a more direct walkway through the site should be provided to allow for direct access to the Brooklyn Bridge space and to key destinations that front the park.

**Water Street Sidewalk.** The sidewalk along Water Street will continue to provide access into the DUMBO neighborhood. However, while it is now the only path that joins the two portions of the park, it will now share the pedestrian traffic with the Esplanade and the Ferry Link.

**A CIVIC SPACE**

Given the primacy and accessibility of the Space, it should serve as the nexus and gathering place that clearly conveys a sense of welcome and inclusivity for a diversity of people, acknowledging and celebrating the wide cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity of New York City and

*Photo: Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation*
Brooklyn. Waterfronts are always great equalizers as everyone is drawn to the natural beauty of rivers and oceans, while this site also benefits from the awe-inspiring views of the bridge and the skyline. Thus, the programming, activities and amenities should feel inviting and affordable to all. The team also recommends that in the future, when the community is engaged regarding programming or other decisions for the park, communities of color and the low income community be intentionally included. (This is also addressed in Section 6.)

**FOOD AND DRINK**

Nothing creates a sense of civic value more than food. It is the most assured way of indicating that a place is welcoming and inviting. The team recommends that several small mobile food vendors be allowed on the site, much as Ample Hills has had an ice cream stand in the Piers part of the park. Given its role as a gateway, and akin to what exists at the other park gateways at Atlantic Avenue and Fulton Street, a small cafe with outdoor tables is suggested. The cafe should provide affordably priced items, accept cash and only serve as an eatery - in contrast to, for instance, some of the eateries in the Empire Stores that are mainly accommodating a relatively affluent clientele. So that it can serve as a place to get refreshments in winter, the cafe’s outdoor seating area should allow for some sort of shelter, portable heat, and/or screen against the wind.

As emphasized throughout, the Space should first and foremost be about history, the bridge, connectivity, and socializing - a complete civic space without eateries dominating the space. There is a point where food becomes the event not an amenity. As such, food vending, food festivals, etc. should be subject to the same criteria as for all other events, discussed below.
LANDSCAPING AND LAYOUT

Connectivity is a key lens through which to consider the site. It is not only important for pedestrians and bicyclists to “flow” through the site, it is also important to visually and aesthetically connect both parts of the park, north and south of the bridge. Landscaping can be a key feature in making the site feel like it is part and parcel of the park elements, especially to the east.

So are views. The Space needs to have a visual reference that makes people aware of it as a gateway and arrival point. Certainly, it is essential that views up to the span of the bridge, out to the waterfront, over to the tower, across to the hill(s) on either side of the Space be open and unobstructed to the maximum extent practicable. The team fully realizes that this may foreclose otherwise desired permanent structures arguing instead for temporary structures only and the siting of those temporary structures in the most sensitive way possible (e.g. along Water Street).

PASSIVE AND ACTIVE USES

The team recommends a balance of passive and active uses on the site, though with variation by season (as discussed next, below).

“Passive” and “active” are vague terms. Here, passive is meant to confer organically arrived at activities, such as socializing, strolling, and even spontaneous performances by street musicians, outdoor dining or picnicking, a book club meeting, a school class visit, a walking tour - but nothing that rises to the occasion of requiring park permission or a permit. Active refers to organized activities and events that attract large groups or crowds, especially those that require cordonning off or dominating a part of the Space. Whereas passive is definitionally small-scale, active uses can range from a children’s art show to a school picnic to a sports event to an outdoor concert.

Passive uses of the Space provide an important respite from the busy neighborhoods and park areas nearby, particularly for the residents of the area, and should be emphasized in the...
warm months as a perceived escape from the city, as well as provided at colder times of year when park visitation is more localized. Given the prominence of the bridge tower and the stunning Manhattan skyline vistas, the space should give seated guests the opportunity to passively watch the world go by, with its beautiful sunsets and passage of the panoply of people sharing the park in their strolls. Seating areas can also encourage conversation and socializing, e.g., with benches facing each other as well as with moveable tables and chairs.

On the other hand, the magnificent space with its dramatic backdrop of the tower, skyline, and river offers an incomparable place for activities and events. Even on a smaller scale, performance events, markets, and festivals would be elevated by the sheer grandeur of the setting. Events should be encouraged on the site as long as they are respectful of the surrounding communities and meet performance standards in terms of noise levels, safety and crowd capacity.

Both passive and active uses could happen simultaneously on the site, but in different locations. The facilities can accommodate both - as would a piazza or a large lawn. For the Space to be welcoming, it is important to offer “something for everyone,” as mentioned by a participant at the workshop - in all of the Space’s areas, and throughout the year.

SEASONAL USES

The programming and activation of the site throughout the year should be responsive to the relative level of activity and to the types of users prevalent in other sections of Brooklyn Bridge Park. Mindful of noise, congestion, and other impacts on the
park’s neighbors, the BBPC is urged to adopt standards for impacts that would differ by season, day of week, and time of day (also see Section 6).

Focusing on the seasons throughout the year:

**Summer.** In the heat of the summer, when the park is crowded with visitors from around the region and world, the Space should be used primarily as a welcoming place, with areas for tourists to gather, friends and family to meet, and visitors to pause to reorient themselves under the huge landmark. Food and drink, information, restrooms, seating, shade, and wayfinding would be particularly important at this time of year. As mentioned earlier, a significant number of people will also pass through the space. They should experience this as a stroll with invitations to linger, and not an obstacle course.

It is the recommendation of the team that the highly popular, summertime Brooklyn Hip Hop Festival - with reportedly 5,000 to 10,000 patrons - be located elsewhere in the park where it would be less of a nuisance for neighbors, and/or take place in the fall and spring when it would not impinge on circulation. That said, it is not only highly popular, per se, it attracts a broad spectrum of people, many of whom identify as Black and Latino, who would not otherwise frequent the park. If neither the relocation nor retiming of this event can take place, the recommendation is that the Hip Hop Festival continue under the present arrangement. But it should be the only exception to thinking of the space as “passive” in the summer - here defined as the time period from when public school lets out and resumes - mainly because to cancel the event would do a disservice to its patrons and would reflect badly on the intention of this Vision Plan to speak to inclusiveness.

**Fall and spring.** In the fall and spring, tourism falls off slightly, and more active events and activities would be manageable. These could include small concerts, festivals and theater performances. There may be occasion for large events, but the
team suggests no more than one or two per season - ideally including the Brooklyn Hip Hop Festival as one.

The same approach should be used for markets, i.e., the site is not recommended as a new, ongoing location for large-scale, full-day, weekly markets along the lines of Smorgasburg or Brooklyn Flea. It might, however, be suitable for an appropriately scaled Greenmarket Farmers Market or a one-day or one-weekend art or book fair during these seasons. The span of the bridge looms above, providing a sense of enclosure, and the angle of the sun allows it to be warmer during this time of year.

The same logic applied to the Hip Hop Festival could apply to Photoville, which likewise is a big event use. Photoville might do as well or even better at Pier 3, which offers interesting curatorial and layout opportunities, and where it would also boost Atlantic Avenue businesses; DUMBO already has an intense art scene and a flourishing retail sector as evident in its very high rents. Photoville is, however, already in the fall season (as defined here; albeit the busiest time of the fall); and like the Hip Hop Festival, has a highly demographically diverse following.

Fall and spring programming should comply with approval criteria developed with input from the community. This criteria could be adjusted as BBPC learns from and responds to cases where such events pose a nuisance for neighbors and/or impinge on the role of the Space as a connector. Active uses should remain in check - i.e., the Space should not be viewed as a stage with the self-fulfilling prophecy of maximizing its utility as such. The priority should remain with the Space’s function as a place for circulation, connectivity, and socializing, further mindful of its historic and architectural significance.

**Winter.** In winter, when the rest of the park is relatively quiet, this area, due to its accessible location on the edge of the park and under the bridge, could be programmed with wintertime activities that draw mainly a local audience, becoming the town square of the park (much as Fulton Landing is in summer) and DUMBO. This season is when the Space will appropriately
be called into service as both a local and regional destination, if practical and popular, including, but not limited to, a temporary ice skating rink along with other ancillary wintertime uses.

It should be noted that the team foresees an ice skating rink somewhat smaller than that illustrated on the Brooklyn Bridge Park website. Such a large facility, together with its support services and structures, would take over the Space to the detriment of both circulation and the multifaceted nature of (and opportunities presented by) its sub-areas. Moreover, though it might serve a destination, the entire Space should not be programmed with high intensity uses and activities during the winter months. The Space should feature areas where local residents can enjoy quiet escapes.

**FLEXIBILITY**

Because of the proposed seasonal transformation of the Space, the design and storage provided for the space should leave plenty of opportunity for a wide variety of programs and activities. As needs change and tastes evolve in the future, new types of activities should be able to be accommodated as well. Thus, dynamic furnishing and

*Bryant Park summer film in flexible space, Photo: Flikr/André Natta*
landscape features, such as movable seating, planters, vending carts, and temporary art, could be easily moved and stored to make room for pop-up markets and an ice skating rink. In general, all uses should be viewed in some way as provisional - allowing for adjustments based on their positive impact in terms of visitation, diversity, and finance; and their negative impact on the community as well as for honoring the principles indicated in the prior chapter.
RECOMMENDATIONS BY PROGRAMMING AREA

The Brooklyn Bridge Space appears open, but can actually be seen (in conjunction with the spaces that it abuts and blends into) as the composite of eight programming areas, seven of which encircle the large central space directly below the span of the bridge, with the tower as its backdrop. It should be noted that these areas are used in this report as planning tools that help categorize uses that correspond to the physical context and unique character of each area. While each programming area presents its own set of opportunities and intrinsic value, they all should be programmed and designed to be mindful of each

MAP 8: PROGRAMMING AREAS

The diagram above indicates areas for programming purposes only (not intended for design or demarcation purposes). Please note that the nomenclature of these areas is intended only as a planning device.
other. Their specific design must respond to the set of constraints laid out in Section 3, including the need of St. Ann’s for servicing its theater, that of the NYC Department of Transportation for access to the tower, and the need to protect the tower from acts of terrorism. Further, consistent with the principles laid out in Section 4, in no way should such programming and design impede the open views out to the water, above to the bridge span or across to the tower.

Recommendations are organized below by these programming areas.

It should be emphasized that all of the details in these recommendations may be viewed as preliminary, and do not forestall further creativity on the part of the participants in this Vision Plan process or others after the completion of this planning effort.

The Flex Space. This central area is the heart of the Brooklyn Bridge Space, appropriate for both passive and active uses that change throughout the year. Its size, location and openness provide the opportunity for a wide variety of seasonal, temporary uses and activities.

In the summer, when temperatures and the sun are both high, the Flex Space can provide a sheltered, shady spot for visitors and groups to gather, sit, picnic, and learn about the history of the bridge and its
makers. Spontaneous activities would draw passersby, without attracting crowds. As noted, larger events should be included only upon the careful application of criteria that limit negative impacts on the nearby residents and businesses, with the possible exception of the Brooklyn Hip Hop Festival.

In spring and fall, a variety of moderately scaled markets - farmers, prepared foods, arts and crafts, or flowers - could be held. Weekends could be programmed with specific target audiences in minds - families, visitors, international tourists - while weekdays could be quieter with small scale vending and games. As described below, a handful of larger events, such as concerts, festivals, and exhibits, may also take place in the “shoulder seasons,” when the crowds of tourists diminish. The Flex Space can be active throughout the winter, supporting, for example, with an ice skating rink, fire pits or and ice sculptures.

The Flex Space could then become a cultural showcase featuring the artistic diversity of New York City and its rich cultural heritage. Overall, a variety of uses, representing the rich diversity of New York City, could be central to the programming of the Flex Space, much as the bridge itself was central to the opening up of Brooklyn to waves of immigrants.

The Front Porch. The Front Porch programming area is the busy nexus of the Space, where many paths and people converge. The Front Porch can serve as a kind of “relief valve” for the main entrance to the park at the base of Fulton Street, providing services and amenities for park users that do not fit into the Ferry Landing area: food, seating, a meeting place,
and possibly bathrooms (a technical and needs analysis would be needed to make this determination). The Front Porch would be the welcome center, providing reasons for people of all ages and backgrounds to linger and feel comfortable.

In summer, fall, and spring, the Front Porch could be the location of a small, temporary food vendors and/or an affordably priced cafe. In the winter, the Front Porch could provide the ancillary commercial amenities for an ice rink and other cold weather activities: hot chocolate, a warming hut or tent, skate rentals, a fire pit, and, during the holidays, a small pop-up market. This “comfort zone” would bring a cozy and warm ambiance to the Space. Because Homeland Security requires secure means to protect the Space and the bridge’s tower from the intrusion of ill-intentioned vehicles from Water Street, the perimeter of this programming area should be minimally separated from the sidewalk by bollards or sturdy, intermittent planters and/or benches that can restrict access and provide a sense of enclosure while ensuring clear visibility. These elements should complement the character of the Space and enhance its open and welcoming quality, without obstructing views (as might landscape mounds).

The Hill. The existing grass mound to the immediate east, adjacent to the Empire Fulton Ferry Lawn,
should remain as a passive place for picnicking, admiring the views, and providing an admission-free overflow seating area for concerts and performances taking place in the Flex Space. While there is potential for it to be expanded, this may result in the reduction of the adjacent flex space.

Waterfront Garden. The area east of the tower offers an ideal area for passive seating designed for viewing the Manhattan skyline and the Brooklyn Bridge. The seating could also accommodate outdoor classes and tours - given its up-close proximity to the tower and view both into Brooklyn and across the East River to Manhattan. Landscaping here might feature native plants and flowers, creating an attraction for butterflies and birds, and complementing by contrast the industrial power (and story) of the bridge itself.

The Back Porch. The waterfront esplanade should extend behind the Brooklyn Bridge tower, offering an exceptional spot for viewing the bridge and the skyline at the base of the historic structure. Seating for viewing and people watching would help create a safe stopping area.
along the promenade. This might involve a changing array of seats and amenities, so that people “in-the-know” come to this spot, enhancing its sense of arrival and its safety. This might include temporary swings, artistically conceived seating (as done at Battery Park), a piano, recycled seats from a theater or auditorium, picnic tables, and even bleachers (if there is an event in the water, such as a decathlon or boat race or fireworks) - on a temporary basis.

**The Gateway.** The Gateway area is highly visible from the base of Fulton Street, drawing visitors from the Fulton Ferry Landing and connecting the two major parts of Brooklyn Bridge Park. The small historic brick structure at the southern entrance to the Gateway, once the “smokestack building,” houses Luke’s Lobster, a popular take-out eatery. Since it is outfitted with a kitchen, continuing to use it for food makes sense, but ensuring a variety of affordable options will make it a more comfortable fit for diverse users. Warm foods in cold weather such as hot soup or hot cocoa will extend its season and complement the winter activities, and a covered, heated area close by will encourage diners to linger.
Because of its visibility, the Gateway provides a good location for wayfinding and visitor information. One of the mobile information carts that BBPC is implementing throughout the park could be stationed here.

**The Gateway Garden.** This programming area includes the garden in front of the River Café, which serves as an informal and relaxed, quiet respite within the park. Currently however, it is visually cut off from the public areas and feels private and off-limits.

Given that the property ownership of this portion of the park is held by the City of New York, the Gateway Garden should become a more accessible, yet still quiet, passive and beautifully landscaped extension of the Space, adjacent to the Gateway and its Visitors’ Center, and ideally with additional access from the Flex Space.

As BBPC does not at present have jurisdiction over this parcel, and the other programming area plans do not hinge on it, the Gateway Garden might (like the Gateway) be part of a later phase.

**The Woonerf and Water Street.** This programming area directly in front of the River Cafe is now used as a parking lot for the restaurant, serviced by valet parking. As with the currently leased areas described above, the team recommends that eventually this area could become a “shared space,” with room for cars and pedestrians. It provides a critical connection between Fulton Ferry Landing and the Flex Space, and if made available would
relieve the pressure on the crowded sidewalk on Water Street with a safe, wide pedestrian path. A careful design would also benefit guests arriving to dine at the restaurant. A smaller number of cars could still be carefully parked here including parking for handicapped visitors, as in the “woonerfs” of the Netherlands.

Or, the parking could be relocated to Water Street. This would require study by and the agreement of the NYC Department of Transportation (DOT); and might be complicated in terms of parking tour buses. But Water Street widens and becomes two way just for a short distance, without an outlet, posing a safety and congestion problem by all accounts. This was likely necessary when the River Cafe was launched, as driving the one-way back streets of the industrial district now called DUMBO would have been off-putting for many. But given the popularity of DUMBO as a destination, and the ease of Siri (and similar) services, this is no longer the case. Thus the team recommends making Water Street one-way, and relocating the valet parking spaces either to this location or to a nearby parking garage with no change to the drop off in front of the restaurant. This would both allow the prioritization of pedestrians and remove a confusing roadway condition for everyone involved. Again, while this is not within BBPC’s jurisdiction or the scope of this study, further study by the NYC DOT is recommended.

Besides the DOT, this idea would likely hinge on negotiations with and the agreement of the owner of the River Cafe and other New York City agencies. Thus, the Woonerf and Water Street ideas would likely be packaged with the Gateway and Gateway Garden in a later phase of the Vision Plan.
GOVERNANCE

It is a principle of placemaking that local management and control is more likely to support successful places than top-down government. While government is often needed to create physical spaces, it is local involvement and support that creates “place”. In the case of Brooklyn Bridge Park, the creation of the Brooklyn Bridge Park Development Corporation (BBPDC), later to become the Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation (BBPC), was an important step in devolving governance of the park from State and City bureaucracy to the local level - to an independent entity solely concerned with creating and managing a successful park. As the park grew, BBP established a policy of partnering with outside entities (including the BBP Conservancy) to create programming in the Park, while handling capital work and overall maintenance and operations in-house.

The Corporation therefore needs to identify and reflect the needs of the community and the users of the park and to implement programming that reflects and responds to those needs.

While the BBP has become a regional destination serving the needs of a population that comes from far beyond the local community, those living in the immediate vicinity of the Park have a unique interest.

In order to assist BBPC in understanding and articulating community needs the Brooklyn Bridge Park Community Advisory Council (“CAC”) was created in 2010. The CAC is composed of 21 members representing a broad spectrum of local and regional interests, both business and residential.

Over the past several years as the Park has expanded the CAC has focused primarily on design issues connected to the capital program, with relatively little input regarding park programming. As the BBPC completes this last major capital project in the “Space”, attention will and should refocus on programming and management. This brings into question the future role of the CAC and its relationship with the BBPC with respect to the Space. Several questions might be posed:

1. When should the CAC be consulted about programming needs for the Space?

2. What mechanism will best serve the CAC in gathering information about community needs (e.g. the recent community workshop was informative as to community thinking and could be repeated)?

3. How should the BBPC and CAC define success in terms of the management of the space (i.e.
going beyond simply number of users or revenue generated)?

4. What should the governance relationship between the BBPC and the CAC be? Should the CAC have more voice in decisions about the nature and timing of programming in the Space?

5. How should BBP balance the programmatic needs and desires of those who live in close proximity to the Park to the need/desires of the broader universe of Park goers?
CONCLUSION
Brooklyn Bridge as viewed from the park at dusk. Photo: CurbedNY
The purpose of this study was to create, on behalf of the Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation (“BBPC”) and the Community Advisory Council (“CAC”), a “Vision Plan” for the space beneath the Brooklyn Bridge. The Plan is not intended to be prescriptive in terms of design proposals for the Space, but rather to provide guidelines by which the designers, MVVA can successfully meet the social needs of the Space with their design.

Through a process of community engagement, the Pratt team sought the views of as many interested parties and local community members as could be identified, conducting interviews and holding one “workshop” attended by 80 participants at which views about the potential for the Space were fleshed out and discussed.

Perhaps the most significant finding from this process was the multitude of possibilities presented by this unique Space and the difficulty that will present in trying to meet those possibilities, particularly since they sometimes conflict (e.g. quiet, passive activities versus public events).

The Vision Plan attempts to resolve that difficulty by thinking of the Space as an aggregate of smaller spaces rather than a single space, and by temporal subdivision for some spaces, where different activities can be accommodated in different seasons of the year. In this way, there can be parts of the Space that are reserved for quiet contemplation, especially during the busiest times of the year, and other parts where larger gatherings for programmed activities are possible. Given the myriad possible activities in the Space, and the probability that these will change over time, it would be important to not impede future change by permanent structures or design features except where necessary.

One finding of the engagement process was the unanimous desire to celebrate the history of the Space, the power of the architecture of bridge and the unique role in the construction played by Emily Roebling. Any design should therefore address that desire with a permanent installation that reminds visitors of the history and the role of Emily Roebling.
As placemakers, the Pratt team looked at the broader context of the Space and considered several issues that are outside the defined scope of this study and in some cases beyond the jurisdiction of the BBPC. These issues - the use of the building currently occupied by Luke’s Lobster; the traffic arrangement on Water Street; the various pockets of space adjacent to the River Cafe; and the role of the community in governance of the Space, are nevertheless important issues that may be addressed at some point in the future.

Ultimately, we hope that the Vision Plan gives sufficient guidance for the design and programming of the Space that it will fulfill its potential as one of the great public spaces in Brooklyn Bridge Park and indeed in the world.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX 1:
List of Stakeholders

- Community Advisory Council
- Brooklyn Bridge Park Corporation
- MVVA
- Brooklyn Heights Association
- DUMBO Neighborhood Alliance
- Fulton Ferry Landing Association
- One Brooklyn Bridge Park
- One John Street
- Pierhouse
- Vinegar Hill Neighborhood Association
- DUMBO Business Improvement District
- One Hotel
- River Café
- Jane’s Carousel
- St. Ann’s Warehouse
- Brooklyn Historical Society
- Historic District Council
- Society for the Architecture of the City of New York
- BBP Conservancy
- Community Board 2
- Brooklyn Borough President
- City Councilman
- State Assemblywoman
- State Senator
- Photoville
- Dock Street School
- Hip Hop Festival
- DoT Bridge
- Landmarks Preservation Commission
- 84th Precinct - Brooklyn
- NYCHA - Farragut Houses
- Homeland Security
- Two Trees - Residential
- Two Trees - Commercial
APPENDIX 2:
List of Stakeholder Interview Questions

• Questions for Interviews:
• Describe constraints
• What do you like about this place?
• What are the issues or challenges with this space?
• What activities, uses, and events would you like to see year round, daytime/nighttime, weekdays/weekends?
• Daily uses - what would you do there everyday? When there isn't a big event?
• What physical improvements? (entrance, plaza, greenspace)
• Potential partner - who should we talk to? Who should we invite to the workshop?
### APPENDIX 3: Workshop “Place Game”

#### PLACE GAME
place performance evaluation

A Tool for Initiating the Placemaking Process

### What to consider in this place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMFORT &amp; IMAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of safety?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic significance of site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of views?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comfortable place to linger?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection from sun and wind?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCESS &amp; LINKAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease of walking to the place (including for stroller, wheelchairs)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit access?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of information and signage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility from a distance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USES &amp; ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency and types of events and activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy-ness of area year round? Weekday/weekend? Day/night?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge uses enhance space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to the rest of the park, in terms of activities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of people in groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse users in terms of age, race, gender, physical ability and socio-economic status?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective spaces? Interactive spaces?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OTHER NOTES:                                                                   |

| GROUP NUMBER:                                                                 |

**Identifying Opportunities:**

1. What do you like best about this place?

2. What kinds of uses, activities and special events would you envision here? What is missing now from Brooklyn Bridge Park?

3. What kind of opportunities could there be for social interaction? What would entice you and a group of friends to come here?

4. What kind of amenities and features would you like to see here?

5. How can we best celebrate the history of this place?

6. How can we make this space more inclusive and serve the surrounding neighborhoods?

7. How do you think success in the space should be measured?

8. What local partnerships or local talent can you identify that could help implement some of your proposed improvements? Please be as specific as possible.
APPENDIX 4: Verbatim Notes from Workshop Dot Exercise

Group 1 - Winter

QUESTION 1:
Flat - access to Right of Way (ROW)
Emily Roebling - Name space after Emily Roebling (4 red, 3 green)
Iconic site
Rich history
Scale of the Bridge - impressive and meaningful
Views
White noise
Place of transition - park and cultural center
Solace (6 green)
Large empty space

QUESTION 2:
Opportunities for community giveback
Gathering site for social justice - civic opportunities (5 red, 2 green)
Food drive, coat drive
Never Again, Time’s Up, Black Lives Matter, etc.
Media outreach
Define civic future of NYC
Advertising
Agriculture - Hydroponic winter growing (2 red, 1 green)
School events
Water studies - climate studies

QUESTION 3:
Projections on abutment (1 green)
Ice sculptures - SACWMU - ad hoc and organized
Flexible architecture (4 red, 1 green)
Sculptures and open space (1 green)
Drives
Hot chocolate festival (2 reds)
Beer festival/garden
Vendors - local suppliers
Christmas Market - limited engagement

QUESTION 4:
Tunnel for pass through (1 red, 1 green)
Climate controlled dome - heat lamps
Security
Bathrooms
Information Kiosk - park and events, bridge history

QUESTION 5:
Placards/Kiosk
Winter performance
Seasonal historic events - exhibits
Cardboard box sculpture - domestic coffee roasting (1 green)
Participatory space
Cardboard competition
Hot chocolate

QUESTION 6:
Ad hoc multicultural space for gathering - Hyde Park corner (1 red)
Food Vendors - encourage local businesses (1 red)
Movable planters
Zero food waste space
Signage - in the park, neighborhood, subway stops, Brooklyn Bridge entrance
ADA
Lighting (2 red, 1 green)
Visible from Manhattan

QUESTION 7:
Use
Number of people
Noise does not equal success (1 red)

QUESTION 8:
DUMBO BID (2 green)
DUMBO Businesses
Local residents and artists (1 red, 1 green)
SAW
Dock Street
Collaborative programming of local stakeholders (2 red)
BAM
BRIC
BHS

**Group 2 - Winter**

**QUESTION 1:**
Flexibility/scale of space - flatness (1 red)
“Defined” space by location between 2 bridges
Breathing room - open sky
Iconic/historic/architectural significance (5 green)
Water access/views

**QUESTION 2:**
“Winter Festival” - ice carving/sculpture (3 red, 2 green)
Ice skating/curling (13 red, 7 green)
Ice castle/labyrinth - possibility for artists to design the spaces -
celebrate the months after the holidays (3 red, 3 green)
Hot chocolate, mulled wine, vendors (1 red, 2 green)
Winter sports - sledding/tobogganing/tubing - snow football
Specific sporting events - snowboard half-pipe, competitions
Hygge - warmed outdoor areas celebrating the cold, dark moths (4 red, 2 green)
Campfires, heated areas, mulled wine (1 green)
Winter night market with food (3 red, 4 green)
Polar Bear Club
Kite flying (1 green)
Passive activities
Sleigh rides
Petting zoo with cold weather animals
Ice fishing - artist designed ice-fishing shanties (1 red)

**QUESTION 3:**
Food and drink (1 red)
“Courting” spaces
Films with music accompaniment - multi-sensory projections (1 red)
Temporary indoor “lodge” space (1 red)
Special light show against the bridge (1 red)
QUESTION 4:
Trees to help block wind (1 red, 2 green)
Bathrooms (2 red, 1 green)
Lighting - celebratory or otherwise (3 red)
Infrared heaters

QUESTION 5:
Costume exhibit - ability to try on different fashions of the time
“Escape Room” related to history
Historic ships
Historic performances
Emily Roebling - namesake of the space, celebrate her story and significance (3 red, 6 green)
Statue of Emily Roebling (1 red)

QUESTION 6:
Flexibility - allows for something for everyone (1 red, 1 green)
Focus on the orientation/anchorage of the site’s history

QUESTION 7:
Smiling
Diverse gathering - inclusivity - all feel welcome
Profitability for neighboring businesses
ALL feel welcome (1 red, 2 green)

QUESTION 8:
BK Historical Society
Time Out
New York Magazine
Sporting Goods Store (surf shop)
Jacques Tornes (hot chocolate)

**Group 3 - Summer**

QUESTION 1:
Openness
Spacious
View of water
Accessibility from all directions
Scale (huge)
Offers different perspectives
World-wide known, iconic landmark
Engineering marvel
Versatile
Global crossroads/footprint
Hear “motion” (traffic above, river flow)
Access to river’s edge
Safety - cameras
Need to protect people and art
Need more lighting
Park enforcement patrol?
Gates or walls to secure areas?

QUESTION 2:
Currently:
Hip Hop Festival (1 green)
Photo-fence
Not a lot of people patronize food shops in summer
Weddings
Engagement photo shoots
Too much traffic (pedestrian, vehicular)
Future:
Celebrate the history (3 red, 1 green)
Interactive events at lunch and after work (not food-centric)
Food trucks
Workshops (2 red)
concerts/no concerts (2000-4000 people too much? Shuts place down to general public, noise and trash impact neighboring streets)
Connect local businesses so visitors visit their shops down block
Events that allow public to “flow through” space (1 red)
Rotating themes
Art installations - functional or interactive (5 red, 4 green)
Educational programs with schools
Sculpture garden (2 red)
Lighting activated by public (motion) (1 red, 1 green)
Picnic benches (1 red)
Garden flower festival (Dutch?) (1 green)
Protection on anchorage (1 green)
Interactive family programming - engineering (i.e. “imagination playground blocks”), construction, suspension principles (1 red, 1 green)

QUESTION 3:
Pop-up beer garden (non exclusive) (2 green)
Pet friendly venue
Hands-on building events (lego?)

QUESTION 4:
Water fountain (1 green)
Benches (1 green)
Grass (1 green)
Stroller parking
Bicycle parking (1 green)
Bathroom (1 red, 3 green)
Shade (2 green)
Protection from “road rain” (1 green)
Electricity (for events)
Wayfinding - signage - businesses and amenities
(needs to blend into environment) (3 red)
Information booth with human
Directional signage (to trains, bridge access (walk and ride)) (1 red, 1 green)

QUESTION 5:
Honor Emily Roebling (1 red, 5 green)
George Washington - Battle of Brooklyn (Revolutionary War History)
Historic plaques (1 green)
Special events (historical theatre, readings, etc.) (4 red, 3 green)
Walt Whitman

QUESTION 6:
Better connection between schools and neighborhood (3 red)
More neighborhood centric programming
Public picnic tables
“Harlem Eat Up” example (4 red, 1 green)
Local businesses host programming (2 red, 1 green)
Group 4 - Summer

QUESTION 1:
Esplanade
Unobstructed view of the bridge
Feeling of serenity
Architectural quality
National Meeting point
Sense of history

QUESTION 2:
Landscape/green (6 green, 5 red)
Seating (1 green)
Hammocks
Natural Hill (1 green, 1 red)
Community Garden
Children’s Farm
Restore Cobblestone on New Dock street (1 green)
Education re history of the bridge (1 green, 1 red)
Involve Dock Street School
Rose garden or other specialty garden (5 green, 1 red)
Butterfly Garden (1 green, 2 red)
Something that supports bird life
Movie screen
Ice skating (1 red)

QUESTION 3:
Landscape topography (2 green, 3 red)
Meandering paths (4 green, 2 red)
Community garden
Film night
Moveable seating
Water feature that helps acoustically/reflecting pool. Waterfall
Art installation (4 green, 3 red)

QUESTION 4:
Viewing place/structure (2 red)
Secluded small spaces (1 red)
Interesting seating (1 red)
QUESTION 5:
Name esplanade Emily Roebling (3 green, 4 red)
Hart Crane/Walt Whitman - text embedded in paving (1 green, 4 red)
Memorial garden ref. bridge

QUESTION 6:
Is anything needed?
Outdoor/nighttime lighting and or heating (1 red)
Educational programming or exhibit (1 red)

QUESTION 7:
Circulation management
Year round use that is moderate
Access to esplanade (1 green, 2 red)

QUESTION 8:
Brooklyn Botanic Garden

Group 5 - “Shoulder” Spring/Fall

Clarification of River Cafe boundaries - what can be used as a path or connection to the space - ACCESS - use of space would be enhanced if certain areas were not closed off (5 red, 1 green)
Passive use - contemplative area, things that can be moved around (ex tables), open areas (4 red, 5 green)
Like:
Openness (3 red)
Views (water, iconic views of bridge including stone towers)
Periodic and occasional uses vs permanent uses
There may be crowds for certain uses or because of weather, etc. and a destination use may be problematic
It may be better suited as a transition space (paths) to other access of the park or facilities
Uses, Activities, Events:
Less programmed space, structured uses (1 red, 1 green)
Let people use as they determine (1 red)
Seasonal uses (Christmas Market)
Non-permanent installations
Limited food / farmers market (excluding weekends) - keeping in mind where there are already markets (1 red)
Subject to DUMBO Association
Ice skating (ex Pier 2) - not necessarily a rink but a sort of pathway (3 reds)
Benches that face each other (1 red)
Recognition of history/commemorative things (3 red)
Missing:
Shade (2 reds)
Water fountains
Make police parking public parking (1 red)
Shoulder seasons not really necessary
Measures of success will be determined by how use and impact on neighbors and other park areas
No structures (2 red, 2 green)
Keith Goddard - type art (2 red)
Jen Lewin - light sculptures (3 red, 1 green)
Adequate lighting for safety (1 red)
Emergency kiosks

**Group 6 - “Shoulder” Spring/Fall**

**QUESTION 1:**
Landmark Bridge (Location)
Topography
Sunshine/Shade
Views
Connection of N/S park (4 red)
Accessibility - easy to get to
Historical value (2 red)

**QUESTION 2:**
Open, passive/quiet space (7 green, 4 red)
Bathrooms
Public art - place on hardscape to avoid damage to lawns (2 green, 1 red)
Native plantings/rose garden - support local ecology
- birds/butterflies/fauna (2 green, 3 red)
QUESTION 3:
Open spaces - quiet (1 green, 1 red)
Opportunity for picnicking (1 red)
Moveable furniture for gathering
Connecting EFF to southern park (5 red)

QUESTION 4:
Bike path/parking (2 green, 5 red)
Lighting
Sculptural wall - connection on streetscape - kept open/use historic materials (1 red)
   -acting as a border
Bathrooms (1 red)
Moveable furniture
Info/wayfinding
Sculptural seating
Community garden

QUESTION 5:
Historical materials used - wall, Belgium blocks (1 green, 1 red)
Native plants
History wall (2 green, 5 red)
Naming - speaking to the history of the area (2 green)
Historic markers/plaque

QUESTION 6:
Keeping waterfront accessible (1 red)
Keeping it low/no commercial (if commercial - priority to local businesses) (2 red)

QUESTION 7:
Seamless connectivity (3 red)

QUESTION 8:
Local biz
BHS
Neighborhood BID/local assoc.
Artists
Schools
BBPC
DoT
BBP
Group 7 - All Year

QUESTION 1:
Bridge itself (3 red, 1 green)
Unique
Gateway (1 red)
Connects north/south park

QUESTION 2:
Ice skating (2 red)
Skateboarding (1 red)
Flexible space for temporary events (2 red)
Picnic tables (1 red)
Ping Pong (under the bridge)
Artwork - events
Sculpture Park - Emily Roebling (?) (1 red)
But... no market, no load music, no big events

QUESTION 3:
Ice skating - all ages - free or not free (1 red)
Maybe don’t need “activities”
Fountain (1 red, 2 green)

QUESTION 4:
Historic wall (2 red, 2 green)
Ping Pong (1 red)
Restrooms (2 red)

QUESTION 5:
“History Wall” (1 red, 1 green)
Honor Emily Roebling (2 red)
Celebrate history through art (3 red)

QUESTION 6:
Family Focus
Diversity
Art brings visitors (1 red)
QUESTION 7:
Usage, not crazy use
Draws people to local businesses in winter (1 red)
Publication
Local satisfaction
Increased foot traffic (1 red)
Diversity of people (1 red)

QUESTION 8:
Volunteers
BID (1 red)
Brooklyn Authocity (??) Historic
Bryant Park to understand costs and implications
Local art galleries (1 red)

**Group 8 - All Year**

Relationship btwn space and park
No event space (1 red)
No sound - bad acoustics (1 red)
Bottle neck space (pedestrian and traffic)
Kiosk - announce all activities
Historical marker info (3 red)
History of BB on Fulton Ferry Landing, Battle of Brooklyn (1 green, 2 red)
Pool info station
Inspiring visual space & relationship to BB
Belong to all of us (1 red)
  -place for entire Boro
Welcoming crossroads (1 red)
Feel like fountain at Washington Square Park
Separates piers from park
Civic space concept
Green lawn area with benches (1 green)
Natural feel no concrete (2 green, 1 red)
ACTIVITIES
Small play areas for young children
Patches of water, grass, benches, fountains (1 red)
Sculpture
Public art space - winter/summer rotation (1 green, 4 red)
Temporary or permanent art installations
Small concerts
Keep people moving through the space - concerns
with potential falling debris (3 red)
Passive space to enjoy shade (1 green)
Ice skating rink - good winter use (3 red)
Attract visitors from other area
Extend reach of park
Sensitivity to traffic issue
Silent music concert - special headphones (1 red)
Outdoor education site (amphitheater style)
Modern seating: rotating styles (2 green, 2 red)
Lighted swings
Benches
INCLUSIVENESS
Pool (1 red)
Smaller scale programmatic events that speak to
various neighborhood communities (2 red)
Culturally relevant music genres
Literacy push: book reading (1 green, 2 red)
“Under the Bridge” Events
Subway musicians
Public performance space for individuals
Impromptu performance space

HOW TO MEASURE SUCCESS
Polls, surveys, park attendance #’s - measurement
Committees (1 red)
People want to linger (1 red)
Play chess, games
Interaction opportunities

PARTNERSHIPS
Pool
Group 9 - Night

Bridge
Historical Reference (4 red, 2 green)
Illuminated - High water line (4 red, 1 green)
Streams underground

Walking tour, self-guided
Fire boat house

Historical Tours (1 red)
Market - Art (1 green), Food
Illuminated Features
Passive Space (7 red, 6 green)

QUESTION 3:
Game Tables
Moveable tables and chairs
A fountain
Landmarks - Fulton Ferry Fountain (7 red, 8 green)

QUESTION 4:
Japanese Garden - Meditative/Contemplative
Hologram on Bridge
Drinking fountains - sustainable? (1 red)
Native plants (1 red)
Discreet lighting (1 red)

QUESTION 5:
Historical Markers
- High water line
- Underground stream
- Self guided tour-plaque (1 red)
- Fulton Ferry Landing (6 green)
- BB Plaque

QUESTION 6:
Brooklyn Neighborhood Council
Local art events
Photoville

Question 7:
Wildlife area (1 green)
How many locals coming
How many people coming
Reduction of 3-1-1 calls
Mix of active and passive space

Question 8:
River Cafe
Museums
Brooklyn Bridge Botanical Garden
NY Historical Society/Brooklyn Historical Society
Brooklyn Bridge Park
Historical District Council
Municipal Arts Society

Group 10 - Night

QUESTION 1:
Connections to other parts of the park
Opportunity for official entrance
Can “experience” the bridge - scale of space
Opportunity to tell the story of the bridge honor its history (2 red)
Experience of feeling the city
Openness (4 reds)
Feels like the base of a waterfall (1 green)

QUESTION 2:
Not trying to make something that invites people (1 red)
Could have projections - magic and wonder - light the bridge (3 red)
Landscape lighting (3 red, 1 green)
Fountain - relating to St. Ann’s Warehouse - Bethesda
(??) Fountain - not crazy (3 red, 2 green)
Pop-up fountain spray (2 red, 1 green)
Small gathering, picnicking, eating, food trucks (1 red)
Outdoor museum about bridge - “celebrating bridge” (4 red)
How to include pets?

QUESTION 3:
Families having dinner
Benches that face each other
Music? (1 green)
Space for street performers
Landscape lighting (2 red, 1 green)
Acknowledge Emily Roebling (1 red)
Attractive access point
Site lines are important

QUESTION 4:
Highlight the water
Bathroom
Outdoor wine bar returns! (1 green)
Bike amenities
Cobblestone - Belgium Block - historically relevant materials (4 red)
Picnic tables
Planting - landscaping to help mask noise (1 green)
Safety features
Artwork garden - outdoor gallery
Ice skating (4 red)

QUESTION 5:
Celebrate the history (3 red)
Outdoor museum (1 green)
Projections
Emily Roebling
Scale model of bridge
Cable making
Celebration of New Technology

QUESTION 6:
Maintain the quiet nature of the park (3 red, 2 green)
Picnics
Less programming
Continue diversity of existing park
QUESTION 7:
Quality vs quantity
Feels inviting
Disperses people to parts of park (1 green)
Highlights bridge
Can get to the water
Rate your visit button
A place to stop and spend some time
“Roman fountain” - meeting point
Multiple access points - emphasis on Dock Street
Sense of Place

QUESTION 8:
Brooklyn Historical Society
Brooklyn Museum of Art
Local artists
Brooklyn Arts Council
DUMBO Open Studio
St Ann’s Warehouse
Brooklyn Flea
Barge Music?
Smorgasburg
Museum of the City of New York
Spark Children’s Museum
BID