CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----X

January 11, 2011 Start: 9:55am Recess: 10:40am

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

BEFORE:

MARK WEPRIN Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Leroy G. Comrie, Jr. Daniel R. Garodnick Daniel J. Halloran Vincent Ignizio Jessica S. Lappin

Diana Reyna Joel Rivera

Larry B. Seabrook

James Vacca Albert Vann

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Leonard Garcia-Duran Director Staten Island City Planning Office

James Miraglia Deputy Director

Ryan Singer Bronx Borough Deputy Director

Jeffrey Chester Attorney Lucille Roberts

Dan Siegel AE Com

Jenny Pollack Queens District Manager Lucille Roberts

25 We're going to start right in on

from Queens. And I'm sure we'll be joined by

23

24

others.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Land Use number 278 and 279. This is in 2 Richmond County. They are numbers C110069 and 3 4 N110070 and we're going to call upon members of the city, Department of City Planning to come up, 5 Len Garcia-Duran, James Miraglia and Ryan Singer, 6 I believe. Come on up. Okay, please reintroduce yourselves for the record and make a presentation

when you're ready.

LEONARD GARCIA-DURAN: Good morning. My name is Len Garcia-Duran, Director of Staten Island City Planning Office. I am here with [pause] Thank you. I'm here with my Deputy Director James Miraglia and the Bronx Borough Deputy Director, Ryan Singer. This past April our chair, Department of City Planning Chair Amanda Burden, reconvened Mayor Bloomberg's Staten Island Growth Management Task Force to present several proposals for text amendments and rezonings. These were the result of a year long effort of our agency working in coordination with representatives of Staten Island Borough President James Molinaro and all three Staten Island City Council Members, practitioners and civic representatives, all members of the task force, to

address several issues that the Staten Island community boards, residents and business owners have brought to our attention.

Mayor Bloomberg's task force was first convened in 2003 and since that time the City Planning Commission has adopted several proposals for rule changes and rezonings to ensure that the borough's future development respects existing lower density neighborhood context, which is based upon limited mass transit, the resulting high auto ownership and a lack of a regular street grid. Other parts of the city share these same challenges and we have adopted similar rule changes in Throgs Neck and community board district 10 in the Bronx and tackled their specific concerns.

These earlier task force efforts resulted in designating all of Staten Island and the Bronx community district 10 as lower density growth management areas. Our ongoing efforts in working with these communities have culminated in today's proposal to amend the zoning rules of both Staten Island and the Bronx community district 10 and to rezone commercial corridors of Staten

2 Island.

The proposed text amendments will tackle an issue raised by many civic groups throughout Staten Island. While everyone agrees there is a need for easy access to medical services and day care providers in our lower density neighborhoods until now it has often come at the cost of oversized buildings in residential neighborhoods with little or no parking spaces provided for staff or customers.

Over the past two years, Agency staff has been meeting with the task force members to craft this proposal that we are presenting to you today to ensure that future medical offices and day care providers have sound rules for their future buildings and incentives to locate them in commercial areas where these services have better access to roads and existing transit. I should point out that while these rules were crafted by the Staten Island task force, many of these same issues are found at Throgs Neck and Council Member Vacca requested that community district 10 be included in the proposal. We were happy to oblige.

easy to implement.

In addition, we have crafted several amendments to the commercial rules on Staten Island. These are based on the input we have heard from practitioners and staff regarding the earlier lower density rules we adopted several years ago. While we want to ensure that rules remain in place, manage growth and preserve neighborhoods, we also want them to be fair and

Also in our efforts to update our commercial rules it was pointed out by Staten Island elected officials that due to outdated zoning or BSA cases, many commercial businesses were located in residential districts and did not have to abide by our new lower density commercial rules and our parking design guidelines. We believe it is appropriate that the new commercial rules should be applied to these commercial areas to provide predictability to property owners, which will encourage them to reinvest with certainty about their futures.

City Planning staff has been working diligently since the task force met in April to present these recommendations to

| 1 | SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 8 |
|----|----------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | community boards, local practitioners, and the |
| 3 | Department of Buildings to incorporate suggestions |
| 4 | and insights to ensure that their future |
| 5 | implementation be smooth. Thanks to Council |
| 6 | Members Oddo, Ignizio, Vacca, their staff members. |
| 7 | I'd like to thank all of them for their support |
| 8 | and advice in our coming effort to provide better |
| 9 | planning for these neighborhoods. And with that |
| 10 | I'd like to introduce James Miraglia to walk you |
| 11 | through those proposals. |
| 12 | JAMES MIRAGLIA: Thank you. |
| 13 | [Pause] |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: We can't see |
| 15 | anything, maybe the lights also maybe Jerry might |
| 16 | help, I don't know. Is that a problem? I don't |
| 17 | know. |
| 18 | MR. MIRAGLIA: It's got to reboot. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay, we're |
| 20 | okay. We're waiting to reboot. Uh-oh, that's not |
| 21 | going to stand. |
| 22 | MR. MIRAGLIA: I'll go check the |
| 23 | plug was kicked out. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: That was an |
| 25 | impressive job of. |

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| 2. | MR. | MIRAGLIA: | Just. | one | moment. |
|----|-----|-----------|-------|-----|---------|

This is coming on now.

[Pause]

MR. MIRAGLIA: Okay, thank you. Sorry for the delay. There are three main goals of the text amendment. One was to provide adequate parking and prevent out of scale medical facilities in lower density areas of Staten Island and CD10 Bronx. Another goal was to prevent the out of scale day care centers in lower density growth management areas and finally we need an area to accommodate the additional medical facilities and day care centers in appropriate configurations. For those of you who don't know, the lower density areas are all--almost all of the residential areas in Staten Island, as we noted in the Staten Island map with all the colors and CD10 in the Bronx is Throgs Neck, Pelham Bay and City Island on the lower, on the right hand corner.

So let's first talk about the medical facilities in residence districts. The current rules limit your medical facilities to 1,500 square feet of floor area however cellars are not included so what we get are these strange

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 excavated front yards in the middle of residential 3 districts. And of course that's problematic for

4 people who live there. Secondly, medical

5 facilities can waive all of their parking and

6 there are no parking design guidelines when there

7 is a parking lot and there's no screening or

8 buffering as well. And eventually, obviously,

9 what happens is all the cars are parked in the

10 street and again, this is, this causes a big

11 impact in the residential neighborhoods with these

12 lower density areas.

Medical facilities in commercial districts have their own set of challenges.

Although they're allowed a 1.0 floor area, which is pretty high for a lower density area, the parking requirements and the 30 foot front wall requirement maximum size creates a situation where the buildings only get to about as half as big as they are allowed to be. So this creates a disincentive to going in commercial districts where as the residential rules incentivize these medical facilities to go into the residential

district. We'd like to try and reverse that.

So our proposal is to limit a

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

medical facility, as you can see it in the blue 2 there on the bottom of the building, to 1,500 3 square foot for the entire building including the 4 5 cellar space therefore the excavation of the front yards and that kind of thing won't occur. There 6 will be for the first time a 60 foot minimum lot width and a 5,700 square foot minimum lot area for 9 this medical facilities which creates a hurdle in a residential district to get to. There is no 10 11 minimum today. And finally, the buildings 12 themselves would be limited to whatever the 13 residential district sizes are so if your houses can go to a 35 foot peak, like most of Staten 14 15 Island is, then so will be the medical facility.

And we would keep these side yard regs in the

community facility as well, which are bigger.

And finally there's an existing BSA special permit to allow these facilities to be larger, however we're going to severely like strengthen and beefen up the special permit by creating neighborhood findings and to say that you have to start at the 5,700 square foot minimum lot area to even begin with so it creates more of a threshold to even begin to ask for this special

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

permit. And then the neighborhood findings, of
course, the BSA would have to meet those, find

that those findings are appropriate.

In plan, we're looking at our proposal here. What we would do is to eliminate the parking waiver so you have to have parking. Secondly we would keep the 1 per 400 ratio, which is a good ratio and we'd have four foot planting buffers required, no parking in the front yard. So from the street you're going to look at a medical facility that will be the same size as a house and it will be a fully planted front yard. So if they want to do this, you have to find a 5,700 square foot lot. You have to put the parking in the rear and from the front the building looks more like a regular residential building as opposed to a large commercial building in the middle of a residential neighborhood. finally we would say that no parking lot lighting would be directed at residents is part of the enforcement.

In the commercial districts, now that we've restricted—these proposals restricted residential districts, in the commercial districts

we'd like to incentivize. So first of all we
would go to a 1 per 400 parking requirement, which
is a reduction from the allowable there today. We
would say that you can have a parking waiver for a
lot smaller than 4,000 square foot. We would
increase the FAR to 1.2 and increase the maximum
front wall to 35 feet. And the combination of all

9 of those allows a building that almost gets

completely to its allowable floor area of .9 with

11 parking to the side.

The day care centers have a similar set of issues. That was the medical facilities. The day care centers are built to what they call the sky exposure plane so they could be much bigger than their surrounding residential buildings. So we often on Staten Island could have a day care center that's 45 to 50 feet tall next to a, you know, a 15 foot high ranch house or a 35 foot peak, you know, four square houses which we show there. So these day care centers could be much, much larger. They have a much larger FAR, too so they're bulkier, they're longer and they're bigger.

There is no parking requirement as

required.

well, getting to that now. So obviously all the
parking and drop offs, everything that's going to
occur with this day care center will be in the
street. If you have a day care center serving 60
children the first thing in the morning with no
parking available in your residential
neighborhood, of course that's going to be an
impact for the people of the neighborhood. And if

there is parking, again, there is no buffering

So under our proposal what we would do is create a 10,000 square foot minimum lot area to create a day care center. That's a, you know, close to a quarter acre and there's a reason for that. Because we would want there to be onsite parking and we would also want area for children to have a play area. Although our zoning doesn't require a play area, it'd be nice that there is space to have a green playground as well some parking on the lot. Also, we would have a 60 foot minimum lot width to accommodate a mandatory drop off, and that's what we're showing there. So this is a significant difference.

Finally or also, the building

,

itself again would have to be built to the residential bulk of its particular district. In Staten Island and CD 210 that's mostly R3 so again you'd have a 35 foot peak and a .6. So instead of having a 50 foot building next to you, you have a building with a parking lot, a play area and it would look like the same size as the buildings around it. We would have to change some of the current LDDM rules to accommodate that drop off area. And again, the side door rules would remain for community facilities, which are larger than the residential so there'd be more space between the buildings.

So in plan, you could see that there's a drop off area. You go to a 1 per 1,000 parking requirement. There's, we have to loosen some of the rules about paving, four foot planting buffering requiring, no accessory parking spaces in the front yard and no lighting directed at residences. So a 10,000 square foot lot shown at 60 foot minimum gives you sufficient space to have an outdoor play space plus your parking.

So by restricting in the residential districts, again in the commercial

districts we want to try to encourage them so it's the same set of rules that we are doing for the medical, except for the parking. We'd go to 1 1,000 for the parking. You could waive out of your parking at 4,000 square foot because you can't fit the parking on a tiny lot. But the big thing is we would increase the FAR to 1.2 and increase that perimeter wall to 35 foot so you can get three full floors accommodating all of your floor area at once and getting your parking next door. And potentially of course you could have outdoor play space on the roof and we've seen that

in Staten Island several times.

Okay, well, those are the proposed text amendments for community facilities. We're also tweaking some of what we call the lower density growth management commercial rules. There was some unintended consequences when we enacted these back in 2005. One of them is that we mandate that the ground floor on all these commercial buildings has to be commercial. Elsewhere in the city these can be residential in a commercial district, this is the commercial overlay. However there are existing houses today

/

that were there since the 1920s and 1930s and because of our rules that saying that the first floor has to be commercial, they can not expand on the first floor because that would be increasing in non-conformance.

So we're simply going to change the rules that said for an existing house like this, if one wants to do an expansion on their own property and meet all the side art rules, they can. It's just something to give relief to several hundred homeowners in Staten Island where this rule applies today.

We also have an unintended consequences from the rules of 2005 in our historic town centers of Staten Island, which are R5 and R4 districts. This is your Port Richmond, your Saint George, your State Bolton. You know, they're traditional old town centers thriving, they're great. You have, you know, apartments above stores and things like that. Unfortunately, on narrow lots, lots maybe less than 60 feet down to 50, 40 feet, the current rules as written would not allow there to be a second story because of limitations and I'll explain those limitations.

Basically this would be the old style, you know,
stores with some apartments above.

4 Currently, you can't waive 5 residential parking so if you wanted to d

residential parking so if you wanted to do residences above your store where would you put the parking. Right? On top of that we said that only 25% of the façade could be devoted to a door and a garage. So on a 60 foot lot you can do a 15 foot entrance there but as soon as you get down to 25 or 35 foot there's no room under the current rules to get that entrance to parking in the rear. And so basically what we get in these old town centers are just single story concrete block commercial buildings as opposed to the mixed use that would provide valuable housing.

So our regulations would say that on small lots, less than 4,000 square foot in lot area, you can waive residential parking. So a couple of units above, you know, this would be one unit here, this could be two. You just wouldn't have to provide parking just like it is in the old town centers. Now this is only in the R4s and R5s in Staten Island, which is a very limited area but it is our historic town centers and we don't want

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 to see the town centers, you know, taken up with

3 parking lots. And we would relax that façade rule

4 to allow more of your façade to be used for the

5 parking, if you did want to provide parking in

6 your backyard or inside the building.

Another unintended consequence is that, again, as I mentioned that there are regulations in Staten Island in the lower density areas that the entire ground floors in the commercial overlay has to be commercial or community facility. What we found that is during these hard economic times in the last couple of years that developers were saying how about on the side street. I mean, if we're providing all of this commercial space here, we're having a great difficulty in getting tenants on side street commercial and we're mandating it; it's not giving a choice. So what we'd like to do is to allow beyond 30 feet of the primary commercial street, a developer to have the choice in a single building of whether or not they want to do the residential on the first floor. And it's kind of a transition to the rest of the residential district that continues on down the block but it is a choice;

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it's not mandated. However the primary commercial
street and 30 feet from the corner still would
have our mandatory commercial rule. And that

5 explains what I just said.

And finally one little tweak we have with our Hillsides district. The Hillsides district, if you're not familiar, is a special district on Staten Island that is created to protect our Hillsides. In our Hillsides, however, the actual mapping of it goes down to very flat areas in our old town centers as well. It's just the way it was mapped. Our commercial rules, as I said, say you have to do commercial on the first floor however the Hillsides requires that you ask for discretionary approval by the City Planning Commission to do that commercial on the first floor. And this creates a conflict in which a mandated use requires a CPC authorization and also it triggers an environmental review for an old building that's been there since the 1920s. want to, like, pretty much clean that up and make it very efficient.

All the other Hillsides protections would come into play. For instance, if this

building actually was on a hillside, all the other regulations would go into play. We would still have review. If there were trees on this site, they wouldn't be able to remove the trees without our authorization so this is basically just to clean up some—to make it more efficient for someone to redevelop some of our old town centers, which need some economic help.

And finally the third piece of this proposals was to take three areas of Staten Island which are intensively built up with commercial uses over the years through BSA cases and simply map commercial districts on them. They're over 98% commercial use today and it's just pretty much creating de facto, they're de facto commercial districts today and the idea here is just to map the commercial districts to make them comply and conform and to use the new landscaping guidelines.

So the areas are on Richmond Avenue and Victory Boulevard. The red signifies all the commercial uses here that are not in the overlay but these are the hatch marks and the overlays.

And this is just representative of the very large commercial establishments due to BSA cases that

are there. So it behooves us to actually create a real regulatory framework for these. So the proposal in this area is, as you can see, all that red that got filled in is going over where all the

existing commercial is today.

Another area, again you can see all the commercial overlays here in the black hatched and then two large developments. One is a huge Staples, another is a big strip mall, that just never had the overlay put on it and they were created via BSA cases. So the idea here is to, again, create a regulatory framework that's consistent and moving into the future. And the last area, and I'm sorry, and this is where we would fill in the overlays here. Again, just continuing the continuous strip.

Finally, there's a large strip
along Highland Boulevard and Richmond Avenue,
again all that red and blue signifies commercial
and community facilities uses that were done via
BSA cases. And again, these are just indicative
of these very large establishments here. And the
idea again is just to fill in with the red, that's
the proposed districts, next to the existing black

commercial overlays. And again, these are areasthat are already built out with commercial uses.

So that concludes my presentation and I thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much. Impressive presentation. We have been joined by Council Member Seabrook, Council Member Vacca and Council Member Ignizio and I'm going to turn to Council Member Ignizio now who wanted to make a comment and statement about this particular application.

Mr. Chairman and thank you to my colleagues. I know that was a lengthy presentation but it's the culmination of several years worth of work and one in which every elected official, every community board, the borough board, the borough president, the mayor and City Planning really have all come to an agreement with. I just want to single out, thank James Miraglia for all the work you put into it and our very own Len Garcia-Duran of Staten Island has really done Yelman's [phonetic] work in meshing all the interests together.

Our goal was to create a situation

whereby we maintain the character, integrity of 2 communities while allowing growth and allowing 3 4 commercial districts to expand and overall have an 5 improved quality of life with day care centers. A lot of it came out of issues that we have seen in 6 our local communities with the day care centers, with the medical facilities. And this truly is--I 9 will criticize this administration when warranted 10 and praise it when warranted it. And this truly 11 was a great working relationship and I want to 12 thank the mayor for allowing us to work so much 13 with City Planning and Amanda Burden and Len and 14 James and really building a better mouse trap. 15 And I think that this is what we did today. So I 16 thank you and I apologize to my colleagues but it 17 really was a lot of work and that's why it was a 18 lengthy presentation. Thank you very much. 19 CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: No apology

necessary. It was a very interesting presentation. Does anyone else have any comments or questions regarding this proposal? Seeing none, I want to thank you all very much. And you're excused.

24 you're excused.

20

21

22

23

25

MR. GARCIA-DURAN: Thank you.

| 1 | SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 25 |
|----|----------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | MR. MIRAGLIA: Thank you. |
| 3 | [Pause] |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay, okay. |
| 5 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Excuse me, |
| 6 | Mr. Chair. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay, we close |
| 8 | the hearing on that item. |
| 9 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Excuse me. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Yes, Mr. |
| 11 | Vacca. |
| 12 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: 279? |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: They are, |
| 14 | these were both items together, Mr. Vacca, 278 and |
| 15 | 279. |
| 16 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Don't leave. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Oh, okay. |
| 18 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Don't leave. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: We'd like to |
| 20 | bring you back. |
| 21 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Thank you |
| 22 | Ryan. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: You don't need |
| 24 | the slide show though, right? |
| 25 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: No, I don't |
| | |

| need the slide show. I thank you very much. This |
|----------------------------------------------------|
| includes this community board district 10 in my |
| Council district so I thought you were only on |
| Staten Island. Okay, I know. We exist too in the |
| Bronx; I want you to know. I want to thank City |
| Planning also and when we originally had the |
| presentation on Staten Island and I heard lower |
| growth management I chimed up and I says wait a |
| minute, I have lower growth management in my |
| district too and we managed to include board 10 in |
| my Council district. I'm glad that we had that |
| opportunity so I thank you and I thank the mayor |
| as well and City Planning. |

Let me ask you two questions. The community board voted in favor of this application, my old board, but let me ask you something. They mentioned about including houses of worship and group homes. What was your response to that request?

MR. MIRAGLIA: Yeah, my understanding from the issues as we discussed them at the community board with the group homes, they had some specific set of concerns and I think what we want to do is take a look at those as a

separate study because they sound like they had

slightly different issues. It was more about

parking and the way that--and less about the size

of the facilities so we didn't want to just, you

know, apply these rules to that just wholesale.

And also at that point that would have been

outside the scope of this project. So we're going

to take a look at those, of course, pending our

10 work program.

On the houses of worship, that's a particularly thorny issue because of federal law for us to regulate. I'd like to have more conversations. One with the community board about what their issues are with the houses of worship and then two also with our attorneys to see what we could actually do for them.

COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: I thank you.

I wanted your statements for the record and I'm sure the board will look forward to working with you, again. But I thank you, as always Ryan and I thank the Bronx office and I thank City Planning and Amanda Burden. This is a great win for my district. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Nice to see

| 2 | everybody | getting | along | so | well. | Very |
|---|-----------|---------|-------|----|-------|------|
|---|-----------|---------|-------|----|-------|------|

encouraging. All right, thank you. Now we're going to move to close this hearing, thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: Big

difference from yesterday, right?

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Ha, touché.

The next item, Land Use number 280 is going to be off the agenda for now and it'll be coming back at a later date, the sidewalk café in Council Member Reyna's district. And we are going to move on to Land Use number 286, known as the Bell Boulevard rezoning, 20080293COUNCIL MEMBERQ, in Council Member Halloran's district. And we'd like to ask Daniel Siegel and Jeffrey Chester, attorney for the applicant, to please come up. I want to, uhoh. We have an easel for them? Yeah, can you get them? Pete, can you get them the easel? And just make sure introduce yourself for the record and as soon as you're ready. Oh, also we've been joined by Council Member Lappin here today.

[Pause]

JEFFREY CHESTER: Good morning
Chair Weprin, Council Members, my name is Jeffrey
Chester, I am the attorney for Lucille Roberts.

| 1 | SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 29 |
|----|----------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | With me today is Dan Siegel of the planning firm |
| 3 | of AE Com. In addition |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: [] Hold on one |
| 5 | second, Mr. Chester. We want to make sure that |
| 6 | you get full view on television so |
| 7 | MR. CHESTER: Okay, excellent. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Good. |
| 9 | Good to go. |
| 10 | MR. CHESTER: Okay, in addition to |
| 11 | Mr. Siegel I have with me, behind me, is Jenny |
| 12 | Pollack who is the Queens district manager for |
| 13 | Lucille Roberts, which has several clubs in the |
| 14 | borough of Queens. I think initially what I'm |
| 15 | going to do is I'm going to have Dan take you |
| 16 | through some of the board so you can see |
| 17 | physically what the rezoning consists of, which is |
| 18 | five lots south on the east side of Bell |
| 19 | Boulevard, south of the Long Island Railroad |
| 20 | tracks and then I'll go into a little bit of the |
| 21 | history and the reason why we're here and why we |
| 22 | need this approval. But I want Dan to take you |
| 23 | through it, sort of physically, what's involved |
| 24 | here. |

25 DAN SIEGEL: Thank you, Jeff. Good

2 morning Council Members.

[Pause]

MR. SIEGEL: Yes, thank you for having us today. This is a rezoning, as Jeff said, on the east side of Bell Boulevard between the Long Island Railroad tracks and 42nd Avenue, 42nd Avenue or Street. It consists of five lots, all developed with one to three story buildings, approximately 13,500 square feet of land area developed with approximately 26,000 square feet of floor area. The underlying zoning is R6B, which allows a 2.0 FAR and the contextual district is currently C12 and the proposed rezoning is to take the--I'm sorry, the commercial district is C12 and the proposed rezoning is the commercial overlay to C22.

Of note, the community was concerned with some spot zoning, however this is not one property but five properties and this rezoning will allow the applicant to forgo back to the Board of Standards and Appeals, which Mr. Chester will review in a moment, to obtain a special permit to legalize the existing physical culpers [phonetic] establishment. The rezoning

4

5 6

7

,

9

11

10

13

12

1415

16

18

17

1920

21

22

24

23

25

will also bring into conformance a couple of existing driving school uses on the upper floors of the other existing buildings on the rezoning area. We worked with City Planning on the boundaries of the rezoning area to make sure that these other lots were brought into conformance.

The other issue the community brought up was, there were concerns was upzoning. However, as Department of City Planning correctly noted at their hearing as well, this is not an upzoning application. The FAR will remain 2.0 allowing the same amount of floor area as existing as proposed. The difference is the allowable uses. In addition to the applicant going forward, being able to obtain the special permit with the BSA some additional uses in C2 districts are allowed further in C1 consisting of use group 7, 8, 9 and 14, which are some additional, more limited commercial uses such as home maintenance and repair and some other uses that really would not occur here, such as bowling alleys or waterfront activities.

With that, I'm going to hand this back to Jeffrey Chester unless you have any

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 questions for me.

[off mic]

4 CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: ...to Chester?

5 MR. CHESTER: Sure. I just wanted

to talk a little bit about the history and why we're here. Lucille Roberts originally released a site in 1993, which is 17 years ago. It's quite a long time. I believe as most of you know, you can't do a gym, what we colloquially refer to as a gym or fitness club in the city without a special permit. It defines a physical culture establishment and you need a special permit from the Board of Standards and Appeals. At the time they came in in 1993 they did apply for a special permit from the Board of Standards and Appeals. While that application was pending at the BSA, that section of Bell Boulevard was downzoned from C4 to C1 and for whatever reason, through a quirk of the zoning resolution, special permits of physical culture establishments are not allowed in C1 districts, which BSA dismissed the case for lack of jurisdiction and we were stuck. Nothing happened for several years except that the site

continued to collect violations, ECB violations,

2 criminal court summonses and fines.

In the earlier part of this decade an application was made for a variance at the BSA and we were told that that application had no real chance of approval because we would never make the B finding of 7221 of the zoning resolution, which requires that you can't, but for the zoning change you can't have a reasonable return and that just wasn't a realistic argument to make on Bell Boulevard, which is a very active retail commercial strip. So that application was thrown.

We weren't left with many options except this final last option to legalize this business. And I guess one of the questions that may come up is, you know, why that just try somewhere else. And the truth is we did. Lucille Roberts did look for others space in the areas but there was nothing in size that could meet their needs at a price point that they felt could work. And this is one of their most, if not the most, successful club in Queens. It benefits approximately 250 women every day. And it's a very active club and one of their more profitable clubs. So we've been trying to do everything we

after the fact.

can to get this legalized. And as I said this is really the last chance. And if this gets approved by the Council and rezoned, we'll be able to then go back to the BSA, apply for the special permit for physical culture establishment, finally get our certificate of occupancy and public assembly permit and have a fully legal business 17 years

That's basically why we're here today. But as Dan mentioned, there area couple of other existing businesses within the five lots that are actually operating illegally. One is a trade school, which is not permitted in a C1 zone and the other is a spa salon, a Reinys [phonetic] spa salon, that's also a physical culture establishment and would require a permit to be operating legally. That's our hope that we can eventually get this business legalized and operate as the good citizens we'd like to be.

I think the people in the community are happy with Lucille Roberts in general and the service we provide. The local Bayside Business

Improvement District was a very enthusiastic supporter. One of the reasons being we're one of

| 2 | the | few | businesses | that | draw | street | retail | traffic |
|---|-----|-----|------------|------|------|--------|--------|---------|
|---|-----|-----|------------|------|------|--------|--------|---------|

3 during the day, which is a problem for Bell

4 Boulevard. But basically that's the essence of my

5 presentation. Any questions I would be glad to...

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very

7 much. I'm going to call on Council Member

8 Halloran who represents the site. I know he's

9 familiar with the location although obviously

10 neither he nor I are members of Lucille Roberts.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Thank you
12 for pointing that out Mr. Chairman, I appreciate

it, although I could certainly use a little more

14 time in the gym. I am very familiar with this

15 area. This is one of the most active of our

16 shopping districts that are left. It's still low,

17 quite quaint and the community board expressed

18 some reservation. This business has been there

19 for a very long time. In fact, this business was

20 here when I owned a bar up the block from it on

21 | Bell Boulevard so I'm well aware of the

22 constituents that it serves. And in this

23 particular instance the community board requested

24 that a restrictive declaration be put into effect.

25 This is going to be benefiting three of the five

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

lots there directly which have non-conforming

businesses because of the zoning alterations that

have been made. Necessary zoning alterations for

the rest of the community, but for this, a

6 definite oversight.

I have a letter from the Bayside Village Business Improvement District, which is the supervising group there, as well as the Bayside Business Association. They have written on behalf of this applicant Lucille Roberts to indicate that they would support this change. so my position has been and will continue to be that they are a business that the city can be proud of. They are good neighbors. They take care of what they need to and so long as they comply with the request of the community board to file that restrictive declaration then I have no reason not to support them going forward. And I would hope that they are in contact with the councils for the other two non-conforming businesses and that they will inform them that they should be reaching out to me because only Lucille Roberts has actually done that. Lucile Roberts was good enough to meet with me early on

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 in process when I came into office but the other

3 two businesses did not and so certainly I'm not

4 going to hold Lucille Roberts up for that but they

5 should strongly recommend that the other two

6 businesses come see me.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr.

8 Halloran. Ms. Reyna.

COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to associate myself with the comments of Council Member Halloran and just, you know, congratulate the Lucille Roberts establishment for not only finally after 16, 17 years you mentioned? Seeing an obstacle and achieving the goal of legalizing their status in the neighborhood and being a good neighbor and bringing on to other businesses in the best interest of doing business with the city. It's a shame that it's taking this long and these are some of the obstacles that we have to look into for small businesses in the City of New York to get through are these hurdlers and how do we shorten that timeframe.

I think it's atrocious that it's taken 17 years for something as simple as a

Store with a second story yoga studio and a

MR. SIEGEL: Yes, Parker's Hardware

24

25

| 1 | SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 39 |
|----|----------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | driving school. The next lot over is |
| 3 | COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: [] Liquor |
| 4 | store. |
| 5 | MR. CHESTER: Liquor store. |
| 6 | MR. SIEGEL: Is it a liquor store |
| 7 | or is it a Benjamin Moore Paints? |
| 8 | MR. CHESTER: Benjamin Moore Paints |
| 9 | and then the liquor store. |
| 10 | MR. SIEGEL: Yeah, the paint store |
| 11 | with the driving school above. The next lot over |
| 12 | is Lucille Roberts Health Club, which occupies the |
| 13 | entire building. And the final lot over next to |
| 14 | the railroad tracks I believe is the |
| 15 | MR. CHESTER: Spa, Rainey's Spa. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Mr. Halloran. |
| 17 | COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: And then |
| 18 | there's the Long Island Rail Road, which it sits |
| 19 | on top of. That is the Bayside station of the |
| 20 | Long Island Rail Road which meets there at that |
| 21 | intersection and is the Passover to the other |
| 22 | buildings. |
| 23 | MR. SIEGEL: No, though, this |
| 24 | rezoning does not include that |
| 25 | COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: [] Does |

street.

the morning, I think parking's not that big of an issue. That's morning is their heavy time anyway to getting street parking at that point in time is not that difficult, I don't believe, on the

COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: I don't know that I would agree with that but I won't argue that. I know that we have a lot of activity on Bell Boulevard overall but I was just curious to know what they're doing. Is there a long term parking plan for that commercial areas so they can be viable.

COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: [] Mr.

Chairman, if Mr. Halloran could jump in. We've actually been fighting with two different groups, the MTA being one of them, which has the property behind the municipal lot on 41st, which we're attempting to expand out. Remember we discussed that so we're still pushing for them to continue to expand it. We just got the DOT, thanks to work I did with Council Member Ignizio, to remove the parking restrictions, alternate side. You know, we haven't had a street cleaner for 20 years but somehow we had the alternate side parking

| 1 | SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 42 |
|----|----------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | regulations there. So we just got that removed |
| 3 | about a month ago. And as they're expanding and |
| 4 | improving the Business Improvement District, they |
| 5 | are also looking to continue to develop the |
| 6 | parking, both municipal and potentially private, |
| 7 | in the area so that's actually stuff that is |
| 8 | underway. |
| 9 | COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Okay, I was |
| 10 | just curious to see where that is. |
| 11 | COUNCIL MEMBER HALLORAN: Thank |
| 12 | you. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr. |
| 14 | Halloran. The tour of Bell Boulevard is over? |
| 15 | Good. Good, well thank you gentlemen very much. |
| 16 | We're going to move to close this hearing. Now |
| 17 | we'll move to couple the items before us today. |
| 18 | That is Land Use numbers 278, 279, remember 280 is |
| 19 | off the agenda and we're going to add 286. So |
| 20 | those three items; 278, 279 and 286 are coupled. |
| 21 | I'm going to call on the counsel Carol Shine to |
| 22 | please read the roll. |
| 23 | COUNSEL: Chair Weprin. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Aye. |
| 25 | COUNSEL: Council Member Rivera. |

| 1 | SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 43 |
|----|----------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | COUNCIL MEMBER RIVERA: I vote aye. |
| 3 | COUNSEL: Council Member Reyna. |
| 4 | COUNCIL MEMBER REYNA: I vote aye. |
| 5 | COUNSEL: Council Member Comrie. |
| 6 | COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Aye. |
| 7 | COUNSEL: Council Member Seabrook. |
| 8 | COUNCIL MEMBER SEABROOK: Aye. |
| 9 | COUNSEL: Council Member Vann. |
| 10 | [off mic] |
| 11 | COUNSEL: Council Member Garodnick. |
| 12 | COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Aye. |
| 13 | COUNSEL: Council Member Lappin. |
| 14 | COUNCIL MEMBER LAPPIN: Aye. |
| 15 | COUNSEL: Council Member Vacca. |
| 16 | COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Aye. |
| 17 | [Pause] |
| 18 | COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: While we're |
| 19 | waiting on a vote total, just to let members know. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Mr. Comrie |
| 21 | with a public service announcement. |
| 22 | COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: Yeah, I'm |
| 23 | sorry to interrupt. Just to let members know, we |
| 24 | are not going to hold the Land Use meeting |

tomorrow. We're going to defer until Tuesday due

| 1 | SUB COMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 44 |
|----|----------------------------------------------------|
| 2 | to the impending snow storm, just to be on the |
| 3 | safe side with everyone. So you don't have to |
| 4 | schlep from Staten Island. |
| 5 | [off mic] |
| 6 | COUNCIL MEMBER COMRIE: So we can |
| 7 | all man our plows tomorrow so it will be 10:00 on |
| 8 | Tuesday. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr. |
| 10 | Comrie. Back to the roll. |
| 11 | COUNSEL: Council Member Ignizio. |
| 12 | COUNCIL MEMBER IGNIZIO: I vote |
| 13 | aye. |
| 14 | COUNSEL: By a vote of ten in the |
| 15 | affirmative, none in the negative and no |
| 16 | abstentions, the aforementioned items are approved |
| 17 | and referred to the full committee. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you, Ms. |
| 19 | Shine. We appreciate that. Thank you members of |
| 20 | the Committee, this meeting is now adjourned. |
| 21 | [Bangs gavel] |

I, Amber Gibson, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Signature Au Kri

Date ____January 26, 2011_