1	SUBCOMMITTE	EE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 1
2	CITY COUNCIL CITY OF NEW YORK	
3		x
4	TRANSCRIPT OF THE	
5	Of the	
6	SUBCOMMITTEE ON Z	CONING AND
7	FRANCHISES	X
8		JANUARY 23, 2024
9		Start: 11:05 A.M. Recess: 1:21 P.M.
11	HEID AT.	250 BROADWAY-COMMITTEE ROOM, 16 <sup>TH</sup>
12	11115 1111	FLOOR
13	BEFORE:	Kevin C. Riley Chairperson
14	COUNCIL MEMBERS:	
15	COUNCIL MEMBERS.	Shaun Abreu David M. Carr
16		Kamillah Hanks Crystal Hudson
17		Francisco P. Moya Lincoln Restler
18		Yusef Salaam Lynn C. Schulman
19		Sandra Ung
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 2
2	APPEARANCES
3	Richard Lobel
4	Sheldon Lobel
5	Nick Liberis Project Architect
6	Bishop Robert V. Butler
7	Glory Tabernacle Church
8	Jose Lainez
9	Kevin Williams Environmental Consultant with Geo Environmental
10	Bishop Eric Figueroa
11	New Life Tabernacle
12	Marco Keio
13	Pastor James Neville
14	Leola Holmes 77 <sup>th</sup> Precinct Council
15	Gregory Smith
16	Chris Williams
17	Bill Oelsner
18	Charles E. Boulbol
19	Michelle de la Uz Executive Director of the Fifth Avenue Committee
20	Stephen Fabian
21	Program Manager of Real Estate and Planning for Evergreen Inc
22	Carmelo Piazza
23	Brooklyn Pre-School of Science

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 3	
2	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)	
3	Daniel Wong	
4	Community Preservation Corporation, CPC	
5	Eric Palatnik Attorney at Law representing Whitestone Lanes	
6	Sara Penenberg Political Coordinator at SEIU 32BJ  Arlene Fleishman President of the Mitchell-Linden Civic Association	
7		
8		
9		
10	Eugene Kelty Chair of Community Board 7	
11	Marilyn Bitterman Mitchell-Linden Civic Association	
12		
13	Charles Apelian Vice Chair and Land Use Chair Committee Board 7	
14	Christian Batres(SP?)	
15	Local 157	
16	Richard Basc Akerman LLP	
17	Judith Gallent	
18	Kent Riverview LLC-applicant	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

SERGEANT AT ARMS: This is a microphone check for the Committee on Zoning and Franchise recorded on January 23, 2024 in the 16<sup>th</sup> Room, hearing room by Nazly Paytuvi.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Good morning and welcome to the New York City Council Hearing of the Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchise. At this time, can everybody please silence your cellphones. At this time and going forward, no one is to approach the dais. I repeat, no one is to approach the dais. Thank you for your cooperation. Chair, we are ready to begin.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: [GAVEL] Good morning everyone and welcome to the meeting of the Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchise. I am Council Member Kevin Riley, Chair of the Subcommittee. This morning, I have been joined by Council Member Abreu, Schulman, Carr, Ung, Hudson and virtually by Council Member Moya.

Before we get started with today's agenda, I wanted to note that we are starting a new legislative session. And I look forward to working with each Committee Member on the projects we will be hearing and voting on.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

Today, we will hold hearings for five proposals.

The first public hearing is a proposal for a mixeduse project in Brooklyn within the projected rezoning
area of the ongoing neighborhood study focused on
Atlantic Avenue in Council Member Hudson's District.

We will then hear a proposal for another residential
project in Flushing Queens followed by a proposal for
a life science development project in East Harlem.

The fourth hearing concerns a mixed-use residential
project in Jamaica Queens.

The fifth and last hearing will be another mixeduse residential project but this time in Williamsburg
Queens. So we have a full agenda for our first
meeting with proposed projects in four of the five
boroughs. I now turn it over to Subcommittee Counsel
to review the hearing procedures.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you Chair. I am

Counsel to the Subcommittee and this meeting is being held in hybrid format. Members of the public who wish to testify may testify in person or via Zoom.

Members of the public wishing to testify remotely may register by visiting the New York City Council website at <a href="https://www.council.nyc.gov/landuse">www.council.nyc.gov/landuse</a> to sign up.

But for those of you here in the Chambers, please see

one of the Sergeant at Arms to prepare and submit a

3 speaker card if you have not already done so. And

4 when you submit your speaker card, please indicate

5 the project you are seeking to testify regarding.

6 Members of the public may also view a livestream

7 broadcast of this meeting at the Council's website.

8 When you are called to testify before our

9 Subcommittee, if you are joining us remotely, you

10 will remain muted until recognized by the Chair or

11 | myself to speak. When you are recognized, your

12 | microphone will be unmuted. Please take a moment to

13 check your device and confirm that your mic is on

14 before you begin speaking.

1

15 We will limit public testimony to two minutes per

16 witness. If you have additional testimony you would

17 | like the Subcommittee to consider or if you have

18 | written testimony you would like to submit, instead

19 of appearing before the Subcommittee, please email it

20 to landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. Please indicate

21 the LU Number and the project name in the subject

22 | line of your email. We request that witnesses

joining us remotely remain in the meeting until

excused by the Chair as Council Members may have

25 questions.

2.3

2.2

2.3

Chair Riley will now continue with today's agenda items.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Counsel. I will now open the first public hearing on LU's 6, 7, and 8 relating to 962 Pacific Street Rezoning Proposal in Council Member Hudson's District in Brooklyn. This is an unusual proposal because it is seeking to rezone property that is located within the proposed Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan.

This plan is projected to certify and begin the official public review process in just a few months this spring. Despite the efforts to comprehensively rezone this area of the city, the applicant is seeking the individual rezoning before the proposed comprehensive plan is finalized. The requested rezoning is from a manufacturing district M1-1 to a mixed-use district M1-4/47A that will facilitate a mixed-use project where approximately 150 apartments. This project would involve the mapping of a mandatory inclusionary housing over the rezoned area which will require the 38 to 45 of the units be income restricted.

The applicant is also seeking a special permit to reduce the number of required parking spaces. For

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 2 anyone wishing to testify on these items remotely, if 3 you have not already done so, you must register online and you may do that now by visiting the 4 Council's website at council.nyc.gov/landuse. 5 once again, for anyone with us in person, please see 6 7 one of the Sergeants to prepare and submit a speakers card. If you prefer to submit written testimony, you 8 can always do so by emailing us at 9 landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. I would now like 10 11 to give the microphone to Council Member Hudson to 12 give her remarks. 13 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: Thank you so much Chair Riley for the opportunity to comment on this 14 15 application, which as you noted is quite unusual. 16 Between 2018 and 2022, at least eight individual 17 development projects have sought rezonings between 18 Vanderbilt and Nordstrom Avenues along Atlantic 19 Avenue and the corridors surrounding streets. 20 Combined, these projects are projected to create over 2,000 residential units. However this is a 21 completely untenable way to plan for a neighborhood. 2.2 2.3 This type of uncoordinated development in such a concentrated area means there's no comprehensive plan 24

to ensure that the needs of long-standing residents

2 are met. Everything from infrastructure, open space,

3 safe pedestrian circulation, an economic development

4 plan, and most importantly a thorough anti-

5 displacement strategy that will allow us to build

6 necessary housing without pricing out our most

7 vulnerable neighbors.

2.2

2.3

I will remind this Committee that this part of my district has seen significant decreases in Black households. A trend that is true across the city but acutely exacerbated the long list corridor. Over the past two years and during my campaign I have stated clearly that this neighborhood needs a comprehensive development plan. It must not be rezoned in a piecemeal approach project by project and a comprehensive plan is exactly what I have been leading in partnership with the local community and the Department of City Planning.

The effort to create a comprehensive neighborhood plan was officially announced in April of 2022 under the name of Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan or AAMUP. And in January of 2023, my office kicked off an extensive community engagement process. We held 12 public meetings with over 1,000 individuals in attendance including issue area focus groups. The

2 Plan Steering Committee continues to meet regularly

3 as the project moves forward. Based on this

4 extensive community engagement process, the

5 Department of City Planning put forth a comprehensive

6 draft rezoning proposal this past December and the

7 formal public review of the city's proposal will

8 start this spring.

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

As you can see, a tremendous amount of work of community planning has gone into preparing a thoughtful thorough plan for this section of Atlantic Avenue where the applicant is proposing this development project. AAMUP has made significant progress and should have a final plan in place by the end of this year or early next year. This process will yield a comprehensive rezoning, capital economic and residential plan, which is what this neighborhood needs. Despite the immense progress we've made over the last year toward establishing a comprehensive neighborhood plan, the process is not over. spring, the Administration will present its final proposal to the community and City Council triggering the ULURP. This is a vital part of this process and it should not be shortchanged. The current application is seeking to get ahead of the final

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Council Member Hudson. Counsel, please call the first panel for this item.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: The first panel consists of Richard Lobel and Nick Liberis.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Counsel, please administer the affirmation.

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Please raise your right hand 3 and state your name for the record.

RICHARD LOBEL: Richard Lobel.

NICK LIBERIS: Nick Liberis.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this Subcommittee and in your answers to all Council Member questions?

RICHARD LOBEL: I do.

NICK LIBERIS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. For the viewing public, if you need an accessible version of this presentation, please send the email request to <a href="mailto:landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov">landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov</a>. And now the applicant team may begin. Panelists, please state your name and organization for the record before you begin.

RICHARD LOBEL: Good morning. My name is Richard Lobel of Sheldon Lobel PC. I represent 962 Pacific Street in this matter joined by Nick Liberis, the Project Architect. With me as well are Nadine and Bill Oelsner who are the applicants here as well as Kevin Williams, the Environmental Consultant.

2.2

2.3

So, we're going to run through the presentation and are happy to answer specific questions of the Committee. Uhm, as we look at the potential rezoning here at 962 Pacific, we note that this process did not begin for us in 2022 when the neighborhood rezoning was announced. And it did not begin in 2021 but actually dated back to 2020.

2.2

2.3

So, in September of 2020, this applicant submitted a pre-application statement for this rezoning and while other applications went forward and ahead in soon over two years, this applicant was asked to wait several times. And so, by the time that announcement was made in April 2022, this application had already been in process for close to two and a half years.

And so, the issue now with asking the applicant wait as we again are about to go through the materials is that we know because we've seen before through area one rezonings, that while they do reflect the goals of the community, they're not necessarily timely in producing housing. We look at the Gowanus rezoning right now, which was approved in 2021 and there has not been a unit that has been produced pursuant to that rezoning. There is

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 excavation; more than half of those sites being built

3 pursuant to that rezoning are being excavated but

4 | there's no units that are online right now and we're

5 in 2024 and those units won't be online probably

6 until 2026. So, that's a five-year gap and during

7 that five-year gap, there's a housing crisis and we

8 all know it because we all see it and we see people

9 every day when we pass on the streets of New York

10 City that don't have housing and that there is the

11 demand that's created from this lack of supply is

12 directly affecting them.

Next slide please.

So, while we understand and are respectful of the goals of the community and the stated goals of the Council Member, indeed we could not be more respectful having attended every meeting with regards to AAMUP as well as of Community Board 8's Land Use Committee. We do feel very strongly about this, about the opportunity to proceed forward, not jumping ahead of the line but after having been patient and

So, what is this application? This application is for rezoning. It would rezone the existing M1-1 District for this site to a mixed-use district of M1-

waiting our turn to allow our application to proceed.

2 4/R7A. The R7A residential equivalent here would

3 produce a potential nine story building with

4 approximately 153,000 square feet of floor area, 150

5 dwelling units, of which 38 to 45 would be

6 permanently affordable. Roughly 8,500 square feet of

7 community facility space, 19,000 square feet of

8 manufacturing space and approximately 8,000 square

9 | feet of commercial space. Importantly as will be

10 noted further in the presentation, the production of

11 this mixed-use building fulfills many important goals

12 set forth by the community board as well as the AAMUP

13 proposal in creating housing and creating

14 | affordability. But also importantly, in recognition

15 of Community Board 8's longstanding efforts in terms

16 of [00:12:47] and creating good job generating uses

17 | at the site and creating an early childhood community

18 | center which is nothing that has been offered or

in a gap in that zoning. Next slide please.

19 provided before by any of the other rezonings within

20 the R7A District.

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

This project area is currently located between R7A districts, so as the Committee will see, there is a continuity of R7A here that exists on several blocks, on multiple blocks and this is merely filling

2.2

2.3

So, the next slide is a zoning map. Tough to see here but — and we're going to see it as we go to the area map but basically the R7A here is one, a lot amongst a number of lots which is zone M1-1 and a C R7A. But you can see from the circled area, again residential zoning both on the north side of Civic Street in this area on the south side of Pacific Street in this area, as well as of course along Atlantic and we can talk about each of those rezonings in turn.

The next slide I think is very telling with regards to this area and what we see. So, you can see this entire block front and then you're able to see the area in the dotted lines. The dotted lines represent our site. And so, to the west of our site, there's already a portion that's highlighted in red that is already zoned R7A. It was rezoned R7A in a prior rezoning in the Grand and Pacific Streets Rezoning.

But here, this would allow us to provide for R7A zoning on this site and I think the next slide, the area map really tells you the story extremely well, because you can see to the east of Clason what happened here, there's 26 lots on this frontage of

2 Pacific Street between Grand Avenue and 200 feet east

3 of Clason.

2.2

2.3

So, in those — in that over a block of lots along Pacific Street, there's 26 lots and of those, 25 are zoned R7A except for ours. So, this is clearly not a case where we were introducing something which is not accepted, which hasn't been accepted by the area, by the community board. In deed what we're doing is providing something which allows for a context which respects the fact that the Community Board and the area and the Council has already created R7A on 25 out of 26 blocks — uh lots, excuse me.

The next slide demonstrates photographs of the area, again demonstrating that we are contextual within the surrounding area. And then, I think that I would close my portion for now just with regards to some of the prior rezonings that were accomplished on the site in comparing our rezoning to their rezoning. So, the next slide shows the other R7A rezonings in this area, how those were created in 2019, 1010 and 1050 Pacific Street were rezoned to R7A.

In 2020, there was a rezoning on Grand and Pacific which rezoned the property adjacent to ours as well as a small portion of our property to R7A and

3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

as well as the 1034 to 1042, which rezoned a portion of Pacific Street on that site to R7A.

When we look at the other neighborhood rezonings, next page please, we can see how our rezoning compares to those rezonings. All of those rezonings created R7A. Everyone of them created - they went to an M1-1 District and they created R7A zoning. 25 of 26 lots, so what's the difference? The basic FAR height bulk remains the same but of all those units that were created and of all the uses at those buildings, M-Crown space was not required on any of those wholly RFA zonings, while a small portion of the 979 Pacific Street Rezoning required 25 percent of ground floor space to be M-Crowned. That was in terms of the R7D portion as that was a split site.

So, of all the rezonings that were rezoned to R7A, none of those had required M-Crown uses, which is a vital goal of the community board here. regards to family size units, all of them allowed studio units and with regards to any restrictions, none of them were restrictive to declaration or by community benefits agreement. What's the difference between those rezonings and our rezonings? Our rezonings provide for no studios. An important goal

to an area which seeks larger units for families. Our rezoning importantly is going to be restricted by Community Benefits agreement, which has already been partially negotiated and would be entered into titles to the property. And I think most importantly with regards to the M-Crown space, with regards to other sites, there was no required M-Crown space. we're creating 30,000 square feet. We're partnering with important community partners like Evergreen, who is going to administer our manufacturing space, create good, high paying jobs for local workers in the area and really actually create something here which is going to be deeply utilized and beneficial to this local area. In addition to which, 10,000 square feet of this would end up being an early childhood community center. Nadine and Bill feel strongly about this. They have backgrounds in They are of the area. They're not coming education. into the area and it is a goal of theirs to allow for local families and mothers to be able to have their kids housed in this early childhood education center. They're not creating problems here, they're creating solutions to longstanding problems in the community,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 AAM

which is why I think that you can feel that we are very passionate about this rezoning going forward.

And lastly, which regards to the DCP proposed rezoning and AAMUP, we waited and we waited patiently to see what was going to be the result of the AAMUP And so, the next slide demonstrates what a proposal. comparison is to their buildings and our buildings. And you know, what is the true comparison? produce bigger buildings. Their buildings could exist up to a 5.0 FAR. Ours would be at 4.6. We get more square footage, 168,000 square feet. They would basically have a taller building by three stories amazingly. Most of the time that we go to community boards and have these discussions, we talk about height is an issue and right now again, while it is influx, the proposed building height of these mixeduse buildings would be 125 feet. And so, uhm, you know it's really, our building would fit literally fit within that building that would be created by AAMUP with the exception being that we would have a greater number of affordable supportive, affordable units as well as residential units in our building versus the building that would be created under AAMUP.

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 So again, we offer a very strong comparison to 3 those properties and with the primary difference being that we'll be able to proceed on a shovel-ready 4 site as soon as a rezoning is potentially approved 5 because we're ready to go. The last one, the last 6 7 page that I will discuss just has again the comparison to AAMUP. It creates new affordable 8 housing check. Creates new neighborhood services 9 including educational services check, creates new 10 11 public open space importantly a garden to the rear of 12 this property will create available open space, a 13 desired resource by the community at large as well as a community board check and expands career pathways 14 15 and job opportunities through the creation of 16 commercial and manufacturing space, unique to the R7A 17 rezonings here. We are binding this property to 18 provide M-Crown uses.

With that, I would pass the microphone to Nick Liberis who can discuss some of the plans and architectural aspects of the design. Nick?

NICK LIBERIS: Okay, thank you Rich. Thank you all for your time. So, what we have here is a site that's over 300 feet long and 110 feet deep and what this lets us do is mass everything towards the east

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

of the site. You can see on this site plan over here, that the maximum height of the building is achieved towards the east end of this site and to the west, we have an R7A, which is going to probably be massed up very low because of the size and shape of that site. So, it gives us this opportunity to make the west side of the building lower, which makes for a very nice streetscape. We put all of the entrances to the community facilities that Rich mentioned on this low side also and uhm, you know as Rich said, we are nine floors high. We have about 150 units. have the eight and a half thousand square feet for the children's - for the educational facility and we have about eight and a half thousand square feet for commercial and then, we have all of the light manufacturing, which we're also providing. So, next slide please. Next slide.

So, this is the front elevation of the building facing Pacific. You can see on the right-hand side over here, you have all of the entrances for all those aforementioned programs and the main entry for the residential portion is in the center. Next slide please. This is the cellar floor plan. This has been uh, this has been over to Evergreen to curate.

2 We have you know almost 20,000 square feet which has

3 good access to the street, which has good access to

4 loading facilities, which are placed on the opposite

5 end of the building from all of the community

6 facility entrances. Next slide please.

2.2

2.3

This is the ground floor over here. You can see that we have the entry to the M-Crown over here on the far west side, right next to the child — uh to the early development center. You have the residential lobby and then you have the commercial space over there, which is right next to the loading. Next slide please.

One other thing which is kind of unique about this site is that the extra depth in this length, it give us the opportunity to do home offices in almost every single unit. So, you can see here in the red color, we have sizable home offices and we think that this is something which is, which is going to be really valued by the community also. Next slide please.

So, this just takes you through some typical floor plans as you go up. You can see everything is two bed, three bed, you know there's a few one's and everything is very capacious and we worked over the

1 years with this Community Board, with several 2 3 stakeholders and we were very, very careful to take everything to heart that had been communicated and 4 you know I think we all feel very strongly that this 5 proposal is as in keeping as anything that we've seen 6 from this area with a regard to the M-Crown proposal 7 and the new successor, the AAMUP. So, you know we're 8 9 hoping that uhm, that we can move forward with this because we really think it would be a huge boom to 10 11 the neighborhood for something like this to happen. 12 Thank you.

RICHARD LOBEL: With that, we're happy to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you so much. Richard, I didn't recognize you and the look today.

RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you Chair.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: I'm just going to ask a few Council Member Hudson had to step out to questions. a press conference that we're having right now, so that's why she couldn't be here but I'm going to ask some questions. Council Member Hudson has put in a lot of effort and time in preparing a comprehensive plan for this neighborhood and local community. very investing in the finalizing this plan. Given

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

how far along this comprehensive plan and effort has progressed and that DCP has publicly stated intends on certifying its proposal for a comprehensive plan by this spring, why are you still trying to get ahead of this community planning effort?

RICHARD LOBEL: So, as I said before, uhm we have an applicant here who has been around for over four years and I think that if the applicant was merely concerned with getting a building up and didn't have deeper concerns, I think that we wouldn't even be here anymore but frankly, given the applicants long standing history in the area, which dates back decades. This family has been here for decades and the fact that there is a lag between when the rezoning will be approved as we demonstrated both in Gowanus and other rezonings and when these units will be produced. I think that they feel that in fairness, both for themselves as well as to those community members who don't necessarily have an opportunity to live in the district and don't have an opportunity to necessarily even participate in the process, that's why they are pushing so hard to do this.

2.2

2.3

To think of it as cutting in line I think is the wrong way to categorize an applicant who has really been very patient and has been attentive to what's been sought by the community in terms of the AAMUP plan and at the end of the day, what would really be the harm here, the AAMUP plan, the importance of having that established was to see what would be allowed and what would be created. And so, the building here that would be created is a smaller building, is a building which requires M-Crown uses as desired by the community and is a building which produces as far as the margins, more units and affordability than AAMUP.

So, this is not something where we are putting in a zoning district, which came out of nowhere, it makes no sense. As the Committee as seen, 25 of the surrounding 26 lots are already zoned R7A. This is a vetted, approved zoning district and so, yes AAMUP is not finally approved but we are well within their guidelines and the difference here is the opportunity to create those units sooner rather than later.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: So, uh Rich, stating that it's not finally approved, you're stating that's in the guidelines. You know as anybody, ULURP

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

27

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

applications can change, especially when it gets to the Council and we vote on them. Why does the applicant feel like it should be prioritized over the public review of the comprehensive plan if this application could change when it gets to the Council?

RICHARD LOBEL: Yeah, so a good question but when I look at the envelope and the uses that are required pursuant to AAMUP, I see a building which currently stands at three stories taller than our building. a building that currently stands at thousands of square feet greater than our building and one which basically understandably given the outlook of city planning, doesn't restrict any uses at this site. don't see necessarily even after deliberation that these buildings in AAMUP will necessarily be reduced by greater than three stories or in this case, thousands of square feet and admittedly City Planning doesn't like to condition uses on buildings. understand the realities of business and retail and the fact that City Planning as a whole doesn't want to limit your uses. The applicant here is voluntarily doing so.

So, understanding that that's not currently a part of AAMUP, the applicant here is saying we're

going to enter agreements into our property that are going to require these job generating uses and not only that but we've got Evergreen, which is the local industrial advocacy group to ensure that these uses aren't just good uses but are great uses. So, I think that's the reason that despite the fact that of course there may be changes to AAMUP, we're still not only well within it but in some ways, exceed the opportunities provided for the site.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: I want to go to the building; the new model that Nick pointed out. I'm very interested in the office space that you guys incorporated in each unit. Can you explain to me, did that come from uhm because Richard stated that you guys have been a part of the AAMUP process. So, did you hear that from community leaders? Like where did that thought process come to add the office space into each of these units?

NICK LIBERIS: It was more from the shape of the site because we had all this floor area and we had a deep site and we saw that we wanted to lower that right hand part of the site, so then we had some extra floor area. So, usually it's not the most efficient depth once you get passed like let's say 60

2 feet. So, when you add in the home offices, you get

3 to about 70 feet, 70 plus feet, but we saw that we

4 had the floor area. We saw that there was a demand

5 for this within the area and we just thought it would

6 be good and then COVID happens and it just seemed

7 like it was much like an appropriate thing. So, you

know everybody liked it. It does stuff but it was

9 actually coming from the shape of the site.

10 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Does each unit have this?

11 NICK LIBERIS: I think so at this point, yeah,

12 yup.

1

8

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: And from that space, you

14 couldn't produce another unit, like another room

15 maybe?

16 NICK LIBERIS: You can but you can't really use

17 | it for legal light in there because it's like stuck

18 | back like within the thing, within the unit so you're

19 ▮ always - you always have a limit with how many bays

20 that you have. You know so the width of the building

22  $\parallel$  you could put in. So, we could either prioritize

23 doing some more units and have some more rooms or we

24  $\parallel$  could do the bigger units with that more depth with

25 that home office.

2 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Alright, thank you.

NICK LIBERIS: Sure.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Does any Committee members have any questions? Council Member Abreu.

COUNCIL MEMBER ABREU: My question you sort of already gotten into it. Can you speak to how this plan fits neatly within the comprehensive plan and also speak to the differences of how it doesn't fall within that plan?

RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you Council Member Abreu.

So, I'm not sure whether we can still call up the last comparison slide, which would be prior to the plans and architectural plans. It would be two plans prior to the architectural calculations sheet. Uh, keep going. You'll see a list; it says comparison to DCP proposed rezoning. One more, thank you.

So, uhm with regards to the building itself, the physical plan to the property. For building in M1-4/R6A, which is arguably the comparable zoning district here, you would have a total FAR of 5.0 with a building of 168,000 square feet, as currently composed. Our building 4.6 FAR with 153,000 square feet. So, our building again, while AAMUP has not

2 been finalized is 15,000 square feet plus or minus

3 less.

2.2

2.3

Of that building, the 5.0 building would have a 3.9 FAR for residential. Our building would have a 4.06, extremely similar. With regards to nonresidential uses, uhm we would max out our commercial FAR and indeed provide additional square footage in the cellar, so our total square footage in terms of gross square feet is over 30,000 square feet for commercial and job generating uses. The building height for our proposal for a mixed-use building, the AAMUP proposal would allow for 125 feet. Our building would allow for 95 feet, three stories less.

Having been involved in five rezonings in this
Community Board since 2019, I can tell you that the
three stories of height is meaningful. And so, this
is more along the lines of what they've previously
approved in this district. In addition, again we
talked about City Planning and the fact that they
don't necessarily want to restrict nonresidential
uses, we are doing so to create high quality jobs,
job generating uses for people in the community and
with regards to affordability options, we would
actually — uh actually have expressed a desire to

approximately ten individuals in person who wish to

2 testify and another four individuals online who also

3 wish to testify.

2.2

2.3

For members of the public here to testify, please note that witnesses will generally be called in panels of three. If you are a member of the public signed up to testify on the proposal, please stand by when you hear your name being called and prepare to speak when the Chair says that you may begin. Please also note that once all panelists in your group have completed their testimony, if remotely, you will be removed from the meeting as a group and the next group of speakers will be introduced. Once removed, participants may continue to view the livestream broadcast of this hearing on the Council's website.

Because we have a mix of in person and online individuals who would like to testify, we're going to try to do two in person panels of three people and then switch it to the online registrants and then back to the in person.

So, for the first group of three individuals who are here in the room, Jose Lainez. Please excuse me if I am mispronouncing your name. Bishop Robert V. Butler, and Kevin Williams, please step up to the desk, to the table.

The other portion of it that makes it very personal for me is the city is unsecretly in a housing crisis and I am very familiar with the crisis of housing. Having had a good livelihood, it has been difficult to live in my neighborhood because it

2.2

2.3

24

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.2

2.3

has outpriced us. And so, I believe that this project would not only give us a great avenue of educating our children at the early stages of their life but also providing affordable housing for individuals who need it. The community is a great community and we've seen so many people displaced and so many people moved out of it because they cannot afford it and this project appears to be a project that helps to solve that problem for now and for years to come.

And so, I thank you for the opportunity to talk to you today and testify concerning this. I am in full support of this project. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Bishop. Jose.

JOSE LAINEZ: [SPEAKING IN OTHER LANGUAGE 00:37:46- [00:39:02].

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Jose. I just want to state on the record, we did not have an interpreter here, so we will begin Jose's testimony on the record and be able to translate that. So, thank you so much Jose. Uh Kevin.

KEVIN WILLIAMS: Kevin Williams with GZA, Geo
Environmental, I'm the Environmental Consultant that
prepared the environmental assessment for this

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

36 project and I want to just take a brief opportunity to give a little bit of background context to members of the commission relating to as Council Member Hudson noted, the displacement of African American communities and uh those that are socially and economically disadvantaged in this area. One of the things that's very important is the person that prepared the racial equator report to note is that is indeed true and the background context of that though is even though this area has underwent considerable rezonings along the Atlantic Avenue corridor, you know some decades back, as well as many of these private rezonings, none of those rezonings have been considered in terms of generation of affordable housing. None of the private rezonings along the Pacific or the Grand corridor were in place at the time that the census took account of this displacement.

None of the large scale R7 zonings along the Atlantic Avenue corridor had MIH and to my knowledge, none of them took advantage of the inclusionary housing bonus that was created during the time of those rezonings. So, what you're seeing is an organic displacement both through redevelopment that

- 2 did not include MIH and as well as a lot of the town
- 3 homes that surround this perimeter that converted
- 4 from multifamily homes back in the 80's and 90's to
- 5 single family higher income housing. And so, it's
- 6 very, very important to note that you're going to see
- 7 the infusion of MIH units related to the two
- 8 rezonings that have just recently come out of the
- 9 ground as well as this rezoning. That while it may
- 10 not displace the statistics in terms of percentages
- 11 of people displaced but it will increase the
- 12 numerical count of affordable units in the
- 13 | neighborhood, allowing people to remain and not be
- 14 displaced in the neighborhood.
- So, I wanted to provide that context from the
- 16 past development in this community district and
- 17 census.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Mr. Williams. This
- 19 panel is excused. Counsel, can you call the next
- 20 panel?
- 21 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yes Chair. The next panel
- 22 consists of Bishop Eric Figueroa, Marco Keio. Sorry
- 23 | if I'm mispronouncing your last name and Pastor James
- 24 Neville.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Do we have a Mario or Marco here? Somebody yeah, Marco, sorry Marco. It's okay, it's our eyes. Okay, first we'll have Bishop Eric Figueroa.

BISHOP ERIC FIGUEROA: Good morning distinguished Council Members. My name is Bishop Eric Figueroa and I am the Pastor and Founder of the New Life Tabernacle located in the 77th Precinct in the Crown Heights community of Brooklyn. I am here today to enthusiastically support the proposed project at 962 Pacific Street in Crown Heights, which will provide badly needed affordable housing in a community where too many have been priced out. And that will also feature a new childcare and educational facility in a neighborhood where there are too few options.

As someone who has been a pastor for 40 years, I appreciate how this project aligns with the needs of our vibrant community by prioritizing real and permanent affordability with units reserved for families with incomes that's low as \$50,000 or less as well as good paying jobs. Too often, I have seen long-time members of the community forced out because of the rising rents they can no longer afford. They return to community to attend service yet they cannot

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 39 call it their home. This is not something we should find acceptable.

Everyone in our congregation should be able to live near where they worship. Meanwhile, vacant lots bursting with potential and possibilities like the one at 962 Pacific have set follow for too long. Often this due to owners, faceless developers that can simply sit while waiting for perfect conditions or to sell it to the highest bidder.

Council, I submit to you that this 962 proposal is just what we need in our community. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Reverend Figueroa.

Next, we're going to have Marco.

MARCO KEIO: [SPEAKING IN OTHER LANGUAGE 00:44:48- [00:45:33].

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Gracias Marco and just for the record, I just want to state members of the public who wish to have an interpreter, you have to request that three days ahead and you could do that by emailing <a href="mailto:swerts@council.nyc.gov">swerts@council.nyc.gov</a> or mbenjamin@council.nyc.gov or you can call 212-788-6936. I just want to state that for the record. Thank you everyone. Pastor James Neville.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

PASTOR JAMES NEVILLE: Good morning. I also echo what Bishop has said, as a resident of Crown Heights for over 50 years, I also agree with Council Member Hudson about the displacement of so many of minorities in our community. Uhm, I'm the Pastor of Holly Temple of Prayer located within 77th Precinct Community Council in Crown Heights. I'm also the Vice Chair of the 77th Precinct of Clergy Council.

I'm here today to support the proposed project at 962 Pacific Street in Crown Heights. As a community resident, I appreciate how this project aligns with the needs of our vibrant community. Prioritizing real affordability, building much needed community space and resources and creating good paying jobs.

Nadine and Bill here; I had a 1985 Oldsmobile who their family had owned on Atlantic Avenue and that Oldsmobile had over 200,000 miles on it. I don't know if you know that 1985 Oldsmobile. You had one right then? And I used to take it to that Atlantic Avenue shop where their parents owned and I kind of missed it when that shop was no longer there because that '85 Oldsmobile with 200,000 miles, I could take it to that Oldsmobile dealer and get serviced and so I missed that dealership when they closed down, Bill

and Nadine. I just want you know the family has been

3 you know supportive of our community for decades and

4 this project represents the voices and values of the

5 neighborhood at a time when in addition to housing,

6 the jobs are desperately needed. We know the process

7 to immigration, what's going on at a time when we

8 need this.

1

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

So, as the Pastor, one of the clearest needs amongst our faith communities, access to affordable housing. Having seen so many individuals and families who have been you know displaced even in my block where I live at — sorry, I'm over time but we need this project desperately on 962 Pacific Street. Thank you and God Bless.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you so much Reverend.

I had to ask the Council where the Oldsmobile was, I didn't know, so thank you so much. Uhm, does any Committee Members have any questions for this panel? Alright, thank you so much.

PANEL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Counsel, can you please call the next panel?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yes Chair. The next panel — we're going to shift to the online attendees, so I am

2 calling - uh, the next panel will consist of Michelle

3 de la Uz, Stephen Fabian, Carmelo Piazza and Daniel

4 Wong. Starting with Michelle de la Uz, could you

5 please turn on your mic to testify.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Michelle, if you can hear me, you could please begin.

MICHELLE DE LA UZ: Great, thanks so much Chair and Committee. I appreciate the opportunity to testify. My name is Michelle de la Uz and I am the Executive Director of the Fifth Avenue Committee. The Fifth Avenue Committee is a 46-year-old nonprofit comprehensive community development corporation whose mission is to advance economic, social and racial justice. I've also been a member of AAMUP's Steering Committee, the Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use Plan Steering Committee and I'm here today to testify in support of 962 Pacific Street. And in particular, Fifth Avenue Committee was led to work with Council Member Hudson and the Oelsner's to get to it. Yes on this project as Council Richard Lobel noted, the Oelsner's have offered to do a community benefits agreement to memorialize the commitments that go beyond what is required under Mandatory Inclusionary Housing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Uhm, they've offered to increase the total number of affordable housing units in a communication to Community Board 8. They offered to go to 32 percent affordable overall. Obviously seven percent more than what is required under MIH Option 1. And also committed to deeper affordability, which I think is particularly important given the displacement that was mentioned earlier and is very much - has been present for a number of years. So, uhm, and I know one of the questions that the Chair asked and was really about, how does this project differ than what is proposed under the Atlantic Avenue mixed-use plan? And I'll just say that in particular that the commitment to a higher percent of overall affordability and a deeper affordability is something that could not be achieved if we wait for AAMUP because any, basically MIH, any changes to MIH would require citywide text amendment and obviously AAMUP is not -

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time has expired.

MICHELLE DE LA UZ: Including a citywide text amendment to change the affordability levels. So, I'm hoping that the committee will vote in favor and happy to answer any questions.

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 44 2 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Michelle. 3 we'll have Stephen. Fabian, yes, Stephen Fabian. COMMITTEE COUNSEL: 4 5 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Stephen Fabian next. If you 6 can hear me, please unmute. 7 Hello, my name is Stephen Fabian STEPHEN FABIAN: and I am Program Manager of Real Estate and Planning 8 9 for Evergreen Inc North Brooklyn Business Exchange. I'm here today to testify in support of the 962 10 11 Pacific Street Project on which Evergreen is part of the team as an advisor. 12 13 Evergreen is a nonprofit local economic development organization that champions 14 15 manufacturing, creative production, industrial service business in North Brooklyn and beyond. 16 17 this by primarily providing a range of free services 18 but we also have become a real estate developer for 19 the past 16 years following the purchase of our first 20 building in 2008. We have five and we rent them below market with favorable lease terms. 21 2.2 Additionally, we have seen an increase in mixed-2.3 used developments in our service area. We attribute a lot of this to the 25 Kent Rezoning in the 24

development of the IBIA. For many of these projects,

25

2.3

we simply serve as an advisor during community outreach and support many through testimony. But because these projects that we do are often low and frequency and private developers are often doing them more frequently, we see it as a great opportunity to partner with such projects in a more substantive way.

962 Pacific is our second such partnership following

1160 Flushing Project in Bushwick.

We believe that developing manufacturing space is worthwhile because it provides a community with high working-class, high-quality working-class jobs with low barriers of entry. Well paying jobs are crucial economic development benefit. The Oelsner's with their long history of business and in the community understand this from first-hand experience.

Our role in this project has been to draw in our experience to advise on what would make the manufacturing space viable. What kinds of businesses could fit in this particular mixed-use context with housing? We expect things like jewelry making, fashion and home goods to make sense and we will be part of the process for the remaining of the spaces moving forward.

With how this project brings together affordable housing, manufacturing community space, we believe that 962 Pacific can be an innovative model for development that meets the important range of

neighborhood needs. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Stephen. Next, we'll have Carmelo Piazza. Carmelo, if you can hear me, please unmute.

CARMELO PIAZZA: Yes, thank you so much. Good morning Council Members. Thank you everyone for your service and what you've done for our community. My name is Carmelo Piazza and I own three Early Childhood Educational Facilities called the Brooklyn Pre-School of Science. All of which are in downtown Brooklyn.

I was also a teacher for the Department of Ed for almost 20 years at PS 261, which also happens to be on Pacific Street right off of Smith. I am writing to support the proposed project in Crown Heights. As an educator, I appreciate how this project focuses in the most pressing needs of our vibrant community, prioritizing real affordability, building community spaces and resources and creating good paying jobs.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

The commitment to community resources, such as the early childhood education center is a thoughtful approach that goes above and beyond the norm for new development, addressing critical needs in our area like accessible childcare. I feel even more true to this because of my schools ideology and how relevant it will be for the children of tomorrow, which is why I feel the need to speak here today.

I am excited to be part of such a great vision.

As we continue witness advancements in technology and the increasing digitalization of jobs, introducing a stem-based program at an early childhood educational level is not only timely but also crucial for the future success of our community.

In an era where AI has become more prevalent, we must equip our younger generation with the skills and knowledge needed to thrive in the evolving landscape. Assigned based pre-school can lay the foundation for a solid educational journey fostering a love of learning and exploration from an early age by integrating stem concepts into the curriculum, we can prepare our children for the challenges and opportunities to a technologically driven world that is going to be presented to them daily.

2 Moreover, the commitment to community resources 3 exemplified by establishing an early childhood educational center demonstrates a thoughtful and 4 progressive approach to development. Providing 5 affordable accessible childcare is a critical need in 6 7 this area and an assigned based preschool aligns perfectly with addressing the need while offering 8 9 unique and enriching educational experiences for our youngest community members. 10

So, since taking office, I just want to thank

Council Member Harris — Hudson, excuse me, as always

being remaining committed to creating more resources

for the community and I ask that you stand for those

of us advocating for more childcare options

throughout the community and support the plans for

962 Pacific Street. Thank you so much everyone.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Carmelo. The last panelist is Daniel Wong. Daniel if you can hear me, please unmute.

DANIEL WONG: Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Yes, we can hear you.

DANIEL WONG: Alright, thank you. Good morning.

My name is Daniel Wong, a proud resident of 1010

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Pacific Street. I also work at the Community Preservation Corporation, otherwise known as CPC.

CPC is a nonprofit lender here founded in New York City in 1974 that specializes in sustainable and affordable housing projects but day I'm not here in my professional capacity. As a local citizen deeply invested in the future of our neighborhood, I am here to express my support for this transformative project at 962 Pacific Street. Living next door to this very empty vacant lot, I have visioned a development like this, one that not only creates homes but nurtures the vibrant community, prioritizing real affordability, building communal spaces and creating job opportunities for our local entrepreneurs.

Recognizing Nadine and Bill's longstanding commitment to Crown Heights, they're involvement in this project is a testament to their understanding and respect for the community needs. Their local approach counters a typical developer driven projects that often overlook our unique neighborhood dynamics.

By addressing the acute affordable housing crisis, this project ensures that the benefits reach the most in need within our community families. projects innovative inclusion of light manufacturing

space pays tribute to Crown Heights rich manufacturing history and problems with well paying job growth.

The project echo's our community voice,
especially in its dedication to early childhood
education center. Though the center is not only a
facility, it's a commitment to our children's future,
offering accessible and quality childcare in the
community. It stands as a symbol of our
neighborhoods dedication to nurturing the next
generation of New Yorkers in an affordable and
inclusive matter.

In closing the 962 Pacific Street project stands as a beacon of thoughtful and community center development. I believe this development will enrich our Crown Heights neighborhoods in ways that go far beyond the physical structures it will create. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Daniel. Do any
Council Members have any questions for this panel?
There being no questions for this panel, this panel
is now excused. Counsel, can you please call up the
last panel for 962 Pacific Street?

2 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Sure Chair. The next panel

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

3 | will consist of in-person individuals. Leola Holmes,

4 | Gregory Smith, Chris Williams, and Charles Boulbol.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: First we'll have Ms. Leola
Holmes. Ms. Holmes, just turn on the microphone for
me please. Thank you.

LEOLA HOLMES: Good morning. My name is Leola I reside at 607 Grand Avenue. I serve on the 77th Precinct Council. I was also a participant of Community Board 8 Housing Committee. I've been a resident there for 42 years. I'm right in the footprint of where they're going to make the housing project over on Pacific Street. It is desperately needed there because most of my neighbors and myself, we have adult children. Our children have children, they have no place to live. They cannot afford the prices of the apartments that have went up in my neighborhood. Directly across the street from me, I have two projects. We couldn't afford it because the bedrooms were \$3,000 for a two-bedroom apartment. Who could afford that making less than \$50,000 a year?

This project will do so much for my community right now because it's not isolated in terms of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2 need of housing. I also was a part of [INAUDIBLE

 $3 \mid 01:01:13$ ] which was the organization that founded,

4 that actually supported the [INAUDIBLE I01:01:24]

5 Project. And I supported that project with the hopes

6 that we would have gotten more apartments, in which

7 we actually received.

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

So, now this projects that getting ready to happen will actually fit the need of what's desperately needed in my community right now. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Ms. Holmes. Next we'll have Gregory Smith.

GREGORY SMITH: Good morning. My name is Gregory Smith. I'm a lifelong resident of Brooklyn you all. I've lived in several of the communities from Bushwick, Brownsville, Bed Stuey, Crown Heights, Park Slope. I've seen the community change drastically over the years. I remember when it went from Brooklyn Union running things and other projects came up, mass projects that caused rezoning and housing deficits and what have you. And there's a problem in housing, affordable housing in Brooklyn New York. I say that and I say it passionately because I'm a victim of that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I was born and raised in Brooklyn. I'm 67-yearsold, all but two of my last years of my life has been in Brooklyn. However, now I am forced to live in another part of the city. Why? Because as of 2021, there were no housing affordable for me and I'm very passionate about it because I feel like I'm a victim because it has traumatized me. It has led me into undo hardship. It has isolated from everything that I love, the housing crisis. From my family, my friends, everything that I know and appreciate is in Brooklyn and because I have to live in upper part of the five boroughs now, far away from my family and friends, I have no support. I have no real support units there and I feel threatened, I feel lonely, I feel afraid. Even at this point right now, I don't even go to the place that I'm supposed to live because I'm afraid. And I'm afraid because I don't have the unit, the people around me that I need to support me.

So, I am absolutely in support of this project and any project that's going to bring affordable housing into Brooklyn that is going to keep families closer together. I appreciate this family because they have been there since I was a little boy and the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2 continuity that they're bringing in is a wonderful

3 thing. I support it 100 percent just like I

4 supported the little cop that used to walk around my

5 school when I was a little boy. So, by all means,

6 please, we do support this program and we hope that

7 it goes forward. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. Chris Williams.

9 CHRIS WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. My name is

10 Christopher Williams and I'm here to support the 962

11 Pacific Street LLC.

1

8

25

I have to tell a little story. In the mid-60's,

13 I came here from Alabama. I wanted to start a

14 company. So I was on Pacific Street, I saw this

15 | light there. I ran into the light, I started working

16 and as I worked, there was a gentleman that walked by

17 | every day dressed in a real nice steel blue suit. I

18 mean, I'm sorry, gray suit. So, one day he came in

19 and he said, "what are you guys doing? I said,

20 | "well, I'm opening a little business." He said,

21 \ "okay." He didn't say much.

22 The next two or three days he come by and so, he

23 | saw what we've been doing and then he began to tell

24 me, he said, "well, why don't you buy some of this

property?" And I did. I bought the property and I

2.2

2.3

bought it and finally I had a nice piece of property on the corner and I had a construction company that opened it up and I was able to hire like 43 guys from the neighborhood. All from the neighborhood, maybe one or two that wasn't from the neighborhood. So, this went on for about 30 some years and I said, "okay, I'm tired. I want to retire." I retired and uh one of the guys on my job, one of the employees said, "can you stay a few years longer and we got some kids we want to get out of school?" I thought

I sold my property and one of the guys said,
"right across the street." I said, "okay, we'll
see." I wanted to keep it in the neighborhood
anyway. So, what I did, I got uh a Bill and Nadine —
CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Mr. Williams, I love your
story but you're going to have to wrap it up for us
alright.

about it. I hadn't planned to wait. So, I sold it.

But I said, "but where am I doing to go?"

CHRIS WILLIAMS: Okay. They gave me the property. So I support the 962 project and we need new housing. We need affordable houses and we also need daycare for our kids. So, I support it. I mean I support it 100 percent. Thank you very much.

2 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Mr. Williams.

2.2

2.3

Lastly, we're going to have Charles Boulbol. Sorry if I mispronounced your name.

CHARLES BOULBOL: Good morning. My name is

Charles Boulbol. I was born on Atlantic Avenue.

I've lived almost my entire life in Brooklyn. I

raised my children in Brooklyn. I have a daughter

whose an elementary school teacher of the deaf and a

son in law who is an ICU nurse. I've coached

volunteer swimming in Sunset Park and Bay Ridge for

over 25 years and giving back to the community is

very important to me.

It is self-evident the development of additional housing stock is absolutely necessary. This project is a win-win for all concerned. It includes affordable housing, community resources, and it will create jobs both before, during, and after construction.

Bill and Nadine Oelsner are committed to doing what's best for the community at a time when there is a critical need at the grassroots level. They are not major developers. They are concerned citizens who are in a position to create a win-win for many constituencies.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.2

2.3

This project will give housing. It will give jobs. It will give childhood education and it will give small business development. This project checks all the boxes. Please seize the opportunity and approve it.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you so much. Do any Council Members have any questions for this panel?

There being no questions, thank you so much for your time.

Counsel, are there any other members of the

public who wish to testify on 962 Pacific rezoning?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: No, not at this time but if there are public members who have not yet signed up and who would like to testify regarding 962 Street Rezoning Proposal remotely, please press the raise hand button now or if you're in person, please

Not seeing anyone Chair, we can proceed with this hearing.

identify yourself to one of the Sergeant's.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. There being no other members of the public who wish to testify on LU's 6, 7, and 8 relating to the 962 Pacific Street Rezoning proposal, the public hearing is now closed and the item is laid over. Thank you Counsel.

2.2

2.3

I will now open the second public hearing on LU's 1 and 2, relating to the Whitestone Lanes Rezoning Proposal in Council Member Ung's District in Flushing Queens. The proposal is a rezoning from a manufacturing district M1-1 to a residential district R7A to develop a residential building with approximately 415 apartments. This rezoning will also involve mapping Mandatory Inclusionary Housing, which will require approximately 113 of the units to be affordable units. For anyone wishing to testify on these items remotely, if you have not already done so, you must register online and you may do that now by visiting the Council's website at council.nyc.gov/landuse.

Once again for anyone with us in person, please see one of the Sergeants up here and submit a speakers card. If you prefer to submit written testimony, you can always do so by emailing it to us at <a href="mailto:landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov">landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov</a>. I would now like to give Council Member Ung the floor to give her remarks.

COUNCIL MEMBER UNG: Thank you. First, I'd like to thank Chair Salamanca and Riley and the applicant team for presenting at today's hearing. This project

ERIC PALATNIK:

I do.

2 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. For the viewing
3 public, if you need an accessible version of this
4 presentation, please send the email request to

5 landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. And now, the
6 applicant team may begin.

2.2

2.3

Panelists, as you begin, I'll just ask that you please reinstate your name and organization for the record. You may begin.

ERIC PALATNIK: Sure, Eric Palatnik, Attorney at Law representing Whitestone Lanes. I'm thrilled to be here today. I'd like to thank the Council Member. She came into a process of a rezoning that we started six years ago and she came in, I think she was admitted into office a year or so ago, a year and a half.

Unfortunately, that process of changing Council people midway through a rezoning process caused the miscommunication of the Council Member speaking.

We've been working for the past six years on what I think is a model rezoning application. You are presented today with a rezoning application that is unanimously supported by every single body that its come before, especially the Community Board,

Community Planning Board 7.

2.2

2.3

Now, Community Planning Board 7 in Whitestone in the Flushing area is a very vocal community board and they're very concerned about things such as parking. They're ultra concerned about the Linden Place Extension, which is an off and exit ramp of the Whitestone Express Way that leads to the Whitestone Bridge that causes traffic delays going back to what I still call Shea Stadium.

The redesigned that Linden Place Extension eight years ago. It was built five years ago. It was done with their input and the former Council persons input. Whitestone Lanes, which is owned by Marco Macaluso, who is right here today, a resident of Queens his entire life in Whitestone who built this business from the ground up with his family starting in 1965 when they first built it, when Ferry Land was across the street and was the entertainment mecca over there.

Well, Marco tried to develop the property and work through the rezoning with the community acknowledging the intensity of the traffic concern over there. And one of the main concerns of all Community Board members throughout this entire process has been the elimination and the prevention

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

of any commercial space in this building. They refused to act on it. They refused to support it.

They would not have given it any consent or support at all if it had what they considered to be a traffic generating component to it.

We hired expert after expert. We did different analysis and they were right. What's going up across the street? If you can go to the next slide please. Get to one that's an aerial picture please, I think it's a couple in. Go a couple more if you can. There you go, that's perfect. So, that's Whitestone Lanes. It's surrounded by a shopping center, retail, local retail. It's zoned manufacturing and we are here today to ask you for a rezoning from the manufacturing to an R7A.

The manufacturing district that's across the street, extends across the street as well is home to two, two distribution facilities. They're money makers. The New York Time's site is across the street, well known. Wild Flowers building a fourstory distribution facility. The Toys R Us toy store that sits on a the side Ferry Land across the street is turning into a distribution facility.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

The distribution facilities want to be here. So, what we have asked you to do is rezone the property to a residential development. If it were to be approved, it would stand nine stories and 95 feet tall. If you can go to the next slide please. Go one more slide please.

So, the Zoning District deterred to an R7A and if you can go to the next slide please. And the R7A district would bring with it an as of right development that would include 415 apartments and 113 permanently affordable units with zero commercial space in the building and zero community facility space.

So, the Community Board, though in the five years that we've been working them weren't just concerned about traffic and eliminating the commercial. They were also concerned by the traffic patterns. If you can go to the next slide please. Next slide please.

They were also concerned about an open plaza that we were required to provide by requirement to City Planning. The area is underserved with respect to public parks. It has very little open space. So, as a requirement to the environmental assessment statement, we're required to provide open space. But

\_

we didn't just provide open space, we provided a

Manhattan quality style plaza, the likes of which
have never been seen in this part of Queens.

We worked very closely with the Community Board, who had first had concerns over it and we worked very closely with City Planning. That plaza has turned into a very expensive undertaking to keep it and build it at the style that we've designed it, which is equivalent to a pop standard. And you can see the plaza on the right-hand side there on the top slide. Next slide please. Next slide please. You can go to the next one. You can go to the next one. And one more. Hopefully we'll get to the traffic. Next slide, keep going if you can please. Okay, so here you could see the traffic patterns on the streets around it. You can see the cars backed up. You can go to the next slide.

It shows you an elevation of the building. Just keep going if you can and we'll get to another slide. There you go. Alright, you can go to the next slide, one more forward and one more. Here we go.

This gives you an overview of the property right now. The way the property — this shows you the arrows coming in and out. It's meant to show egress.

2.2

2.3

Those traffic entrances you see with the red arrows are going to be mimicked in the new development. If you can go to the next slide please. And you can see — one more slide forward please. Okay, so what we're showing you here, if you look at the slide at the top, it's showing you cars are coming in on one side of the property and they're exiting on the other side. The idea of it coming in from the Linden side only and no exits on the Linden side, which is the top, again is to protect the traffic pattern. You can go to the next slide please.

This shows you how much time and effort has been put into it and again, this is all explaining to you why the building has no commercial use. We gave up perhaps one of the most profitable components of the building with our work with the Community Board in order to develop a building that would reduce traffic.

As you could see here, the proposal is shown on the left. The as of right that could be built there, such as the distribution facility or community facility is on the right. The elimination of an incredibly, incredibly supportive, income generating component, such as the proposed commercial use that

2.3

7, the support of Donovan Richards, the Borough
President and the support of City Planning, and we

We're not here to do that today. We would like

to build residential. We worked very hard to secure

nearly unanimous support of Community Planning Board

was in there originally and the removal of it during negotiations and discussions with the community, is perhaps one of the most expensive community benefits I've ever put into a project before. We gave up a lot to do that and we did it to earn the support of the community. You can go to the next please. Next slide please.

We were asked by the community to do a lot of work on the school seats and if there was enough school seats in the community for us to accommodate all the future students. And this slide shows you that we've done all of that. Next slide please. And the as of right alternatives. What we're trying to show you here is next slide. Is that this is what can be built on the property? If this project does not go forward, these are the as of rights alternatives. You could build a hospital. You could build a distribution facility or you could build a mix of the two and some kind of community facility.

would hope that everybody likes the project that we set forth today. You can go to the next slide please. One more slide.

2.2

2.3

This goes to what I was saying a moment ago, there is no proposed commercial use within the building. If you saw the location of the building now on the Whitestone Expressway next to commercial, it's actually called Whitestone Lanes, it has commercial use in it. We've eliminated that commercial use and the reason we've done that again, so I can be abundantly clear, was after years of discussion with this community. This is a model of a rezoning. This is a good example of a rezoning that we worked with the incoming Council Member. We're working with the current Council Member and we've worked with every single stakeholder in the community to secure everybody sign on. Every single persons sign on.

The only thing we haven't done yet unfortunately, is worked out a deal with some third parties who would like to be involved in the construction of the building. That we haven't done. But other than assigning contractual obligations to third parties to build this building, I am presenting to the City of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

New York to solve its housing crisis, a shovel ready development with a local developer who is sitting in your room, who has been invested in your neighborhood for 50 years, that's ready to go. He's ready to build tomorrow. If we'll make a deal, which we're trying to with the third parties, we will make that deal and I am hoping we can. We've been sitting with them and we're trying to again but as far as the land use component to this application goes, never in my career have I presented an application that has been so well supported and I'd be doubtful if I'll come back to you again with another obligation in my career that's been so well supported. I thank you very much for your time today. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you so much. I have a few questions and I am going to see if Council Member Ung has some questions.

ERIC PALATNIK: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: How have you responded to some of the Borough Presidents recommendations, such as those around affordability levels, job opportunities or enhancements around open space and recreational use?

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.2

2.3

ERIC PALATNIK: Yes, we've spoken with the

Borough President at length. Some of the discussions

I just mentioned a moment ago, are impacting — are

substantially the economics, which directly relates

to the affordability. You have the opportunity to

bring into this project 113 Option Level 1 units,

which is twice as much that is coming to Flushing in

the past few years. You're creating a great

opportunity to do so.

The Borough President would like to talk about the MIH levels. The MIH levels relate directly to the ability of the developer to afford to be able to provide that because there is no tax subsidy in there right now and as I mentioned ago, there's a third party involved that's also asking for the developers funding.

So, the developer only has so much money in his pocket. His name is Marco Macaluso. He's a local guy. He's not a big shot out there and there's only so much that can come out of a pocket. We would love to give much deeper affordability. There are other people that are also asking for money to come out of the project and we must make our deal with them as well. So, we'd like to try to increase the number of

2 MIH units greatly, tremendously I mean. We'd like to

3 make that effort but right now, we are put under some

4 other financial pressures that are causing a little

5 bit of difficulty with us achieving the goal that we

6 all share which is to provide more affordable housing

7 for the city.

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I'll mention this too, we're on the cusp of signing an arrangement with 32BJ that we've been working on for the past two years that we feel would be the provision to the Borough Presidents position. Very good jobs, their rates are incredibly competitive. In the market place they are very similar to other people and they do a great job and we just spoke with them yesterday.

I don't recall what some of these other questions were. I think I addressed some labor and I addressed

19 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Open space, recreational use.

ERIC PALATNIK: The open space and recreational use of the plaza, the plaza was the biggest discussion at the Community Board. The area is substantially underserved as I mentioned ago by open space. There is a lack of open space. So, the dog leg of the property, we're providing a beautiful

2 plaza. I don't know if the Borough President had

3 concerns about it.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Even that this is a straight rezoning, how are you being sure that the plaza will be built?

restrictive declaration that's being attached to the property that's going to govern the entire ground floor layout. This is worked out in combination with Department of City Planning, their city environmental quality review. It's a restrictive deck that's tied into the [INAUDIBLE 01:24:00]. You know, legal counsel is nodding his head.

That restrictive deck was created at the request of both City Planning and the Community Board. The purpose of it was to lock in the ground floor layout exactly as you just suggested. So, the Community Board could be assured that the Linden Place extension was this project they worked on for ten years, a decade to achieve and are quite proud of.

They wanted the ground floor layout to be in and out the way we were proposing. In the way the required it and they wanted that to be memorialized. So, we put that into the restrictive declaration and

also in the restrictive declaration is the plaza

3 area.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: So, my last question is uhm, you mentioned shovel ready.

ERIC PALATNIK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: So, you guys are willing and able to build this without a tax abatement like 421A?

ERIC PALATNIK: The project can be built without a 421A. The margins are close but the project can be built.

Not just that, there's been a substantial amount of developers that the owners started to talk to that have expressed interest in building in the current climate if the price is right and the owner understand where he's at right now with that. I will say that that's barely tenable and I think you know that obviously. There's been very — I think Concord New Hampshire pulled more building permits last year than New York City did. So, we know we're in a slump. He couldn't be more anxious to go.

The bowling alley by the way, just so you know if you've been following the daily news stories, the bowling alley is done. He'll tell you; they don't have much business. COVID put whatever nail in the

1 coffin that could be put in it. It's an iconic 2 3 place. So, he doesn't have any way to make a living right now. So, this project moving forward in one 4 way shape or form, whether it's financially tenable 5 as a residential rezoning, which would help solve the 6 7 city's housing crisis or whether he sells it to Wildflower across the street to build another 8 9 distribution facility. He doesn't have - this man is in a fix. He has to do something because nobody goes 10 11 bowling anymore.

So, if you want to go bowling, he'll keep the bowling alley but nobody really goes anymore. you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Alright, thank you Eric. Council Member Ung, you have any questions? No, okay. Council Member Schulman.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Hi, how are you? ERIC PALATNIK: Hello, good morning. afternoon.

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Good morning, good morning. Oh, good afternoon. So, yeah, I have a question. So uhm, I see that we have labor here this afternoon and I appreciate what you said about 32BJ. My understanding is they've raised concerns about an

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 74
agreement actually being signed. So I wanted to ask
about that with you.

ERIC PALATNIK: With which, with 32BJ?

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Hmm, hmm.

2.2

2.3

ERIC PALATNIK: I spoke to uh I think it was Sara yesterday, Ms. Peterburg, I'm not recalling her name but we spoke yesterday. Yes, I actually reached out to them a year ago to initiate a conversation with them. When I had heard that there was a strong desire to have union labor, permanent union labor jobs on this site.

They have proven to be a very trusted and reliable and excellent service through the last decade that I've worked with them and we have fashioned and an agreement that is about to be signed. At about the time we are about to sign that, as I mentioned in the MIH discussion, another third party came into the mix and would like to have a piece of the job as well. We're working and sitting with them.

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Okay.

ERIC PALATNIK: That piece seems to as if it might be a little over powering but we're trying our hardest to try and achieve it.

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.2

2.3

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Okay, I'd like to because I know 32BJ is important as our just organized labor in general, so I'd like to see those agreements signed as we move forward and I appreciate you working with them. Thank you.

ERIC PALATNIK: Yeah, well we'd like to work with everybody that could be reasonable with us on that piece.

COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. Any other members? Uh, there being no members that have any questions for this panel, this panel is now excused. Counsel, are there any members of the public who wish to testify on this project?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yes Chair. We have four members who signed up online to testify and one person who is here in the room. So, we will start with the person who is here in the room and that is Sara Penenberg.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Members of the public will be given two minutes to speak. Please do not begin until the Sergeant at Arms has started the clock.

SARA PENENBERG: Good afternoon. Thank you Chairman Riley and members of the Subcommittee on

Zoning and Franchising. My name is Sara Penenberg

2.2

2.3

3 1

3 and I am the Political Coordinator at SEIU 32BJ.

32BJ is dedicated to represent 175,000 members in 11 states, in Washington DC and in New York. Our union members are the pillar to the property service sector here in New York performing crucial jobs in the property service sector. As mentioned just prior to this, 32BJ has been in talks with Marmer Reality on Whitestone Lane rezoning but to date, we have not been able to have a credible commitment on this project to create the family sustaining and middle-class jobs that maintain prevailing wage standards for building service workers in the city.

These are jobs that build up our community and that create a robust middle class. A project like Whitestone Lane would result in about five to six full-time property service jobs and gaining a credible commitment here for this project in addition to creating prevailing wage standards would also make there be labor peace agreement in securing a union representation if employees choose so.

Labor is an important part of the foundation of

New York City. A project like Whitestone Lane would

benefit the community on multitude of different

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

77

2 fronts. One of them being a path to the middle-class

3 prevailing wage. So, I hope that we can come to an

4 agreement on this project. It is true that we had

5 some discussions but we are still pending that

6 agreement and thank you so much for your time.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Sara. Sara, I don't know if anyone has any questions for you. Do any members have any questions for Sara? Oh, they don't. Alright, thank you Sara.

Counsel, can you please call the next panel for this item?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yes, we will now switch to the online individuals who have signed up to testify. That consists of Arlene Fleishman, Eugene Kelty, Charles Apelian and Merilyn Bitterman. Please note once you have testified remotely, you will be exited from the online chat room. You can view the livestream broadcast for the remainder of the hearing on the Council's website. We will now start with Arlene Fleishman. Please turn on your microphone.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Arlene, if you can hear me, please unmute and you may begin. Arlene, are you there? Okay, we'll come back to Arlene. Next, we'll move to Marilyn —

ARLENE FLEISHMAN: Yes, I hear you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Go ahead Arlene.

24

2.2

2.3

Thank you.

ARLENE FLEISHMAN: Okay, good morning ladies and gentlemen. I should say afternoon. I appreciate this opportunity to address you regarding the Whitestone Lanes rezoning. I am Arlene Fleishman; I serve as President of the Mitchell-Linden Civic Association, representing over 5,000 families residing in 28 cooperative buildings. We have since the 1950's spoken with one voice, maintaining the integrity and quality of life for all has and still is the goal of our organization.

When first approached about rezoning of the Whitestone Lanes, I was dead set against the development of a nine-story apartment complex at this location and remain so until many committee meetings were held, issues of the concerned disgust, compromises made and negotiations concluded. I come to you today with the support of the entire Mitchell-Linden community to ask for your support to honor the request for the zoning change for the Whitestone Lanes. Permitting the development for residential housing void of any commercial entities. We look forward to welcoming our new neighbors while maintaining the safety and security of our community.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Arlene. Next,
we'll have Eugene Kelly.

2.2

2.3

EUGENE KELTY: Thank you Mr. Chair and it's

Kelty. I'm the Chair of Community Board 7 for over

26 years. I've been on the Board for almost 40

years. So, thank you for letting me testify before

the Council. It's nice and I appreciate the Zoom.

It's much easier than trying to get downtown, so I

appreciate the Council working with the community on this.

In the fast nutshell because you don't need to hear repeated information, this project has been sitting I thought it was at least eight years not six like Eric talked about but as he said, we were working it in the past for over ten years. We pushed very hard to get the residential component to pull the commercial component out of it. Anybody that knows the area and knows that's it gridlocked over there. For anybody in DOT, understands that intersection used to be what they call level F and you can't approve a level F and over the course of the years from my — you'll hear him testify in a second Chuck Apelian, we worked with a lot of the engineers in the area and the Borough Presidents

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2 previous engineers to get them to put crossways in

3 over there to help improve the district.

So, right now we got one of the sites that s coming up and could impact us if we go back to a commercial component and that's why we pushed specifically for a residential component and we put the restricted declarations on it. And we hope that that would make it very well and it seems specific groups are going with it. We agree with it. As I said, there's plenty of development around it.

You're going to hear it that there's a site next to us which is the Stop and Shop and of course the road way is a Toys R Us. So, I don't need anymore commercial in there. I need residential and we need it so it doesn't impact the area.

And you know, I know it's kind of tough for

Councilwoman Ung; she's relatively new but she's not

new to the area. She's worked in the elected

officials area, so she knows the area very well and

we're very pleased to work with her but her office

has been involved with this. I'd like to say the

Borough Presidents office was involved in this but as

you see there's little gaps where it was needed to be

2.2

2.3

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

community facility use; I'll get to that in a second,

Alternative goal to Whitestone Lanes was simple.

placed the manufacturing, commercial, retail and

We

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2 solely with housing. Why? In one word, as you

3 heard, traffic.

2.2

2.3

And there are also huge amounts of commercial retail and community facility nearby, hundreds of thousands and literally the potential for millions of square feet on the other side of the highway.

Everybody felt R7A was a good solution and it would allow greater bulk and current but only with the strict condition that it become a residential development only.

And without the choice and chance for community facility and I'll explain as I keep going forward.

Therefore, the developer agreed to the following restrictive declaration, which was the only reason we got overwhelming support by both the co-op community and our community board. A. Eliminate community facility use. B. Maximize the dwelling units to be 350, minimal parking spaces to be 300. You heard about the access and restrictions on Linden Place and on-site parking for delivery vehicles. The restrictive declaration guarantees and union count, why?

Well, please remember the plan being presented is illustrative. An R7A zoning is approved without the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 84 restrictive deck and community facility use is still allowed in the underlying zoning. A high traffic generating med center or school could be built after the rezoning and guess what? No housing would be

built even though this plan shows that it is.

We only want housing. Your committee is learning, so you will understand that the restrictive deck to eliminate community facility ensure that only a residential building can be built and ensures that the 350-unit count and the restrictive deck and the number of MIH houses are permanent.

We came up with 350 units that provide decent size units for families to flourish in our community rather than small studios and transit one bedrooms, and we came up with 300 parking spaces to meet our boards requirement for 100 percent parking. So-

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Charles.

CHARLES APELIAN: May I have two sentences?

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Go ahead.

CHARLES APELIAN: The residents won't need to search on street parking, which would increase the traffic in the area again, reducing traffic. I appreciate the time. Thank you again sir.

2.2

2.3

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Charles. Are there any questions for this panel? There being no questions, this panel is excused. Counsel, can you please call up the last panel for this item.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yes, the last panel consists of Christian Batres(SP?), who is online.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Christian, if you can hear me, please unmute and you may begin.

CHRISTIAN BATRES: Yes, I can hear you. Uhm, good afternoon. My name is Christian Batres and I'm a proud 20-year member of Local 157 and the area representative for the New York City District Council Carpenters and also, I'm a Queens resident. It is my privilege to speak on behalf of our 600 members residing in the immediate area of this project and the 1,000 more who call Queens home who can not be here due to other commitments.

This is personal to me. I grew up bowling at Whitestone Lanes and I lived just five minutes away from this development. Every morning I pass by this site when I take you know Whitestone Expressway on my way to work and fight for my members. This is my community and I care about its future. This is why I must voice my decision to the development. Make no

mistakes, creating more housing is critical but if
the very people building affordable housing cannot
even afford to live in it, then we are making this
crisis worse and not solving it. That's why it
brings me no joy to report that while we have some
discussions with the developer, we don't have any
agreement at this time. We transparently provide
them hour rates and offer to work with them to make
sure this project is profitable for them and actually
buildable from a financing perspective.

Afterall, if a project cannot be built, what is good for my members. Council Members, you know us, union carpenters, we're always willing to compromise and we have done so in the past but we cannot and we will not settle for scraps and at this point, we don't even have scraps to consider. We cannot work towards a deal if one of the sites is unwilling to provide any data to offer to back up to their claims.

Despite moments of outrage from our union, there is no offer in hand from the developers. Since initial discussions on December the 7th, there have multiple meetings canceled at the last minute, all by the developer. We have repeatedly asked for them to provide any information to us so we can work with

them. Nothing has been provided. We hope this is not indicative of how they will act towards the community if a rezoning is granted but actions tell a better story than words. But it's part of the reason

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Christian.

why we urge you to oppose -

CHRISTIAN BATRES: Just let me finish please. Ir our agreement —

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: If you could just wrap it up Christian, thank you.

CHRISTIAN BATRES: Alright, thank you very much. In solidarity, you know from the union carpenters, we just want to get you know an agreement approved and you know for this rezoning to be approved. You know we're glad this developer, you know that's all we're looking to get over here.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you so much for testifying Christian. Are there any members of the public who wish to — excuse me. Are there any members of the Committee who have questions for this panel? There being no questions, this panel is excused. Counsel, are there any other members of the public who wish to testify on LU's 1 and 2?

2.2

2.3

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: At this time, there doesn't appear to be anybody in the room else wishing to testify on Whitestone Lanes but if you do wish to testify, please approach one of the Sergeant at Arms. If you have signed up online and you wish to testify, please raise your hand now. Okay, not seeing anybody online or in person. You may proceed with closing this hearing Chair.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: There being no other members of the public who wish to testify on LU's 1 and 2 relating to the Whitestone Lanes Rezoning Proposal, the public hearing is now closed and the item is laid over.

I will now open the third public hearing on LU's 3, 4, and 5 relating to the 2226 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue Rezoning Proposal. This proposal seeks to develop a ten-story life science building in Manhattan in Deputy Speaker Ayala's District. This application consists of a rezoning on part the development site that is currently zoned for residential use only.

The rezoning would be from an R7B to a C4-6, which is the zoning district for the rest of this site. The application also seeks a text amendment to map Mandatory Inclusionary housing and extend the

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 89 2 East Harlem Corridor Special District to include the 3 proposed development site. Lastly, the application seeks a special permit to 4 reduce the number of requiring loading berths. 5 anyone wishing to testify on these items remotely, if 6 7 you have not already done so, you must register online and you may do that now by visiting the 8 9 Council's website at council.nyc.gov/landuse. And once again, for anyone with us in person, 10 11 please see one of the Sergeants to prepare and submit 12 a speakers card. If you would like to prepare and 13 submit a written testimony, you can always do so by emailing to landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. 14 15 Counsel, please call the first panel for this 16 item. 17 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Chair, the first panel 18 consists of Richard Basc. 19 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Counsel, please administer the affirmation. 20 21 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Please raise your right hand 2.2 and state your name for the record. 2.3 RICHARD BASC: Richard Basc. COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do you affirm to tell the 24

truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in

your testimony before this Committee and in answers 2 3 to Council Member questions?

T do.

RICHARD BASC:

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. For the viewing public, if you need an accessible version of this presentation, please send an email request to landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. And now the applicant team may begin. Please just reinstate your name and organization for the record before you begin.

RICHARD BASC: Uhm, I'm Richard Basc. the law firm of Akerman LLP. Thank you for this opportunity to present to the Committee. application it's a little different. As you can see from the slides, the image on the left is the actual building. We've constructed the building pursuant to the exiting zoning. The changes to the zoning resolution that we're seeking is to permit life science use in the entirety of the building.

Can we go to the next slide? This is a hard to see summary of the proposal but let me just verbally summarize it. Uhm, to facilitate a life science use at this site, we have to make certain amendments to the special district regulations. The first one is

2 to allow a 7.2 FAR as of right for commercial use.

3 That would include a use group 9 life science use.

4 Also, to do life science use, that has a higher

5 number of required loading berths, so we have to then

6 create a mechanism to get relief from the loading

7 berth requirement. And then we are seeking relief

8 from the loading berth requirement and the last

9 change is to since this lot is split between R7B and

10 the C46, we need to amend the zoning map and the

11 special district map to incorporate the western 25

12 feet.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

1

So, as you can see from the middle slide, that little bump out in the middle is our extension and because we're as of right you could do residential, we also have to amend the MIH exhibit Appendix F. Even though we're not doing affordable housing, we still have to amend it. So, the changes are permitting greater commercial use, creating a relief mechanism from the loading berth, seeking that relief

Uhm, in discussions with the Community Board, first of all, we've had long discussions with the Community Board from the onset of this project as well as with the Council Member. We made a

and expanding the district by 25 feet to the west.

24 RICHARD BASC: Well, that's a really good
25 question. In our discussions with life science

2 users, they prefer the certainty of use group 9 as a

3 permitted use. That's not there today. We could be

4 cute and say life science use is use group 4 or use

5 group 6. If you look at other life science projects

around the city, there's a variety of use groups that

7 cover life science use. In our discussions with

8 users, they wanted that certainty and that's why we

9 went through rezoning process. Because honestly with

10 my applicant, my client, it's been two plus years

11 going through this very expensive process. If they

12 didn't think use group 9 was a requirement.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

propose?

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Do you have a current tenant for the life science building proposed? If not, are you committed to this or will you also consider alternative as of right use that a tenant may

RICHARD BASC: We're in discussions with other life science users. We did have a user but because the process took so long, they moved on. So, currently we don't have a user. This — my client is committed to life science use at this site and at other sites throughout the city. Has made a commitment to the Council Member. We've reached out to Hope Communities. We will reach out to the math

and science high school on 116<sup>th</sup> and Pleasant. We believe there is still a need for life science use in the city. It's a public policy of the city to have additional life science users. We think this is an ideal location.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. Do any other members have any questions for this panel? Council Member Carr.

COUNCIL MEMBER CARR: I wanted to ask uh, what's the state of your conversations with Deputy Speaker Ayala who represents this area?

RICHARD BASC: We, to paraphrase her, she said "you had me at life science." We had a very you know good discussion. I've worked well with her in her office on other projects. I've worked in East Harlem since '79. She supports the project.

COUNCIL MEMBER CARR: Great, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Council Member

Carr. There being no further questions, the

applicant panel is excused. Are there any members of
the public remotely or in person who wish to testify
on 2226 3rd Avenue rezoning?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Chair, there's nobody signed up in person or online to testify.

2 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: There being no members of the

3 public who wish to testify on LU's 3, 4 and 5

4 relating to the 2226 3rd Avenue rezoning proposal,

5 the public hearing is now closed and the item is laid

6 over.

2.2

2.3

I will now open the 4<sup>th</sup> public hearing on LU's 9 and 10 relating to the 166-11 91<sup>st</sup> Street Avenue

Special Permit proposal in Council Member Williams

District in Jamaica Queens. The special permit requested will waive the heights requirement that applies to narrow lots in the special downtown

Jamaica district. This special permit will allow applicant to develop a mixed-use building with 28 apartments on this narrow lot.

The proposal includes mapping Mandatory

Inclusionary Housing over the development site which

will require applicants to include affordable housing

in the proposed development. For anyone wishing to

testify on these items remotely, if you have not

already done so, you must register on line and you

may do that now by visiting the Council's website at

council.nyc.gov/landuse. And once again, for anyone

with us in person, please see one of the Sergeants to

prepare and submit a speakers card. If you would

record.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you Chair Riley. Council Members, once again Richard Lobel of Sheldon Lobel PC for the applicant 16611  $91^{\rm st}$  Avenue LLC. We are here today for the special permit as you see before you on the screen.

Next slide, unlike rezoning applications which we have previously brought before the Council as well as earlier today, this is for a special permit. downtown Jamaica district regulations provide for certain height limitations for properties on Narrow streets, this is a provision, Section 11560 which would allow the granting of a special permit in order to waive those height restrictions. By way of background, this is as far as our office was able to The only property that is effected by this discern. condition is clearly an unintended consequence of the special district regulations that resulted in a height cap on this otherwise buildable site and so, city planning has been supportive of this application as is evidenced by their approval. We also have the approval of the community board and of the Queens Borough Presidents Office.

The modification here would allow at the development site the provision of a building with

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

roughly 13 stories as we will describe later, and importantly and pursuant to the special permit, the modification is necessary to provide one density and scale as contemplated in the special downtown Jamaica district and to provide much needed housing in the Jamica neighborhood of Queens District 12. Importantly and in addition to the special permit that's sought, as we approach city planning with this

application, they found there to be a true opportunity here which was to map the site with

Mandatory Inclusionary Housing, which would provide for Mandatory Inclusionary on a site which otherwise do not require that.

So, despite the fact that this is not a rezoning action, with the special permit itself, with the mapping of MIH, you got the additional benefit of allowing affordable units where none would have been required had they built as of right. So we really have what is seen as a win-win in this application. The next slide provides the statistics behind the development. Again, this would be a building with 13-stories plus cellar. The underlying zoning is C45X as it will be demonstrated on the area map, this is pervasive in the area and the building here,

2 19,000 square feet, plus or minus residential with

3 1,500 square feet of community facility. Height at

4 139 feet. There would be no parking, as it would be

5 waived. The units would be 28 units, of which 8

6 would be affordable when prior to this time, none

7 | would be required to be affordable.

2.2

2.3

The next slide is the zoning map. I think this really well demonstrates the nature of the area.

Again, shaded in gray, the downtown Jamaica Special District in the C45X, which extends here for quite a number of blocks and is also on the site. The C45X allows for the underlying square footage at a six and the height at 13 stories as would be permitted in this district, absent this condition. So, the special permit really allows for just the merely the reinstatement of the height and bulk would be permitted otherwise.

The next slide is a tax map, which highlights in red the proposed development site as well as the area of the proposed MIH text amendment, roughly 3,600 square feet of which the applicant site is 3,400 square feet. The next slide is the area map which really demonstrates why the special permit is appropriate here. Again, density in the area

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.2

reflects the C4X. In fact, the building immediately to the right, a large pink rectangle in the C45X is producing a site with roughly 12 stories at 124 feet and 462,000 square feet of floor area. This will be a massive site but interestingly because our site is now being matched with an MIH district, we will benefit from MIH on this site, whereas other sites in the area do not necessarily benefit.

In addition, of the parcel — of the units created in that parcel, 614 dwelling units will be created with 284 parking spaces, clearly sufficient parking for the area.

The next several slides demonstrate photographs which primarily show the hulking large building to the east of us, as has been discussed and the slides after that demonstrate the site itself. Again, a contextual building at 13 stories with a greater than required rear yard at 25 feet and a mix of studios, ones and twos throughout the property inclusive of community facility on the ground floor. Feel free to page through those plans and materials.

And with that, I am happy to answer any questions as is the applicant team.

2 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Richard. Could you describe how the proposed development will include

4 environmental sustainability features as part of its

5 design?

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Sure. I mean I just nod at the RICHARD LOBEL: development team and would you like to discuss? wouldn't mind, would you mind discussing environmental sustainability? Okay, sure, so I'll just continue. So, as was requested by the Borough Presidents Office, there was a request that we look at sustainability measures. Obviously the site here being 3,400 square feet is somewhat limited in terms of being able to provide meaningful sustainability but the one concern as was expressed and as the applicant is happy to abide with, is a green roof. The Borough President specifically requested that the site and the roof be painted white and we were happy In addition to which the building is to do so. intended to be electrified as per current DOB regulations. So, in short, we're trying to do what we can to provide a sustainable building.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: For the community facility space, can you please further describe what type of outreach you have done to fill this space?

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.2

RICHARD LOBEL: Yeah, I mean, understandably
given the fact that this is a small site, there's
only going to be about 1,500 square feet of community
facility space produced. And so, the Council Member
has expressed a preference for a local community
facility in the form of, for example, medical
offices. Some service that will be able to be
utilized by the surrounding residential community
particularly in light of the large number of units
coming online to the east. So, we just — just being
the applicant being from the area, has basically just
been seeking guidance in terms of the likelihood of
what community facility could locate there and we do
have some information that that medical office may be
appropriate.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. Do any members of the community have any questions? There being no questions, this applicant panel may be excused.

Counsel, are there any members of the public who wish to testify on 166-11 91st Street Avenue Special Permit, remotely or in person?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: No Chair, no one is signed up to testify online or in person. Just double checking now and if anybody in the room would like to testify,

2.2

please go see the Sergeant at Arms and if you're online and you have signed up, please raise your hand at this time.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: There being no other members of the public who wish to testify on LU's 9 and 10 relating to the 166-11 91st Street Avenue Special Permit proposal, the public hearing is now closed and the item is laid over.

I will now open the 5<sup>th</sup> public hearing on LU's 11 and 12 relating to the 230 Kent Avenue Rezoning

Proposal in Council Member Restler's district and we are joined here by Council Member Restler District in Williamsburg Brooklyn. This is a proposal to develop a mixed-use residential building with approximately 40 apartments. The proposal involves rezoning a Perly Manufacturing District M1-4 to a mixed-use District M1-4/R7X.

The proposal includes mapping a Mandatory

Inclusionary over the rezoning area which will

require applicants to include affordable housing in

the proposed development. Because this would be a

new mixed-use district in this area, the application

would also involve adding the proposed mixed-use

district to the regulations in the zoning resolution

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 104 2 that governs these districts. For anyone wishing to 3 testify on these items remotely, if you have not already done so, you must register online and you may 4 do that now by visiting the Council's website at 5 council.nyc.gov/landuse. And once again, for anyone 6 7 with us in person, please see one of the Sergeants to prepare and submit a speakers card. If you would 8 9 prefer to submit written testimony, you can always do so by emailing to us at 10 11 landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. I will now like to give the floor to Council 12

Member Restler to give any remarks.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Chair Riley, can I ask a question? Am I permitted to ask two questions prior to their presentation?

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Uh, that's new but sure, go ahead.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Uhm, thank you very much Chair for the opportunity today and I just want to -I had two questions for the applicant. One, how much money was spent to remediate this site to make it feasible for development to go forward?

JUDITH GALLENT: The applicant, Judy Gallent -

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

How much money was spent at this site?

JUDITH GALLENT: The applicant spent between \$7 and \$8 million remediating the VOC's that were disposed of on the site by the prior owner, which was a paint manufacturing establishment.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: And what sustainability kind of green upgrades have you all incorporated into design plan?

JUDITH GALLENT: Uhm, the building would contain a variety of green or sustainable measures. First, although the development site is not currently in the floodplain, it is projected that the floodplain could reach the development site by 2080. That's a worse case scenario and rather than waiting for a retrofit of the building to meet that challenge, the building would be built to resist hydrostatic pressures and the foundation would be dry flood proof, which in essence means water tight.

That's in anticipation of what's happening. In addition there would be no dwelling units located on the ground floor and below grade mechanical equipment would be limited to the minimum necessary to service utility points of entry with the remainder on the roof and the mechanical bulkhead. In addition, there would be either a green roof or solar panels. The

decision as to which would come later as the mechanical equipment for the building is designed and shadow studies are done to assure maximum viability of solar panels if that is selected. The building would also be 100 percent electric, even though that would not be required if plans were filed prior to July 1st of 2027. The building would contain no vehicle parking at all and would contain 20 bicycle parking spaces. And in addition to the six new street trees, that would be provided around the site. The applicant is committed to working with DEP and DOT if necessary to establish the viability of rain gardens on the street surrounding the site.

GOUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Oh, that all sounds very good. This applicant took some risk in putting really a small fortune out to remediate a toxic site in our community and to allow it to move forward for development and that's a good thing for our community and I am appreciative that the applicant took that risk before knowing that there was an opportunity for rezoning here and I'm eager to be a good partner and supportive of this effort and look forward to getting this project over the finish line.

2.2

2.3

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2 So, thank you and look forward to the presentation.

2.2

2.3

JUDITH GALLENT: Thanks. We look forward to working with you as well.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you Council Member Restler. And now, the applicant team may begin. Panelists, as you begin or continue, I'll just ask that you just please reinstate your name and organization for the record.

JUDITH GALLENT: Yes, I am Judy Gallent from BCLP Land Use Council to Kent Riverview, LLC, the owner of 230 Kent Avenue, which is located in the northside neighborhood of Williamsburg, Brooklyn. Could I have the slides?

Next slide please. As the Chair indicated, this is an application to facilitate the construction of an eight-story building containing 40 apartments, 12 of which would be permanently income restricted under MIH Option 2 with ground floor retail. The necessary land use actions to achieve that are rezoning of Block 2362 from an M1-4 District to an MX District pairing an M1-4 and an R7X District. A zoning text amendment to establish an MIH area over the entirety of Block 2362 and a zoning text amendment to

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

establish R7X as a designated residence district
within MX8 and CD1 in Brooklyn, in which MIH is
required. May I have the next slide?

2.2

2.3

The development site is located on North 1<sup>st</sup>

Street between Kent Avenue on the east and River

Street on the West. The rezoning area is the

entirety of Block 2362, which consists of just two

lots. Lot 1, which is a development site and Lot 3

to its north. Both lots are currently vacant. Can I have the next slide?

This areal photo shows the site and it's surrounding context. To the west is the River Ring Project, which was rezoned in 2021 to facilitate the development of predominantly residential project containing over 1,000 dwelling units of community facility and commercial space, as well as a three-acre waterfront public open space.

Grand Ferry Park, Domino Park and the Northern most dominant buildings are shown on the bottom left. Next slide please. The applicant owned development site is shown on the left. It's a 5,400 square foot lot that was formerly occupied by a paint manufacturing facility as I indicated. The applicant purchased the site in 2017 and remediated at a cost

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

of between \$7 and \$8 million through the New York State Brownfields Cleanup Program. DEC issued a certificate of completion for that cleanup in 2021.

The application proposes to rezone the site to a mixed-use district because the area around it has really changed from a manufacturing area to an increasingly mixed-use area. The proposed MX would facilitate the development of this block at a scale that really provides a rational transition between the 510 and uhm, 560- and 710-foot-tall towers that are proposed that were approved by City Planning and the City Council on the River Ring site.

On the waterfront and the five to eight story buildings that are located to the east in the upland blocks, while also allowing manufacturing uses on the site.

On the other lot in the rezoning area is the 13,380 square foot vacant lot owned by Con Edison and it's shown on the right. May I have the next slide? Land uses in the surrounding area shown in these photos include a mix of manufacturing commercial and residential uses. East of the site across Kent Avenue are two seven story residential building. block to the southeast on the right contains three to

2.2

seven story mixed-use buildings as well as fully residential buildings, commercial buildings and light manufacturing. Next slide please.

To the south across North 1<sup>st</sup> Street is a four-story commercial building, recently renovated that contains retail, co-working, some light manufacturing and a banquet hall. Further to the south you see the northern most of the Domino buildings, which is a two-tower building containing a two-tower development containing 332 dwelling units, as well as commercial space and retail. Next slide.

Directly north of the site, across Metropolitan

Avenue is a six-story relatively recently developed

building that contains offices, accessory parking and

a Trader Joe Supermarket. Below grade and further

north, you can see on the right, 7 and 40 story

residential buildings. So, the area really has

evolved from manufacturing to contain quite a lot of

residential development and that's what makes sense

for the development site. Next slide please.

This is a side-by-side comparison of the existing zoning on the left and the proposed zoning on the right. The rezoning area as well as the block to its north were both rezoned in 2021, as part of the River

Ŭ

Ring Application from M31 which is a heavy
manufacturing district to M1-4 which is a light
manufacturing district, largely to preclude heavy
manufacturing uses in close proximity to both
existing and proposed residential uses in the River
Ring application and what existed in the community.

The M1 districts are typically mapped as buffers between heavy manufacturing districts or uses and residential or commercial districts and uses. But here as you can see from the slide, the rezoning area is sandwiched between districts on the east and west that permit residential use. There's a C62 on the waterfront and an MX District to the east. And between light manufacturing district on the north where the Trader Joes was recently developed, no manufacturing there at all and a heavy manufacturing district on the south. That is developed with a retail and banquet hall building in which there was recent investment. So, there really is no use for this pure buffer zone on the development site.

The proposed rezoning would maintain the M1-4 manufacturing designation but it would pair it with a residential district which would facilitate development consistent with the area and at a scale

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 that's already permitted by existing zoning. The

3 proposed rezoning would not change the commercial or

4 manufacturing FAR of 2 but by pairing it with the R7X

5 it would permit residential use with MIH at a FAR6,

6 which is actually less than the maximum FAR permitted

7 on the site today. Today, the maximum FAR under the

8 M1-4 is actually six and a half. That's the

9 community facility FAR. So, we're really not looking

10 to change the density at all but just to shift the

11 uses to which that density can be put in a way that's

12 appropriate to what's there. Next slide.

This landuse map uhm shows that the rezoning is consistent with the character of the area, which is as you can see from the map, is continuing to move away from its manufacturing past. The red, yellow, and peach are commercial, residential, and mixed-use development respectively. The two River Ring lots shown in gray on the waterfront will soon be peach whenever they get going because it will be mixed-use and the much less prevalent purple is manufacturing. Next slide please.

This is an illustrative rendering of an eight story, approximately 33,000 square foot building containing 40 dwelling units and 3,300 square feet of

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 114 ground floor retail that could be built on the site.

Approximately 12 of the buildings 40 units would be permanently affordable under option 2. I already spoke about the sustainability measures that would be

incorporated in the building.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

I would just say in closing that the proposed rezoning offers a number of benefits beyond the cleanup that the Council Member mentioned and the sustainability benefits that elicited from me. only would it result in the activation of a lot that has been vacant for more than ten years, but it would facilitate development of that lot that is in nature, more consistent with the prevailing land use character of the area and at a scale that is consistent and provides a transition between River Ring and the upland blocks. It would also facilitate development of much needed housing and much needed affordable housing in an area in which residential demand is increasing and by pairing it with the M1-4 with an R7X, it would also allow more community facility uses that are needed to serve the area such as schools, which under the M1-4 today are not as of right but require a special permit from the Board of Standards and Appeals.

And finally, the proposed MX zone would preserve manufacturing uses as of right on the Con Ed side if Con Ed chooses one day to use the site for utility purposes.

I have nothing further but I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you so much. Just one question. You mentioned Con Edison. Have they engaged the applicant team at all regarding this rezoning?

JUDITH GALLENT: No and I should say, you know I don't represent Con Ed and I don't speak for them but the applicant team did reach out to Con Edison multiple times and really got no response. My understanding is that the Department of City Planning did that as well. They held up the application for a little while while trying to get a response from Con Edison but my understanding from Department staff is that they were not — Con Ed was not forthcoming.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. I have no more questions. There being no more questions, you're excused. Thank you.

JUDITH GALLENT: Thank you.

2.2

2.3

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Counsel, are there any members of the public who wish to testify remotely or in person on 230 Kent Avenue? COMMITTEE COUNSEL: No Chair. No one has signed up to testify in person or remotely. CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. There being no members of the public who wish to testify on LU's 11 and 12 relating to 230 Kent Avenue Rezoning proposal, the public hearing is now closed and the item is laid over. That concludes today's business. I would like to thank the members of the public, my colleagues, Subcommittee Counsel, Land Use and other Council Staff and Sergeant at Arms for participating in today's meeting. This meeting is hereby adjourned. Thank you. [GAVEL] 

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date JANUARY 30, 2024