

CITY COUNCIL  
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING  
& FRANCHISES

----- X

July 8, 2025  
Start: 11:11 a.m.  
Recess: 1:01 p.m.

HELD AT: 250 Broadway-Committee Rm, 16<sup>th</sup> Fl.

B E F O R E: Kevin C. Riley  
Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:  
Shaun Abreu  
David M. Carr  
Kamillah Hanks  
Francisco P. Moya  
Yusef Salaam  
Lynn C. Schulman

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

Richard Lobel  
Sheldon and Lobel PC

Fayanne Betan

Amanda Iannotti

Hamish Whitefield

Ben Apple [sp?]

Matthew Sloane  
Matrix New World Environmental

Aria [sp?]

William Vinicombe  
Resident at Duffield Street

Nancy Vinicombe  
Resident at Duffield Street

Harald Watress

Angelica Peralta  
Ajo & Oregano Restaurant

Jeffrey Nelson  
RXR

Heidi Hsing  
RXR

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

Carol Rosenthal  
Fried Frank Land Use Legal Counsel

Dina Rabiner  
Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce

Sara Penenberg  
Local SEIU 32BJ

Mark Landolina  
Downtown Brooklyn Partnership

Frank Clarke  
New York Building Congress

Tosha Miller  
NYC Black Chamber of Commerce

Joseph Sbarro  
Akerman LLP



2 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Good morning and  
3 welcome to today's New York City Council hearing on  
4 the Committee of Zoning and Franchises. At any point  
5 during today's hearing, no one may approach the dais.  
6 If you like to testify today, please see one of the  
7 Sergeant at Arms in the back to fill out a testimony  
8 slip. Please silence all electronic devices that you  
9 may have. Chair, you may begin.

10 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: [gavel] Good morning  
11 everyone, and welcome to a meeting of the  
12 Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises. I'm Council  
13 Member Kevin Riley, Chair of this Subcommittee.  
14 Okay. I'm Council Member Kevin Riley, Chair of the  
15 Subcommittee. I'm joined today by Council Member  
16 Salaam, Carr, Hanks, Restler, Majority Leader Farías,  
17 and online by Council Member Abreu and Schulman.  
18 Today, we are scheduled to hold six public hearings.  
19 The first one concerns a project known as the 347  
20 Flushing Avenue to build a new commercial and  
21 community facility space and legalize residential  
22 uses in the existing building located in Council  
23 Member Restler's district. The second public hearing  
24 will address the development project known as 236  
25 Gold Street to create a residential mixed-use

1 building also located in Council Member Restler's  
2 district. The third hearing concerns a large mixed-  
3 use project known as the 47<sup>th</sup> Hall Street to be  
4 developed in Council Member Hudson's district. The  
5 fourth hearing concerns a proposal known as the 42-11  
6 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue rezoning which seeks to build a  
7 residential mixed-use building in Council Member  
8 Cabán's district. And the last two hearings, we will  
9 hear two sidewalk café applications for restaurants  
10 located in Majority Leader Fariás district and  
11 Council Member Powers district. Before opening the  
12 hearing, I first will go over the hearing procedures.  
13 I just want to state for the record, we've been  
14 joined remotely by Council Member Moya. I know I  
15 just gave order, but we'll be mixing that order up a  
16 little bit. We will be hearing the sidewalk cafes a  
17 little bit earlier. This meeting is being held in  
18 hybrid format. Members of the public who wish to  
19 testify may testify in-person or through Zoom.  
20 Members of the public wishing to testify remotely may  
21 register by the visiting the New York City Council's  
22 website at [www.council.nyc.gov/landuse](http://www.council.nyc.gov/landuse) to sign up,  
23 and for those of you here in-person, please see one  
24 of the Sergeant at Arms to prepare and submit a  
25

1 speaker's card. Members of the public may also view  
2 a live stream broadcast of this meeting at the  
3 Council's website. When you are called to testify  
4 before the Subcommittee, if joining remotely, you  
5 will remain muted until recognized by myself to  
6 speak. When you are recognized, your microphone will  
7 be unmuted. We will limit public testimony to two  
8 minutes per witness. If you have additional  
9 testimony you would like the Subcommittee to  
10 consider, or if you have written testimony you would  
11 like to submit instead of appearing in-person, please  
12 email it to [landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov](mailto:landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov).  
13 written testimony may be submitted up to three days  
14 after the hearing is closed. Please indicate the LU  
15 number and/or the project name in the subject line of  
16 your email. We request that witnesses joining us  
17 remotely remain in the meeting until you're excused,  
18 as Council Members may have questions. Lastly, for  
19 everyone attending today's meeting, this is a  
20 government proceeding and decorum must be observed at  
21 all times. Members of the public are asked not to  
22 speak during the meeting unless you are testifying.  
23 The witness table is reserved for people called to  
24 testify and no video recording or photography is  
25

1 allowed from the witness table. Further, members of  
2 the public may not present audio or video recordings  
3 as testimony, but may submit transcripts of such  
4 recordings to the Sergeant at Arms for inclusion in  
5 the hearing record. I will now open up the first  
6 public hearing on Pre-considered LUs relating to 347  
7 Flushing Avenue proposal by the Navy Yard in  
8 Brooklyn. Applicant is seeking to change the zoning  
9 for a newly constructed building in an existing  
10 manufacturing district to allow additional commercial  
11 uses. The proposal would also legalize residential  
12 uses located at the eastern end of the block where  
13 the applicant is proposing its new development. For  
14 anyone wishing to testify on this item remotely, if  
15 you have not already done so, you must register  
16 online by visiting the council's website at  
17 [council.nyc.gov/landuse](http://council.nyc.gov/landuse). For anyone with us in-  
18 person, please see one of the Sergeant at arms to  
19 submit a speaker's card. If you're filling out a  
20 speaker's card, please make sure to indicate whether  
21 you are testifying in favor or in opposition. As  
22 always, if you prefer to submit written testimony,  
23 you may do so by emailing it to  
24 [landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov](mailto:landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov). I would now like to



1  
2 give the floor to Council Member Restler to give  
3 opening remarks.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Thanks so much,  
5 Chair Riley. I want to just first by-- first begin  
6 by thanking staff for their hard work on this,  
7 especially Lena and William from the Council Land Use  
8 Division and Angela from my team. We've had a number  
9 of constructive conversations with the applicant team  
10 from 347 Flushing. It's a bit of an unusual  
11 application, and this was a recently constructed  
12 building that they're looking to make some zoning  
13 changes on, but I've been very pleased by the  
14 progress that we're making together, and I'm hopeful  
15 that we'll be able to reach a positive outcome. I  
16 look forward to the presentation and questions today.  
17 Thank you very much.

18 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Council  
19 Member Restler. I will now call the applicant panel  
20 for this proposal which consists of Richard Lobel,  
21 Amanda Iannotti, Covad Saxina [sp?], Hamish  
22 Whitefield, Fyanne Betan, Ben Apple, and Ifram  
23 Hersch [sp?]. Counsel, please administer the  
24 affirmation.

2 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Could you please  
3 raise your right hand and state your name for the  
4 record?

5 IFRAM HERSCH: Ifram Hersch.

6 RICHARD LOBEL: Richard Lobel of Sheldon  
7 Lobel.

8 BEN APPLE: Ben Apple [sp?].

9 FAYANNE BETAN: Fayanne Betan.

10 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: And do we have  
11 anybody else online?

12 FAYANNE BETAN: Amanda and--

13 BEN APPLE: Amanda--

14 AMANDA IANNOTTI: Amanda Iannotti.

15 HAMISH WHITEFIELD: Hamish Whitefield.

16 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Okay.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: [inaudible]

18 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Do you  
19 all swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth  
20 in your testimony today and in response to Council  
21 Member questions?

22 FAYANNE BETAN: We do.

23 RICHARD LOBEL: I do.

24 UNIDENTIFIED: I do.

1 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. You may  
2 start.

3  
4 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. For the  
5 viewing public, if you need an accessible version of  
6 this presentation, please send an email request to  
7 landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. And now the  
8 applicant team may begin. I just ask that you please  
9 restate your name and organization for the record.  
10 You may begin.

11 RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you, Chair Riley.  
12 Richard Lobel of Sheldon Lobel PC with the applicant  
13 team representing 347 Flushing Avenue. Next slide,  
14 please. So, Chair Riley, Committee Members, this is  
15 an application as was mentioned by Council Member  
16 Restler to rezone the affected property from existing  
17 M12 to an M15 district. The building that was built  
18 at the site to eight stories was built as-of-right  
19 pursuant to M12 zoning. However, this zoning  
20 requires two things that are very burdensome in terms  
21 of the property. The first is an extraordinary  
22 number of required parking spaces and the second is  
23 an allocation of uses which really doesn't fit the  
24 community. So, if this application is to proceed and  
25 was approved, the proposed building here upon

1 rezoning would result in an eight-story building, the  
2 same building that exists. However, there would be a  
3 reduction in that parking and changes to the interior  
4 uses as we will detail in the application. There  
5 would also, as a kind of a side note to the  
6 application, be a rezoning of a condo lot to the east  
7 of the subject site which would rezone one condo lot  
8 from existing M12 zoning to R71C24. This would have  
9 the effect of legalizing residential properties that  
10 were granted pursuant to a BSA variance application  
11 in 2000. In addition to which MIH would be zoned and  
12 mapped over those properties. The next slide  
13 demonstrates the proposed development at the site.  
14 Again, what you see is what you get as far as the  
15 building is concerned. Existing eight stories plus  
16 cellar and sub-cellar with the proposed being the  
17 same. However, the next row really tells the story.  
18 The existing building, 140,000 square feet with a  
19 4.79 FAR has roughly 58,000 square feet of commercial  
20 use and 82,000 square feet of community facility, as  
21 well as parking in the sub-cellar in the first floor.  
22 Were this rezoning to be approved, the proposed  
23 building would not have 163,000 square feet. In that  
24 parking on the cellar level-- on the ground floor  
25

1 level would not be converted to commercial floor area  
2 to allow for retail. This would result in a building  
3 with 137,000 square feet of retail use, as well as  
4 office use above, and one community facility floor of  
5 25,000 square feet on the fourth floor. Importantly,  
6 the parking spaces here would be reduced from 313  
7 required spaces, an extraordinary number of spaces  
8 which are seldom used in effect, and that would be  
9 reduced to 86 voluntary spaces which is we've  
10 detailed along the way would be sufficient to handle  
11 the traffic generated by the site. The next slide  
12 shows the zoning map which again shows the existing  
13 M12 with nearby R71, and the next slide is the  
14 preposed rezoning in terms of the tax map. Again,  
15 this one lot would be converted from an M12 to an  
16 M15, and the corner lots, roughly 9,000 square feet  
17 would now be R71. The next slide is the area map  
18 which I think tells the story well in terms of why  
19 this appropriate. This site is access from both  
20 Classon Avenue as well as Flushing Avenue and is  
21 integral to the surrounding residential community.  
22 In fact, Brooklyn Community Board One voted  
23 unanimously in favor of this application, noting that  
24 many local residents heavily utilize this property in  
25

1 terms of shopping and are able to accomplish many  
2 different shopping goals and attend many-- or visit  
3 many different retail stores in one location which  
4 actually decreases a lot of demand in terms of local  
5 congestion and traffic. In addition to that, there  
6 is nearby bulk in the area including R71 to the north  
7 of Flushing and R78 at the south. The proposed  
8 building here again contextual in terms of these  
9 surrounding developed properties. The next several  
10 slide shows photographs of the developed building.  
11 Again, an eight-story building which provides parking  
12 which would not be on the sub-cellar live. And then  
13 the slides following these photos demonstrate plans  
14 of the building. If you want to keep paging through,  
15 you'll see a site plan. Next slide. Sorry, next  
16 slide. Great. So, you see the site plan situating  
17 the property right there. And then in the ensuing  
18 slides, the breakdown in terms of uses and the  
19 proposal for the site. Again, in terms of the change  
20 in uses, there would not be parking on the sub-cellar  
21 level. There would be commercial use in the cellar  
22 and first or third stories, community facility would  
23 be on the fourth story, and general office would be  
24 above. I think that the Community Board was really  
25

1 keyed into why we feel this is a meritorious  
2 rezoning. Given the fact that the building here was  
3 very challenged during COVID to occupy many of these-  
4 - to have many of these spaces occupied by tenants,  
5 and really was seen as being beneficial to the area  
6 in terms of allowing for local visitors and shoppers  
7 to accomplish their goals in one site. And also, we  
8 would note that Council Member Restler has been  
9 integral in our community conversations, and we're  
10 hopeful that given the property here as well as the  
11 support of the Community Board, the Brooklyn Borough  
12 President, and City Planning, that the Zoning  
13 Subcommittee will vote in favor of this application.  
14 And with that, the entire applicant team is happy to  
15 answer any questions.

17 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Richard.

18 Given your building includes much-- mostly commercial  
19 and community facility uses, why are seeking to map a  
20 high-density manufacturing district rather than the  
21 commercial district. And do you plan to introduce  
22 manufacturing uses?

23 RICHARD LOBEL: So, we don't intend to  
24 introduce manufacturing uses. The reason for the M15  
25 is that a C District would also allow for residential

1 use, which is not the goal here, and also means  
2 something very different in terms of demands of the  
3 local area. This area is well-established in terms  
4 of surrounding residential. This property itself is  
5 really not appropriate for that. So, in terms of  
6 available commercial use and allowing for a vast  
7 reduction in parking, the M15 was determined by City  
8 Planning and as confirmed by our office to be the  
9 optimal zoning district for this separation of needs.  
10

11 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: You recently  
12 constructed this building under the community  
13 facility allowed by the current M1-2 zoning district.  
14 Now you're seeking the rezoning to allow more  
15 commercial uses rather than use the building for  
16 community facility uses. Why did you not seek a  
17 rezoning first, and why this change? It's very usual  
18 to first construct a building and then seek a zoning  
19 change.

20 RICHARD LOBEL: Sure, Council Member  
21 Riley. So, truthfully, this is a very unique type of  
22 rezoning, and typically we would come to the Council  
23 before building a building like this. This building  
24 began construction in 2019, prior to COVID. The  
25 upper stories were intended to be populated by



1 medical office. The difference actually between M15  
2 and M12 in terms of these available uses is that  
3 while community facility is the predominant use in an  
4 M12, commercial office can be the predominant use in  
5 an M15. So, we did indeed populate the fourth story  
6 with community facility. However, it became clear  
7 that we were going to be unable to populate community  
8 facility use on the floors above. This resulted in  
9 vacancy of the building approaching 60 percent, and  
10 the building was close to economic failure. The  
11 application here would indeed save the building and  
12 allow to have productive uses. The distinction  
13 between the districts in terms of uses is great, but  
14 in terms of bulk is not great. The bulk as permitted  
15 pursuant to the M12, close to a 5FAR and the  
16 commercial FAR under M15 is a five. So, in essence,  
17 we fully intended to move forward with this as an as-  
18 of-right project, but after COVID and the vacancy of  
19 the above, the units above, we were forced to modify  
20 and request a rezoning.

22 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Richard.

23 Can you help me better understand how the residential  
24 building was built given that the current M1-2 zoning  
25 district does not allow residential uses?

RICHARD LOBEL: Of course, Chair Riley.

So, those buildings were built pursuant to BSA variants granted in 2000, and the buildings were built in 2004. Those buildings were built based upon a very different set of criteria. BSA variances are granted on hardship. At the time, the applicant which was not the owner of this property, made an application to BSA that there were economic challenges facing that property in terms of environmental remediation and such, given the M status of that property. So, at the time, BSA felt justified in granting a residential variance. Now, obviously, we're in a much different atmosphere and the R71 that's proposed for the property would allow for the legalization of these residential units as well as the imposition of MIH. So, to the extent that there was ever any new construction at the site, there would be required affordability. The buildings themselves would not gain any material development rights. Those would remain as residential uses, but very different type of application to go in for BSA variance which requires technical findings under 7221 of the zoning resolution, and a rezoning which seeks

1  
2 to change the actual zoning map to reflect proposed  
3 or in this case, existing uses.

4 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Richard.  
5 I have no more questions. I'm going to recognize  
6 Council Member Restler for his questions.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Thank you, Chair  
8 Riley. Really appreciate your leadership of this  
9 committee. Could you just break down for me, in the  
10 current zoning what's the square footage that is  
11 designated for community facility versus the new  
12 zoning, what's the square footage designated for  
13 community facility?

14 RICHARD LOBEL: Under the current zoning,  
15 Council Member, the community facility square footage  
16 would be roughly 82,000 square feet. Under the  
17 proposed zoning, that community facility use would be  
18 maintained on the fourth floor resulting in roughly  
19 25,700 square feet of community facility.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: So, a difference  
21 of approximately 57,000 square feet?

22 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Okay. So, look,  
24 I-- I'll say I have not yet been inside the building.  
25 I've-- I bike by and I walk by, you know, many

1 hundreds of times. I have heard from many neighbors  
2 how much they've enjoyed it and that they think that  
3 it's been a really positive addition to the  
4 community. So, congratulations on that, and adding  
5 good new jobs, good new businesses, and the ODA  
6 facility is much-needed. You know, in a dream world  
7 for me, I would rather have 82,000 square feet of  
8 community facility space than 27,000 square feet of  
9 community facility space. I'd rather have more  
10 opportunities to-- for more healthcare facilities,  
11 for more community-based organizations to be able to  
12 build out homes and office-- build out office space  
13 and be able to provide more quality childcare  
14 facilities and alike that really do meet the needs of  
15 the community. But when there's an opportunity for  
16 successful businesses to grow, when this is the only  
17 way to make the economics of the building work, we  
18 recognize it. But it is really important to me that  
19 with the community facility space that we have, that  
20 we do our best to really meet the needs of the  
21 community. I know that there have been some  
22 conversations that you all have been pursuing with  
23 local partners about potential leases, parking  
24

spaces, office space. Could you provide any updates on those conversations?

BEN APPLE: I provided six parking spaces for a not-for-profit organization. I am in talks on the--

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: [interposing] Can you turn on the mic for me, please?

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Or just a little closer to you. It's on, I think it's just a little-- you can move it. You can-- it's not stuck. There you go.

BEN APPLE: I provided six parking spaces for the community not-for-profit organization that needed parking. I met yesterday with a different organization for a food pantry possibility. They-- we marked out locations that are possibly viable, and they came back to me last night asking how we could go about it, how we'll enter it. I told them that I [inaudible] discuss with my attorney which I did actually [inaudible] the morning. He's going to look into it.

COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Great.

2 BEN APPLE: I'll have an answer hopefully  
3 later today. I'll be in touch with David [sic] from  
4 their office.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Great. Well, I  
6 just want to say, I-- you know, providing parking  
7 spaces for [inaudible] which do an excellent job in  
8 advancing community safety for the people of  
9 Williamsburg is an enormous service to the community,  
10 and the potential for a food pantry in Williamsburg  
11 would be a game-changer. You know, we do food  
12 distributions in the community, you know, every major  
13 holiday, you know, for many Shabbos's, but we don't  
14 have a food pantry of our own in the neighborhood of  
15 real scale, and so the opportunity to potentially  
16 provide those solutions in your building in addition  
17 to the other good things that are happening there I  
18 think, you know, would be just really wonderful  
19 achievements for the community. And I really want to  
20 thank you for pursuing those conversations with  
21 urgency and being open to helping to make those  
22 things happen. I-- you know, I'll be honest, I'm  
23 pretty happy. I really just want to make sure those  
24 things work out. I really appreciate the way that  
25 you've approached this, and let's just stay in active

1 communication in advance of this coming up for a  
2 vote, because if we can work these things out, I  
3 think we're in a great place. Thank you very much.

4  
5 BEN APPLE: Thank you. Looking forward.

6 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. The panel  
7 is now excused. Thank you so much. Counsel, there's  
8 no public testimony for this item, correct?

9 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Correct. Just  
10 confirming there's no one in the room here for 347  
11 Flushing, and I don't see anybody online.

12 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: There being no other  
13 members of the public who wish to testify regarding  
14 Pre-considered LUs relating to 347 Flushing Avenue  
15 proposal, the public hearing is now closed and the  
16 items are laid over. I will now open the public  
17 hearing on Pre-considered LUs relating to the 236  
18 Gold Street proposal in downtown Brooklyn. Applicant  
19 is seeking to build a new 14-story mixed-use  
20 residential building with about 114 apartments.  
21 Mandatory Inclusionary Housing will be mapped as a  
22 part of this application. So, approximately 29 of  
23 the apartments will be permanently affordable. For  
24 anyone wishing to testify on this item remotely, if  
25 you have not already done so, you must register

1 online by visiting the Council's website at  
2 council.nyc.gov/landuse. For anyone with us in-  
3 person, please see one of the Sergeant at Arms to  
4 submit a speaker's card, and if you're filling out a  
5 speaker's card, please make sure to indicate whether  
6 you are testifying in favor or in opposition.  
7

8 Council Member Restler, do you have any remarks for  
9 this project?

10 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Thank you, Chair  
11 Riley. Twenty years ago, there was a rezoning of  
12 this area, the Bridge Plaza area, that has generated  
13 thousands of units of-- I don't know the exact  
14 number, but I would confidently say thousands of  
15 units of housing toward Tillary, toward Prince, and  
16 along the stretch of Gold Street. And you know, this  
17 is an area appropriate for density. I'm really  
18 pleased that our community was able to facilitate  
19 that rezoning back in 2003. This site is on the  
20 border between the denser part of the area that was  
21 rezoned, and the kind of row houses of Concord and  
22 Duffield. And so, you know, adding a large building  
23 here has been very disconcerting to the neighbors in  
24 the immediate proximity who believe that this will  
25 have negative impacts on their quality of life, their



1 light, their air. You know, we recognize we're in a  
2 housing crisis, and you know, 22 years a long time  
3 since the rezoning, and it's a perfectly reasonable  
4 thing for us to revisit it and reconsider more  
5 density here, but we have a dynamic where the  
6 community is really upset, where the Land Use  
7 Committee voted against it, where the Community Board  
8 voted against it, where we've had meetings with the  
9 Bridge Plaza Civic Association, and they are, you  
10 know, red-hot mad over this proposal. So, I want us  
11 to find a path forward here, but you know, we have  
12 not yet identified how we're trying to work  
13 effectively with the community to reach a compromise  
14 that everybody can hopefully live with, and I hope  
15 that we'll make some progress on that in the hearing  
16 today and beyond.

18 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Council  
19 Member Restler. I will now call the applicant panel  
20 for this proposal which consists of Richard Lobel,  
21 Amanda Iannotti, Fyanne Betan, Ire Jung Reis [sp?],  
22 Mati Stern [sp?], German Cent [sp?], Olga Abinader  
23 [sp?], Matthew Sloane, Yoshi Tenant House [sic], and  
24 Joelle Shorts [sp?]. Counsel, can you please  
25 administer the affirmation?

2 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Okay. So, let's  
3 start with the people online. Can you please raise  
4 your right hand and state your name for the record?

5 RICHARD LOBEL: Richard Lobel of Sheldon  
6 Lobel PC.

7 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Who else is online?

8 MATTHEW SLOANE: Matt Sloane, Matrix New  
9 World Environmental.

10 ARI: Ari [inaudible] from the  
11 [inaudible].

12 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Anyone else?

13 ARI: I'm Ari [inaudible]

14 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Is German Cent [sic]  
15 or Olga Abinade [sp?] there, or Joel Schwartz [sp?]  
16 online?

17 UNIDENTIFIED: Joel Schwartz on.

18 MATTHEW SLOANE: Olga won't be on today.

19 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Okay. Did I hear  
20 Yoshi Tenant House [sp?].

21 UNIDENTIFIED: [inaudible] here.

22 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Okay. Okay. Sorry,  
23 just going through the list here. And then Amanda  
24 Iannotti here?

25 FAYANNE BETAN: She's not going to be.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: No, she's not.

Fayanne is here. Okay. Could you all please raise your right hand. Do you swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony today and response to Council Member questions?

FAYANNE BETAN: I do.

RICHARD LOBEL: I do.

MATTHEW SLOANE: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: The applicant team may begin. I just ask that you please restate your name and organization for the record. You may begin.

RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you, Chair Riley, Committee Members. Richard Lobel of Sheldon Lobel PC for the 236 Gold Street rezoning. Next slide, please. Next slide. So, this is a rezoning as was mentioned by Council Member Restler to rezone the subject parcels, four parcels totaling roughly 11,000 square feet of lot area from existing R6B to a C62A zoning district as well as to require affordable housing in the form of Mandatory Inclusionary Housing. This action would result in the development of a new 14-story, roughly 79,000 square foot building with mixed-use residential and commercial.

1 This development would provide roughly 114 dwelling  
2 units of which 29 dwelling units would be permanently  
3 affordable. As was suggested by Council Member  
4 Restler, this is a work in progress and has involved  
5 much discussion in terms of community conversations  
6 and otherwise. The vote by Community Board Two was a  
7 split vote against with two-thirds against, but a  
8 third in favor of the rezoning, many speaking in  
9 terms of the requirement and the need for additional  
10 residential units and particularly affordable  
11 housing. So, we do hope to come to some sort of  
12 agreement on a path forward and appreciate that  
13 Council Members work-- Council Member Restler's work  
14 on this. Next slide, please. So, as you can see  
15 from the zoning map, this is in an existing R6B  
16 district which is adjacent to the C62 district which  
17 resulted in 13 and 14-story buildings immediately  
18 adjacent and across from the site, as well as a C64  
19 district to the south which has resulted in buildings  
20 of 30 to 40 stories. And so when we look at this  
21 site and we look at the zoning in the area, we do see  
22 that despite the fact that there's an R6B district  
23 affecting the site-- this was zoned in 2003 and that  
24 was 22 years ago. And needs evolve and the community  
25

1 and certain community stakeholders have talked to us  
2 about the fact that they do want to see this and do  
3 want to see housing with affordability here. As we  
4 go through the slides, we'll just demonstrate that  
5 there are conditions at the site which regardless of  
6 rezonings in prior years make this currently very  
7 favorably inclined toward a proposed C62A. the next  
8 slide is a tax map which shows that the C62A would be  
9 adjacent to a C62 district. This is a condition  
10 which is sought by City Planning. In rezoning  
11 applications, the opportunity to take an existing  
12 district and to stretch it to cover a proposed  
13 rezoning area. The C62 here is actually a non-  
14 contextual district, meaning that there's no height  
15 cap on that district. You're able to keep going up  
16 in terms of floor area as long as you have required  
17 setbacks. The C62A, a contextual district, which  
18 would max the building out at that 145 feet or 14-  
19 story number. The next slide is the area map which  
20 we think really tells the story well in terms of why  
21 this rezoning makes sense. This area in terms of the  
22 Gold Street area and the immediate area of first  
23 fronts on a wide street allowing for good site  
24 access. The street system in the area provides for  
25

1 healthy bus access to the site, and in terms of being  
2 transit-rich, the area has roughly four subway  
3 stations and more than 12 subway lines within 0.6  
4 miles of site. This is a transit-rich area. The  
5 opportunity here to take a site which is undeveloped  
6 and currently vacant which would provide-- which  
7 would not cause any displacement of residents on this  
8 site, and to provide housing here on a transit-rich--  
9 in a transit-rich area on a site with no prior  
10 development or no development currently is really a  
11 rare opportunity to produce this number of units and  
12 this type of affordability. So, again, we are happy  
13 that at least a portion of the Community Board found  
14 that this was an appropriate site and that we do have  
15 votes in favor from the Brooklyn Borough President as  
16 well as City Planning. The next several sites also  
17 tell the story in terms of-- the next several maps  
18 and photos tell the story in terms of why this is  
19 appropriate. One can see the 13-story building which  
20 would be immediately adjacent to the site, as well as  
21 tall buildings in and around the site. The next page  
22 shows the 13-story building across from the site. And  
23 one of the things to note as we page to the next  
24 slide which shows some proposed rendering of the site  
25

1 is that we have performed environmental analyses in  
2 accordance with this project. Matthew Sloane is on  
3 the phone with us right now from Matrix. And the  
4 truth is that the shadows that will be cast by this  
5 building and other iterations of this building are  
6 quite similar to those that would be cast in terms of  
7 an as-of-right development. When we look at City of  
8 Yes and the R6B district that is now changed to allow  
9 for six-story building much like the building that is  
10 on the side of the-- the northern most side of the  
11 property as shown in this rendering. That building  
12 and six-story buildings across the site would produce  
13 shadows that with the exception of very select times  
14 during the course of a year would produce very  
15 similar shadows in terms of the effect of light and  
16 air on rear yards. So, you know, again, we do look  
17 forward to working with Council Member Restler and  
18 community stakeholders on a going forward basis, but  
19 we try to be cognizant of the fact that, you know,  
20 from an environmental standpoint we do fall within  
21 the context of the area and are cognizant of these  
22 concerns. The remaining slides, if you want to page  
23 through, show proposed layouts in terms of both  
24 commercial ground floor use, accessory space, and  
25

1 above that residential space and mix of bedroom  
2 units, studios, one's and two's throughout the  
3 property. And of course, we would note that pursuant  
4 to MIH, any of those affordable units-- numbering 29  
5 units in an option one scenario would be placed  
6 throughout the building and would, you know, benefit  
7 from larger unit sizes as well as being present on  
8 higher floors which is one of the great qualities of  
9 MIH. So, I think to conclude this portion of the  
10 proposal, you know, we do look forward to continuing  
11 to work on this ongoing project and really thank  
12 Council Member Restler to-date for all the work that  
13 has gone into this. We know that often times these  
14 applications are not easy, but the applicant team  
15 here is committed to trying to make this work. And  
16 with that, we're happy to answer any questions.

18 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Richard.  
19 Can you discuss the proposed unit size breakdown for  
20 me?

21 RICHARD LOBEL: Sure. Ben if you can--  
22 or if the Counsel can return to that-- one of the  
23 last slides that was put on the screen show the unit  
24 breakdown. But in the absence of that, currently  
25 there's studios that would number roughly 43 units,



1  
2 one-bedrooms at 30 units, and two bedrooms at 41  
3 units which would result in 114 units. Again, 41  
4 two-bedrooms would mean that greater than a third of  
5 the building would be two-bedroom units.

6 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Is there a reason why  
7 there are more percentage-wise studios?

8 RICHARD LOBEL: You know, I can leave  
9 that for the architect to discuss. I think it has to  
10 do with the proposed depth of the building and  
11 layouts, but I know the architect is on as well.  
12 Maybe if he wants to address momentarily the studio  
13 break-- the studio unit breakdown?

14 ARIA: Hi, my name is Aria [sp?] I'm  
15 from the architect's office. So, there is-- the  
16 bedroom mix is really depends on the site, the design  
17 [inaudible] site and not a corner site, which allows  
18 particularly less frontage. So, it result-- it may  
19 result more studios, but it was a standard analysis--

20 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: [interposing] You said  
21 less--

22 ARIA: [inaudible]

23 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: What was that, less  
24 funding?

25 UNIDENTIFIED: Less windows.

2 ARIA: I'm saying it's less windows.

3 It's a--

4 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: [interposing] Okay.

5 ARIA: It's an [inaudible] site, versus a  
6 corner building where you can sometimes have a result  
7 of more two-bedrooms. This is a typical unit mix.

8 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Okay. I-- just  
9 always on the record, Richard, you know how I feel  
10 about studios. I always want to propose, you know,  
11 more one-bedrooms. I think they're more livable  
12 situations for everyday New Yorkers. So, just always  
13 going to put that on the record. So, if there's any  
14 way that if we do approve this, you guys think about  
15 proposing some more one-bedrooms or two-bedrooms, I  
16 think that would be more ideal.

17 ARIA: Okay. That's-- let's do it [sic].

18 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. Do you  
19 have a tenant in mind for your commercial uses?

20 RICHARD LOBEL: No, the conversation to-  
21 date has just been to allow for local retail, perhaps  
22 a food store or other use to service the building and  
23 surrounding residents, but beyond that, there have  
24 been not been any definitive discussions given the  
25

1 fact that we are in ULURP and don't really have a,  
2 you know, a definitive building yet.

3  
4 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Okay. And why are  
5 you proposing to match a commercial district for a  
6 building that is primarily a residential building,  
7 rather than just mapping a commercial overlay  
8 district?

9 RICHARD LOBEL: Sure, Chair Riley. So,  
10 in these conversations with City Planning, I think  
11 there's two things which go on. The first is that  
12 they take a look at the existing sites around the  
13 area and zoning districts, and here we have a C62  
14 immediately adjacent. So, from a contextual  
15 standpoint, it allows us to really extend that C62 in  
16 the form of a contextual C62A and to immediately  
17 provide context to that proposed zoning district.  
18 The second is that City Planning given the  
19 transportation in the area and potential future  
20 development looks to potential additional commercial  
21 at the site. So, while we are in ULURP and we do  
22 have a proposed design, we do know that plans can  
23 change and to the extent that for example, more  
24 commercial or office was sought at the site, City  
25 Planning thought it was appropriate for now or in the

1 future for this to be a C62A. it's an appropriate  
2 district given the abundance of transportation in the  
3 area, as well as the potential for larger commercial  
4 FARs on a site of this nature. So, I think it was  
5 just a view towards the future of the site, and even  
6 if this applicant wasn't to build residential, what  
7 potentially could happen decades from now.

9 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Richard.  
10 I would now like to recognize Council Member Restler  
11 for his questions.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Thank you.  
13 Thank you, Chair Riley. The community in Bridge  
14 Plaza has repeatedly expressed concerns about the  
15 height and the bulk as out-of-character for the  
16 Bridge Plaza area and contrary to the Land Use  
17 principles outlined in the 2003 Bridge Plaza  
18 rezoning. How have you responded to these concerns?

19 RICHARD LOBEL: So, Council Member, we've  
20 met several times with the Bridge Plaza Association,  
21 and we've heard their concerns and have tried to make  
22 changes to reflect those concerns. I think it's been  
23 a challenging time given the fact that there were  
24 statements on the record by these-- by the neighbors  
25 which basically said that they weren't really

1 interested in any rezoning at the site and were just  
2 interested in seeing an as-of-right building. I  
3 think that the applicant internally has looked at  
4 various building designs that would potentially  
5 reduce the height of the building at certain places.  
6 I think kind of one of the things we've been thinking  
7 about is, you know, we respect the discussions that  
8 went on in 2002 and 2003. At the time, there were  
9 discussions around whether or not it would be  
10 appropriate for some type of historic district or  
11 some type of other district which would forcefully  
12 limit the heights in that area and limit building  
13 design. That was not done at the time. This is an  
14 open district in terms of historic importance and  
15 landmarking. It was not chosen to be so conditioned,  
16 and so this property has remained vacant for-- you  
17 know, vacant and under-utilized or unutilized for  
18 over 20 years. So,--

20 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: [interposing]  
21 Richard--

22 RICHARD LOBEL: Yeah.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: That landmarking  
24 question has no bearing on this vacant lot. The  
25 vacant lot wasn't going to be part of a landmarked

1 district. The-- you know, we've gone back and forth  
2 with the LPC. We met with the Chair of the LPC just  
3 yesterday again to request further consideration of  
4 landmarking of the Bridge Plaza area. You know,  
5 they've denied our request previously, including  
6 earlier this year, because you know, while there are  
7 clearly a handful of homes on Duffield and a handful  
8 of homes on Concord that would likely meet the  
9 standards for a land-marked district, both sides of  
10 each of those streets would not, and so it's  
11 challenging to create a historic district when it's a  
12 kind of subset of the homes within the area. But  
13 that's not germane to this-- to the question we  
14 asked. I think that's separate. The-- you know, I  
15 understand that neighbors would probably prefer this  
16 site was owned for row houses. They would be happy  
17 if row house construction or kind of townhouse  
18 construction was built here, but has there been any  
19 effort to reach a sort of compromise with them that--  
20 you know, to move forward?

21  
22 RICHARD LOBEL: Other than the  
23 conversations that we've had with them, responding to  
24 their communication with Community Board Two and  
25 internal revisions of the proposal that would result

1  
2 in a reduction in stories, we have not put anything  
3 on the record that addressed those concerns. On a  
4 going forward basis, in the event that we're able to  
5 do so and that conversations proceed, we're happy to  
6 do that. It's just up to this point we have not done  
7 so.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Okay. How would  
9 you-- I think you included this kind of step-down  
10 approach in your proposal. But how would you work in  
11 this plan to try to reduce the shadow and kind of  
12 impacts on the adjacent homeowners, particularly on  
13 the Concord Street side and toward the corner at  
14 Duffield and Concord?

15 RICHARD LOBEL: I think that there's  
16 certain benefits of City of Yes which were not really  
17 fully utilized in terms of our proposal right now.  
18 And what those would allow for would be for  
19 distribution of the bulk-- additional distribution of  
20 the bulk to the north side of the property where  
21 formally there was a-- you know, a heavier required  
22 step-down as well as potentially shifting some of the  
23 bulk into the rear of the property. This would allow  
24 for reduction in height which would-- as has been  
25 reviewed by [inaudible] Consultants who would result

1  
2 in decreased shadows over the rear yard. So, I think  
3 that there are things we can do that haven't been  
4 fully explored or at least fully presented that we've  
5 looked at internally that we're happy to present on a  
6 going forward basis.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: How do we  
8 guarantee that in the zoning, that there'll be a  
9 meaningful stepdown?

10 RICHARD LOBEL: Yeah, it's hard. I mean,  
11 I know that we've been in this position before,  
12 Council Member, because we have-- an applicant here  
13 is proceeding in good faith who has done other  
14 developments in the area and who is trustworthy, but  
15 I know that there is, you know, our discussions  
16 around, you know, holding a developer's feet to the  
17 fire. So, we like to rely on the good will of our  
18 applicant, and you know, a letter in the record that  
19 says that they're going to do what they're going to  
20 do.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: [inaudible]

22 RICHARD LOBEL: To the extent that-- you  
23 know, I mean, that's where we start and, you know, to  
24 the extent additional assurances are required, you  
25 know, we discuss those.



2 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Is there  
3 anything you want to put forward on the record today  
4 about how you can guarantee in the zoning a  
5 meaningful step down that could try to alleviate some  
6 of the concerns that have been identified?

7 RICHARD LOBEL: Yeah. The problem I  
8 think is that it's not addressed in the zoning  
9 district. So, we have zoning districts where, for  
10 example, there's requirements that if you pair two  
11 zoning districts, you're required to do commercial  
12 use on the ground floor or you're-- or you know,  
13 you're required to have certain considerations in  
14 terms of design. So, is it something we talked about  
15 an applicant team, yes, but in terms of the record  
16 and on a going forward basis, I think we'd be more  
17 comfortable discussing those directly with you, with  
18 local neighbors to make sure that to the extent we  
19 are-- have a rezoning here and have an approved  
20 application, that everyone walks away confident that  
21 the applicant is going to obey their obligations.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: I just want to  
23 be very clear that as Council Members were charged  
24 with negotiating these projects, and when we leave it  
25 up to the good will of applicants, we get burned the

1 vast majority of the time. And so, my expectation is  
2 that we identify crisp, clear, binding agreements in  
3 the zoning resolution for how we can guarantee a  
4 meaningful step down so that you don't have a 14-  
5 story tower immediately next to the townhouse on the  
6 corner, and that we create a thoughtful design that  
7 incorporates the building into the neighborhood and  
8 bridges-- you know, as appropriate for Bridge Plaza--  
9 bridges the-- you know, wasn't that cute? The-- oh,  
10 my-- you know, Crystal Hudson, we love you. That was  
11 on the record. The-- you know, that bridges the  
12 larger buildings to the townhouses. So, I just-- I  
13 have ideas and suggestions for how we can require  
14 this, but I just wanted to one more time give you an  
15 opportunity to present any proposals that you have  
16 for how you could achieve that stepdown more  
17 effectively.

19 RICHARD LOBEL: Yeah, I think it's a  
20 sensitive topic, and you know, my applicant is here  
21 to discuss this. I don't want to go on the record as  
22 offering anything without, you know-- of this-- which  
23 is a serious undertaking just to say that we can  
24 commit to that on a going forward basis, and we look  
25 for ways to do that, but I just want to be careful

1 about saying that right now because we don't want to-  
2 - what we don't want to do is go back on our word and  
3 make promises we can't keep. So, you know, we would  
4 look forward to working with your office to do that.  
5 I just want to be-- I want to be sensitive to the  
6 applicant--  
7

8 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: [interposing] We-

9 -

10 RICHARD LOBEL: in terms of this hearing.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Fair enough. We  
12 look forward to those conversations. We'll have  
13 those promptly. I think the other thing I just want  
14 to ask-- there's no community facility space in this  
15 building. It is a large new development for a  
16 growing neighborhood. What if any commitments or  
17 intentions does the applicant team have to kind of  
18 help meet the needs of the growing neighborhood?

19 RICHARD LOBEL: Yeah, I know my applicant  
20 is in the room today. So, I'd say that given the  
21 building envelope I think that there is the  
22 opportunity there. I don't know whether or not the  
23 applicant team has any other comments in terms of the  
24 opportunity for community facility.  
25

2 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Or investments  
3 in the community to meet the needs of a growing  
4 neighborhood and the additional 115+ odd units that  
5 will be added. Anything you'd like to add?

6 BEN APPLE: We're open to this  
7 conversation.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Okay.

9 BEN APPLE: It's something you brought up  
10 in the past, and we said [inaudible]

11 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: You could just speak  
12 into the mic. Thank you.

13 BEN APPLE: We'll try to accommodate.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Okay. We'll do  
15 our best to try and identify solutions that can work  
16 for all of the parties involved. I would just-- one  
17 other question. There's a-- in Council Member  
18 Hudson's district, you know, which is just across the  
19 street from here, is a beloved church, Church of the  
20 Open Door. Have you all been in conversation with  
21 the Church through this rezoning process?

22 BEN APPLE: Not that I know of.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Okay. Well, we  
24 would like to help build that relationship, and I'm  
25 sure maybe in partnership with Council Member Hudson

1 figure out ways in which the community at the church  
2 and the community [inaudible] houses more broadly can  
3 benefit from and be a part of the conversation here  
4 as well. So, we'll look forward to discussing how we  
5 can incorporate into the zoning resolution an  
6 effective step-down for this project, talking about  
7 community investments that can meet the needs of our  
8 growing neighborhood and working to build a  
9 relationship with Church of the Open Door and  
10 figuring out if perhaps there are opportunities.

11 There's a real focus in that church on  
12 entrepreneurialism, and perhaps there are  
13 opportunities in the commercial space for a  
14 partnership with the church that could create good  
15 jobs for the community and economic opportunity for  
16 people in the neighborhood who would benefit most.

17 So, would welcome the chance to work together on each  
18 of those fronts. I hope that we can get to a yes  
19 here. I do think that this is a great opportunity for  
20 us to build housing. I just- I want us to do it in  
21 such a way that we're bringing people together and  
22 trying to make reasonable compromises to make this  
23 work as well as it can for the neighborhood. I'm  
24 good.  
25

2 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Council  
3 Member Restler. There being no more questions, this  
4 applicant panel is now excused. I will now go to  
5 online testimony. One second. I will now go to  
6 online testimony and would now like to recognize  
7 William Vinicombe and Harald Watress [sp?]. We'll  
8 start first with William. William, if you can hear  
9 me, please unmute and you may begin. William  
10 Vinicombe?

11 SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

12 WILLIAM VINICOMBE: Yes, good morning.

13 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Good morning.

14 WILLIAM VINICOMBE: Thank you for your  
15 time. My name is William Vinnicombe, and I live on  
16 the block at Duffield Street in a house that was in  
17 my family for over 100 years. I am also a former  
18 Chair of Community Board Two, and I head the Land Use  
19 Committee of Community Board Two for over a decade at  
20 one time. I have three points I'd like to talk about  
21 today. I'd like to talk about the Community Boards  
22 involvement with this area, Bridge Plaza. I'd like  
23 to talk about what is changed, and the last thing I'd  
24 like to talk about is the precedent that this may set  
25 for the future. So, number one, Community Board Two

1 in 2003 in partnership with City Planning and the  
2 local Council Member at the time worked to rezone  
3 Bridge Plaza from a manufacturing to a residential  
4 mixed-use district. The intent of the 2003 rezoning  
5 was to encourage a mix of high and low-rise  
6 residential development while preserving the  
7 neighborhood's historic low-scale character,  
8 including buildings over 200 years old. In March of  
9 this year, the Board reviewed and rejected the  
10 proposed change before you today to that plan,  
11 reaffirming the original zoning with fresh  
12 consideration and renewed support. It also  
13 specifically rejected developer's attempt to spot  
14 zone a single building, an approach that undermines  
15 the broader community planning process. My second  
16 point is what has changed? Throughout this process  
17 we've heard people say, well, it's 22 years ago and  
18 things have changed. Well, what has changed? What  
19 has changed is we have-- there's been hundreds of new  
20 apartments built in the area, including affordable  
21 housing under the current zoning. New buildings have  
22 been built all in compliance with the R6B zoning  
23 preserving the intended scale and character  
24 established in 2003. That's changed zoning is doing  
25

1 exactly what it was designed to do in 2003. Which  
2 many of us that had worked on that originally--

3  
4 SERGEANT AT ARMS: [interposing] Thank  
5 you. Your time expired.

6 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: William, you can wrap  
7 up your third point.

8 WILLIAM VINICOMBE: My third point is  
9 that the most important one is that the precedent  
10 that this may set for the future. We talked about  
11 getting 29 affordable housing units out of this,  
12 which I understand that goes with the City of Yes  
13 program, but basically, the future of the area would  
14 be open to chipping away at this due to the fact that  
15 once this is done, other developers can come along  
16 and use this as a precedent set to do new other  
17 zoning areas within the Bridge Plaza area and which  
18 would erase the historical character of Bridge Plaza.  
19 Thank you for your time.

20 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, William.  
21 Next, we'll hear from Harald Watress [sp?]. Harold  
22 if you can hear me, please unmute and you may begin.

23 SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

24 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Harold?

25 HARALD WATRESS: Hello? Can you hear me?



CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Yes, we can hear you.

HARALD WATRESS: Okay, may I start?

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Yes, you may start.

HARALD WATRESS: My wife and I are the owners of a unit at 35 Duffield which adjoins the site. So, before we purchased the unit the building was under construction, and we did a thorough investigation of what the rights are of all the buildings, the properties in the block, in particular the vacant lot which we were going to be looking at. And as you-- as well-documented, the 2003 rezoning involved a lot of communication, contact and decision was made with thorough thought. The developer bought this property knowing that the permissible zoning only allowed for four-story building. This developer is simply seeking to profit from changing the zoning to a 14-story building without providing parking, which is currently not allowed, all to our detriment. Noise, parking would be detrimental to us. We would be looking into 145-foot wall immediately adjacent to our yard. All three of our bedrooms would be looking at this 140-foot wall. It would be totally unreasonable to change the zoning for this property after the community worked tirelessly alongside the

1 New York Council Department of Planning to create a  
2 long-term plan that could maintain the character of  
3 our low-rise neighborhood while allowing for  
4 reasonable high-rise development on Tillary Street.  
5 The 14-story building is inappropriate and would  
6 dramatically change the landscape overshadowing our  
7 homes and destroying neighbor's character. If the  
8 developer cannot guarantee down-scaling the proposal,  
9 surely the proposal should be refused.

11 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Thank you. Your time  
12 expired.

13 HARALD WATRESS: [inaudible] For these  
14 reasons, I ask you not to support the rezoning and  
15 turn it down. Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Okay. Thank you so  
17 much. Council Member Restler?

18 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Thanks, Chair  
19 Riley. Mr. Vinicombe, just a question for you. I  
20 totally hear you on the concern that this could set a  
21 troubling precedent, but this site unlike I think the  
22 rest of the area is a vacant lot. The zoning for the  
23 other sites at R6B currently would-- without  
24 rezoning, there'd be no incentive to tear buildings  
25 down and to rebuild. So, you know, I think I want to

1  
2 be clear as the Council Member on the record in  
3 saying that I'm not interested in rezoning the row  
4 houses of Duffield Street and Concord in the other  
5 portions of Bridge Plaza. I don't think there should  
6 be an incentive to tear those buildings down for new  
7 development.

8 HARALD WATRESS: [inaudible]

9 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Sorry, this was  
10 a question for Mr. Vinicombe. If-- do you have any  
11 further thoughts there or anything you'd like to  
12 expand upon that?

13 WILLIAM VINICOMBE: Yes. Thank you, and  
14 thank you for your question. There's some  
15 vulnerability there because there are some owners  
16 that own more than one building that are adjacent to  
17 each other, so that could be a problem in the future.  
18 It is a very small neighborhood, and the fact is that  
19 while, you know, your support and others at the  
20 Community Board and City Planning and maybe at the  
21 Borough President, you know, somewhat in the future,  
22 but five years from now, you know, there's no  
23 guarantee holding this and somebody coming along with  
24 the kind of very need for things that's going on  
25 politically right now-- it could set a precedent that

1  
2 somebody will come along and say well, listen, you  
3 know, we did it over here. There's some property  
4 that has a bit of a C62 on it now and that has been  
5 rezoned. It goes against the backyards. And you  
6 know, what is-- we were right back where we are here.  
7 Just so-- that's-- it's very-- you know, just-- for  
8 29 units to be able to, you know-- and I understand.  
9 Under the zoning we've added-- it's been successful.  
10 We added affordable housing. So, for 29 units to  
11 jeopardize or maybe set a precedent for the future  
12 that'll actually wipe out the neighborhood-- and we  
13 think about Vinegar Hill, the waterfront, places that  
14 where if we allow things like this to go on, over  
15 time we'll just be erased. So, that's my concern.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER RESTLER: Yeah. Look, I  
17 appreciate the sentiment. I think that the-- I do  
18 think that there's a distinction between an empty lot  
19 and a built neighborhood, and the likelihood for  
20 rezoning, but I do think that it's worth taking a  
21 look at, the existing zoning for the row house block  
22 of the neighborhood and if there are any further  
23 restrictions that we want to place there to try to  
24 protect the housing stock if landmark designation or  
25 creation of a landmark district is not viable. So, I

1 think it's something that we should continue to  
2 explore, but appreciate the testimony from both of  
3 you today, and thank you for making the time.

4 WILLIAM VINICOMBE: Yeah, and thank you  
5 for your involvement in this. I appreciate that.

6 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Council  
7 Member Restler. There being no other members of the  
8 public who wish to testify regarding the Pre-  
9 considered LUs relating to 236 Gold Street proposal,  
10 the public hearing is now closed and the items are  
11 laid over.

12 WILLIAM VINICOMBE: My-- there is another  
13 person that--

14 NANCY VINICOMBE: Hi, my name is Nancy  
15 Vinicombe. I live in Bridge Plaza in a house that's  
16 been--

17 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: [interposing] Hold on,  
18 Mrs. Vinicombe. Hold on one second.

19 NANCY VINICOMBE: Okay, sorry. I  
20 registered.

21 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Mrs. Vinicombe, are  
22 you identified as the iPhone that signed on, or are  
23 you just with your husband?  
24  
25

2 NANCY VINICOMBE: Yes. I'm using the  
3 same as my husband.

4 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: did you sign up?

5 NANCY VINICOMBE: Yes, I did, this  
6 morning.

7 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Okay, go ahead Mrs.  
8 Vinicombe, go ahead. Go ahead.

9 NANCY VINICOMBE: Okay. I live in Bridge  
10 Plaza in a house that has been in our family for over  
11 100 years. The site at 236 Gold Street was once home  
12 to three-story residences lost during the Robert  
13 Moses era when Bridge Plaza endured upheaval,  
14 eminent domain, the BQE, the widening of Gold  
15 Street. These all reshaped our neighborhood. Bridge  
16 Plaza holds some of Brooklyn's oldest row houses  
17 built in early to mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. These homes tell  
18 the story of Brooklyn's working-class history,  
19 housing dock workers, artesians [sic], and naval  
20 officers who helped make the Navy Yard a national  
21 powerhouse. Their architecture ranging from federal  
22 to Greek revival and Italianate [sic] is a rare  
23 glimpse into Brooklyn before industrialization took  
24 hold. New construction located on Duffield Street and  
25 Concord Street is excellent examples. It tastefully

1 conforms to R6B zoning and enhances the neighborhood  
2 while reflecting the historic character of the  
3 surrounding existing structures. The zoning changes  
4 approved in 2003 by Community Board Two, the Planning  
5 Commission, have successfully stimulated new  
6 development while preserving the neighborhood's  
7 historic low-rise character. The rezoning proposal  
8 that is before us today disregards that vision. For  
9 these reasons, I urge you to oppose this rezoning,  
10 and I thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. There  
13 being no other members of the public who wish to  
14 testify regarding Pre-considered LUs relating to the  
15 236 Gold Street proposal, the public hearing is now  
16 closed and the items are laid over. Just before I  
17 move on, there's somebody online registered as an  
18 iPhone. Please re-register and switch your name to  
19 the name that you will be utilizing to testify.  
20 Thank you. I will now open up the public hearing  
21 regarding the sidewalk café application by Ajo &  
22 Oregano Restaurant located along White Plains Road by  
23 the Parkchester development. Applicant is seeking to  
24 place five tables and 10 chairs along the sidewalk in  
25 front of the restaurant. For anyone wishing to

1 testify on this item remotely, if you have not  
2 already done so, you must register online by visiting  
3 the Council's website at [council.nyc.gov/landuse](http://council.nyc.gov/landuse).  
4  
5 And for anyone with us in-person, please see one of  
6 the Sergeant at Arms to submit your speaker's card.  
7 I would now like to recognize the Majority Leader  
8 Farías for her remarks.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER FARIÁS: Thank you, Chair  
10 Riley, and thank you to my colleagues in the  
11 subcommittee. Today's hearing provides an important  
12 opportunity to ensure applications submitted under  
13 the new Dining Out NYC program meet the standards of  
14 safety, transparency and community accountability  
15 that this council and our constituents expect. As  
16 members of the Council, we must review sidewalk café  
17 applications thoroughly especially when public right-  
18 of-way, pedestrian safety, and local business impacts  
19 are at stake. Today, I am raising specific concerns  
20 about the sidewalk café application submitted for Ajo  
21 & Oregano Restaurant in District 18. First, we need  
22 to closely examine the actual distance between the  
23 proposed sidewalk café and the fire hydrant located  
24 to the right of the establishment. The application  
25 states a 10-foot distance, but based on our on-site



1 observations, the hydrant appears to be much closer,  
2 possibly within the eight feet or less range that  
3 must be explicitly disclosed in the application. To  
4 ensure that this application and our land use process  
5 accurately reflect the street, we must clarify this  
6 point. Second, there are clear inconsistencies  
7 between the materials submitted in the application  
8 and what exists on the ground. The site drawings  
9 submitted suggests that there will be two doors left  
10 and right of center along the front of the sidewalk  
11 café. However, photos submitted in the same  
12 application show only one door at the far right of  
13 the sidewalk café. This matters because if a second  
14 door is added to the left, it would place exiting  
15 pedestrians directly into the active work zone of  
16 National Rims and Tires where mechanics frequently  
17 move equipment between the building and the street.  
18 This poses a risk to both patrons and passersby which  
19 should be taken into consideration with the site  
20 plans. Additionally, the café set up currently in  
21 use at the location looks completely different than  
22 the drawings and images submitted to the  
23 Subcommittee. This inconsistency further calls into  
24 question the transparency and materials of this  
25

1 application. We need to know what is the actual  
2 intended layout and how does it reflect or contradict  
3 what is already in operation. Finally, I must raise  
4 the fact that according to photos taken by a member  
5 of my staff last week, there is already an  
6 operational sidewalk café at the site, despite no  
7 official application for a sidewalk cafe having been  
8 submitted from District 18 since the launch of Dining  
9 Out NYC, let alone for Ajo & Oregano Restaurant. If  
10 accurate, this means the sidewalk café has been set  
11 up and is in operation illegally. This is deeply  
12 concerning and warrants further investigation by DOT  
13 and any relevant enforcement agencies. I want to be  
14 clear that I support outdoor dining when done  
15 correctly, when it respects pedestrian space, meets  
16 safety codes, and engages with both the local  
17 community and the Dining Out NYC program, but we  
18 can't allow applications to move forward when there  
19 are serious discrepancies, unanswered questions and  
20 signs of non-compliance. Thank you, and I look  
21 forward to the applicant and the working-- the work  
22 focused on to address a lot of these concerns in  
23 full. Thank you, Chair.

2 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Majority  
3 Leader. Unfortunately, there is no applicant signed  
4 up to present a testimony. I actually do love this  
5 restaurant, but I have to agree with everything that  
6 you just stated. I will now move onto public  
7 testimony. I will now recognizes Angelica Peralta  
8 and Joelle Casado [sp?]. We'll first begin with  
9 Angelica. Angelica, if you can hear me, you may  
10 begin, and you'll be given two minutes to testify.

11 SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

12 ANGELICA PERALTA: Good morning to all  
13 chair members. Does everyone hear me?

14 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Yes, we hear you,  
15 Angelica.

16 ANGELICA PERALTA: Okay. Thank you for  
17 the opportunity. I just wanted to share that all the  
18 points that Ms. Fariás mentioned are valid, and we  
19 will work to rectify this. We have updated site  
20 plans. I just was unclear as to where I could have  
21 uploaded that. So, I guess at the conclusion of this  
22 hearing, I can definitely email those updated plans.  
23 In terms of us operating currently. We had received  
24 an email which I can also forward with the updated  
25 drawings that we have a temporary license. I will

1 check again to make sure, because I know that some of  
2 the emails were sometimes emailed with our other  
3 business in mind, that we're concurrently applying  
4 for sidewalk seating as well. But it was to our  
5 understanding that we were approved. But yes, I  
6 agree with all the points made, and rest assured that  
7 we will work with everything to make sure we're in  
8 compliance.  
9

10 COUNCIL MEMBER FARIÁS: Thank you. I  
11 appreciate you being on here and stating that. I--  
12 you and I-- if you can reach out to my office so we  
13 can connect on getting everything up-to-date and  
14 looking at the current site plans. I live in the  
15 area, and as Council Member Chair Riley has stated,  
16 we both love this restaurant and would like to see  
17 you folks in compliance as well as where we can find  
18 additional benefit in the area we could do so. So, I  
19 look forward to working together.

20 ANGELICA PERALTA: Thank you very much.  
21 And again, I also would like to extend an invitation  
22 for all who wish to dine with us, please welcome. We  
23 want to show you what we created and further discuss,  
24 you know, future plans even with expanding the space  
25 that we we're working with our landlord. I did want

1 to mention, Ms. Arias [sp?], or Fariás, I'm sorry, I  
2 did to try reach the number that was on the email  
3 regarding the public hearing, but it has been out of  
4 service. I'm not sure if there's an updated number  
5 that you can provide.

6  
7 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: It's probably the  
8 Council number, but you could always reach out to the  
9 Majority Leader's office and they'll be able to  
10 assist you with that matter.

11 ANGELICA PERALTA: Okay.

12 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Alright?

13 ANGELICA PERALTA: Alright, thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: And thank you so  
15 much. There being no other members of the public who  
16 wish to testify regarding the sidewalk application,  
17 the public hearing is now closed, and the item is  
18 laid over. I will now open the fifth-- excuse me. I  
19 will now open the next public hearing regarding the  
20 sidewalk café application by Mykonian House located  
21 along 83<sup>rd</sup> Street on the upper east side. The  
22 applicant is requesting to place four tables and  
23 eight chairs along the sidewalk in front of the  
24 restaurant. No applicant is here and the Council  
25 Member is in support of this application. So, this

1 is open and shut, everyone. There being no members  
2 of the public who wish to testify regarding the  
3 sidewalk application by the Mykonian Houses, the  
4 public hearing is now closed and the item is laid  
5 over. I will now open the next Pre-considered LU  
6 related to the 47 Hall Street proposal. It's your  
7 turn now. Proposal also located next to the Brooklyn  
8 Navy Yard. The applicant is seeking to create a new  
9 mixed-use development that will include approximately  
10 611 apartments, commercial space, and manufacturing  
11 space. These uses will be spread across a new  
12 building and existing building, some of which will be  
13 converted to residential use. Mandatory Inclusionary  
14 Housing will be mapped as a part of this application.  
15 So, approximately 153 of apartments will be  
16 permanently affordable. I will now like to recognize  
17 Council Member Hudson for any opening remarks. Okay.  
18 I will now call the applicant panel for this proposal  
19 which consists of Jeffrey Nelson, Heidi Hsing, and  
20 Carol Rosenthal. Counsel, can you please administer  
21 the affirmation?

23 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Can you please raise  
24 your right hand and state your name for the record?

25 JEFFREY NELSON: Jeffrey Nelson.

1 HEIDI HSING: Heidi Hsing.

2 CAROL ROSENTHAL: Carol Rosenthal.

3 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Do you  
4 swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth in  
5 your testimony today and in response to Council  
6 Member questions?  
7

8 JEFFREY NELSON: Yes.

9 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. I just  
10 please that you-- please reinstate your name and  
11 organization for the record. You may begin.

12 JEFFREY NELSON: Good morning. I'm Jeff  
13 Nelson with RXR. I'm joined by Heidi Hsing with RXR  
14 and Carol Rosenthal who's Land Use Counsel at Fried  
15 Frank. Next slide, please. So we're here to talk  
16 about the 47 Hall Street rezoning. Next slide,  
17 please. 47 Hall Street is located in the Wallabout  
18 area, approximate to Clinton Hill, between Clinton  
19 Hill and the Navy Yard in downtown Brooklyn. The  
20 site, if we zoom in on the next slide, is located  
21 between Ryerson and Hall Streets, Park Ave. and  
22 Flushing Park is where the elevated BQE is located.  
23 It's a campus that's a full block. It's 10 buildings,  
24 as we'll show you on the following slide, and  
25 obviously located right next to the Navy Yard, a

1 major job center for the City. So RXR acquired this  
2 campus in 2016. It's about 2.6 acres in total. It  
3 consists of 10 commercial buildings, A through J. it  
4 reads as kind of more contiguous, but in fact, 10  
5 separate buildings. We put about \$100 million in  
6 capital improvements into the campus in 2019 with the  
7 expectation that this would be a commercial office  
8 campus and attract, you know, tech and creative firms  
9 to this area. COVID hit and as a result, you know,  
10 the office market has changed quite dramatically in  
11 Brooklyn. So, the campus has been largely vacant  
12 since that renovation occurred. Today, it's about--  
13 it is 100 percent vacant across all 10 buildings.  
14 And as a result of the challenges, RXR began looking  
15 at ways to reposition the campus to bring more of a  
16 mixed-use character to the block. So, we're here  
17 pursuing a rezoning which Heidi and Carol will go  
18 into to bring both a residential use as well as  
19 ongoing commercial uses to the site. I'll now turn  
20 it over to Heidi who'll talk about the campus.

22 HEIDI HSING: Next slide, please. So,  
23 when looking at the campus we saw an obvious  
24 opportunity to redevelop buildings A and J as they're  
25 currently underutilized. So, our plan is to demolish



1 those two buildings along with the surface parking  
2 and create a new residential building with frontage  
3 along Flushing Avenue. For the balance of the site  
4 we plan to convert building B to residential,  
5 building C and D to self-storage, and because we  
6 wanted to maintain a mixed-use character on the site,  
7 retaining buildings F, G, H, and I for commercial  
8 uses. Next slide, please. So, here is the existing  
9 and proposed developments and plan view. Buildings A  
10 and B would be residential as shown here in yellow.  
11 There would be 620 residential units, 150 to 180 of  
12 which would be permanently affordable. Buildings C  
13 and D as shown in dark blue would be self-storage.  
14 There would be roughly 100,000 square feet of  
15 commercial uses spread across buildings F, G, H, and  
16 I as shown in light blue, and there would be nearly  
17 50,000 square feet of residential, a portion of which  
18 is shown here in red in building E. Next slide,  
19 please. So, as illustrated in the proposed ground  
20 floor plan, it was very important for us that the  
21 site have a strong relationship with the surrounding  
22 community. So, as you can see, we have activated  
23 nearly every corner on the site with retail uses,  
24 targeting local businesses, as well as tenants that  
25

1 would serve the community members. There is an  
2 existing plaza between the new residential building  
3 and the commercial buildings that we expect would be  
4 activated as well as used for the residential entries  
5 for the buildings. And although the City of Yes  
6 waved parking, we do expect there to be some demand  
7 from the residential tenants, so we have utilized the  
8 lower floors of building E which are not well-suited  
9 for residential uses anyway. So, we're planning  
10 roughly 60 parking spots there with an entry off of  
11 Ryerson Street. Next slide, please. And so here's a  
12 view of the proposed development looking from Hall  
13 Street. As a reminder, on the left is the new  
14 residential building, and in the foreground you'll  
15 see the existing commercial buildings which we think  
16 are better suited for pre-built suites as well as  
17 maker spaces targeted towards smaller commercial  
18 tenants. And next, I'll hand it off to Carol who  
19 will speak to you more about our proposed zoning  
20 action.

22 CAROL ROSENTHAL: Good afternoon, Chair  
23 Riley and Subcommittee members and Council Member  
24 Hudson. The application today is for two actions.  
25 The first is for a rezoning which will-- I'll talk a

1  
2 little bit more in a moment. And the second is for  
3 text change to create a new Mandatory Inclusionary  
4 Housing site, as well as an MX27 mixed-use district.  
5 As you can tell, the site which is in red on the map  
6 is located between the Brooklyn Navy Yard which is  
7 zoned entirely manufacturing and has a master plan  
8 for an excess of 4.6 million square feet of  
9 manufacturing space. To the other side is the-- an  
10 entirely residential district which is shown in the  
11 orange, and five blocks from this is also what was  
12 the Navy-- it's the Navy Green District which is also  
13 in orange and is also residential. There are three  
14 parks nearby. There's the Commodore John Berry Park,  
15 Washington Hall Park, and Stueben Playground two  
16 blocks from the east of our site. Notwithstanding  
17 the current manufacturing designation of our site, it  
18 is in fact existing mixed-use. There's everything in  
19 that manufacturing area across from the Navy Yard  
20 from cold storage to residential lofts, utility uses,  
21 retail, a hotel, offices, garages, a number of  
22 vacancies, and warehouses. So, if we go to the next  
23 slide we'll go into specifics about the requested  
24 rezoning. The current M1 was put in place in 1961  
25 and in order to create the mixed-use community that

1  
2 Heidi noted, our application would retain an area of  
3 the block for an M1 district, M15. This covers the  
4 five smaller buildings facing Hall Street which would  
5 be for maker space and other commercial uses. Around  
6 that is the-- an M16A district paired with an R8  
7 district, and in that district there would be the  
8 residential new building, residential conversion, and  
9 commercial buildings as well. So, that's the  
10 proposal for the rezoning, and happy to answer any  
11 questions. I think we have some more-- Jeff's going  
12 to tie it up, and then we're prepared to answer any  
13 questions.

14 JEFFREY NELSON: Yep. So, the next slide  
15 shows you just a perspective looking down flushing on  
16 the corner of Ryerson and Flushing with a new  
17 building on the right, the residential conversion on  
18 the left with the entrance to the garage. You can  
19 see the corner retail activating this corner as well  
20 and improvements along the sidewalk as well. So, on  
21 the next slide-- please-- just to summarize the  
22 project benefits. Over 600 units of new housing to  
23 be delivered in this area, including 150 to 180  
24 permanently affordable housing, permanently  
25 affordable units, a significant number of

1 construction and permanent jobs. Those permanent  
2 jobs primarily located in the office-serving areas of  
3 the campus and community-serving retail to activate  
4 the corridor primarily along Hall Street and along  
5 Flushing. Thank you, and happy to take any  
6 questions.  
7

8 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you so much.  
9 When did the applicant acquire the properties on this  
10 block?

11 JEFFREY NELSON: 2016.

12 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: The Borough President  
13 disapproved of this project citing concerns of the  
14 loss of manufacturing area, lack of affordability,  
15 the self-storage use, and the concerns around  
16 streetscapes and urban design. How do you plan to  
17 respond to these concerns?

18 JEFFREY NELSON: So, as mentioned in the  
19 presentation, you know, we invested a significant  
20 amount of capital seeking to repurpose this campus  
21 for both office uses as well as light manufacturing.  
22 Given the proximity of the Navy Yard and the  
23 subsidized rents there it proved very challenging,  
24 particularly post COVID to find tenants, and the  
25 physical characteristics of the building are also

1 challenging with respect to manufacturing uses. We  
2 actually has the Navy Yard come through, Green Point  
3 Manufacturing Design Center come through to look at  
4 the spaces. None of them seemed to think that they  
5 were very viable. And so manufacturing really didn't  
6 in a sense pan out. So, that's the manufacturing  
7 piece. With respect to comments about affordability,  
8 we noted that, you know, the Community Board felt  
9 strongly about selecting MIH option one for our new  
10 building and that's something that we committed to.  
11 We still believe with respect to the conversion, we  
12 like the flexibility to pursue either MIH option one  
13 or two. That's a request that we have in front of  
14 Council Member Hudson today. We do think it's  
15 important, you know, to be delivering units at lower  
16 AMIs such as option one can deliver.

18 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. Self-  
19 storage facilities, I know within the area there's  
20 about four within a quarter mile. Can you explain  
21 why you have a self-storage facility on this mixed-  
22 use campus even though that area is overly saturated  
23 with them?

24 JEFFREY NELSON: So, self-storage is an  
25 as-of-right use permitted here today. That was-- has

1  
2 been the plan for that area of the campus for some  
3 time now. The buildings C and D are approximate to  
4 the BQE so less desirable from a residential or  
5 commercial standpoint. That said, we've heard this  
6 comment from the Community Board, the Borough  
7 President in conversations regarding the use of those  
8 buildings. I think the benefit of self-storage as a  
9 use is that the leases tend to be shorter term, five  
10 to 10 years, and so to the extent that an expiration  
11 comes up, we'll be seriously looking at, you know,  
12 how we might repurpose those buildings in the future.  
13 Residential could be delivered there. The final  
14 point I make on is just 600+ units is a significant  
15 number to deliver and absorb in this area, and so  
16 there is consideration around kind of the timing of  
17 the delivery. So, we think self-storage makes sense  
18 at buildings C and D, you know, in the short term.

19 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Can you discuss the  
20 proposed unit size breakdown?

21 JEFFREY NELSON: Say again?

22 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Can you discuss the  
23 proposed unit size breakdown?

24 JEFFREY NELSON: Sure. So, it's a mix of  
25 studios, one's, and two's, in the new building and in

1 the conversion. Similar to one of ht comments the  
2 applicant made in a prior presentation, you know, the  
3 conversion has larger units in particular, and the  
4 depts of the four-planed [sic] windows lend  
5 themselves more to studios and one's, though those  
6 are much larger units by square footage.

8 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: How many studios you  
9 have?

10 JEFFREY NELSON: It's less than half of  
11 the units. We're still planning the overall layout,  
12 but the majority of the units will be one's and  
13 two's, and then studios, you know, are less than half  
14 of the units.

15 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. And could  
16 you state again when the residential units are  
17 projected to be available?

18 CAROL ROSENTHAL: 2030.

19 JEFFREY NELSON: Yeah, 2030 is the build  
20 year for the project.

21 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. I would  
22 now like to recognize Council Member Hudson for her  
23 line of questioning.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: Thank you so  
25 much, Chair Riley, and good afternoon. You addressed



1 this a little bit already and I know some of my  
2 questions might be a little repetitive to Chair  
3 Riley's, so I'll try to rephrase some of them. But,  
4 both Community Board Two and Brooklyn Borough  
5 President Reynoso have expressed concerns about the  
6 level of affordability. Can you just share details  
7 about the plans for affordability, specifically at  
8 this development?  
9

10 JEFFREY NELSON: So, the new building we  
11 call building A-- and this was a conversation with  
12 the Community Board regarding the MIH option. We've  
13 committed to MIH option one which deliver 60 percent  
14 AMI units, 25 percent units at 60 percent blended  
15 AMI. With respect to the conversion, we continue to  
16 assess option one versus option two, you know, with  
17 obviously varying degrees of affordability, and the  
18 reason for that is making these conversions work  
19 under the abatement program and dovetailing it with  
20 MIH is a somewhat more complicated exercise. So,  
21 we've sought that flexibility from the Council.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: And so just for  
23 the record, option one, 25 percent at an average of  
24 60 percent--

25 JEFFREY NELSON: [interposing] 60 percent.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: Area median  
3 income would include 10 percent of the units at 40  
4 percent.

5 JEFFREY NELSON: At 40 percent, exactly.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: Thank you. Can  
7 you speak to what environmental sustainability  
8 features you plan to include in the building design?

9 HEIDI HSING: Sure. So, we're targeting  
10 a minimum of lead [sic] silver and to the extent that  
11 we can exceed that, we will. Eight of the 10  
12 buildings will be preserved which comprises roughly  
13 87 percent of the existing floor area. And so that  
14 will be adaptive reuse which has a considerably lower  
15 embodied carbon footprint compared to new  
16 construction, as you don't have to create new  
17 building materials, transport. There are also a  
18 number of landscaped terraces on the site that will  
19 help with stormwater management, as well as mitigate  
20 the urban heat island effect. And-- do I keep going,  
21 or?

22 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: You can keep--  
23 yeah.

2 HEIDI HSING: And we also plan to have EV  
3 charging stations in the parking garage and have all-  
4 electric HVAC and hot water systems.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: Okay, great.  
6 Thank you. And have you had any conversations with  
7 the Navy Yard about the proposed mix of uses on the  
8 site and its relationship to Navy Yard businesses and  
9 future activation?

10 JEFFREY NELSON: We have a good  
11 relationship with the Navy Yard. We have had  
12 conversations with them over time. Our hope is that  
13 that commercial space on the Hall Street side, about  
14 100,000 square feet, could provide opportunities for  
15 Navy Yard businesses. We haven't seen that to-date,  
16 but we continue, you know, kind of hope that that  
17 space is properly set up. The other thing I had  
18 mentioned with respect to kind of workforce training  
19 and thinking about local job training, that is  
20 something we're going to continue to talk to the Navy  
21 Yard about, because they have obviously deep  
22 experience working with the local community on that  
23 front.

24

25

1 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: Thank you. And  
2 can you just go over the plan for building E again?  
3 It's retail space?

4 JEFFREY NELSON: Yeah, that's a smaller  
5 building on the corner of--

6 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: [interposing]  
7 Right.

8 JEFFREY NELSON: Park and Hall. So it's  
9 single-story and a retail, and that's existing today.

10 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: Okay. And then  
11 lastly, if this rezoning were not approved, what  
12 would happen to this site?

13 CAROL ROSENTHAL: We have-- it's in our  
14 EAS. We have-- the plan would be to have what is  
15 currently the most viable use which is mini storage  
16 and storage on the site, and as described in our  
17 environmental reviews that would be in existing  
18 buildings except for buildings-- the building A which  
19 would have to be torn down and rebuilt for storage.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: So, basically,  
21 the entire site would be used for--

22 CAROL ROSENTHAL: [interposing] With the  
23 exception of the buildings, the smaller buildings  
24 facing Hall Street. Those would continue to be-- we  
25

1 continue to look for maker space and, you know,  
2 manufacturing and commercial for those buildings.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: Okay. So,  
4 storage and manufacturing.

5 CAROL ROSENTHAL: Makers-- whatever, you  
6 know, whatever the market would--

7 JEFFREY NELSON: [interposing] It's small  
8 office--

9 CAROL ROSENTHAL: [interposing] There's  
10 small office, not major large-scale manufacturing.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER HUDSON: Okay. Thank you.  
12 Thank you, Chair.

13 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Council  
14 Member Hudson. There being no more questions, this  
15 panel is now excused. Thank you so much for your  
16 testimony. I'll now switch to public testimony, and  
17 we'll start first Dina, Mark, and Sara. We'll begin  
18 first Dina.

19 DINA RABINER: Sure. Hello, my name is  
20 Dina Rabiner and I serve as Senior Vice President of  
21 Innovation and Strategy at the Brooklyn Chamber of  
22 Commerce. The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce is a  
23 borough-wide membership and economic development  
24 organization dedicated to helping businesses through  
25

1 four channels: promotion, support, advocacy, and  
2 convening. The Brooklyn Chamber and its affiliate  
3 organizations, the Brooklyn Alliance, and Brooklyn  
4 Alliance Capital provide direct business services,  
5 technical assistance and support programs to help  
6 businesses grow. I'm here today to express the  
7 chamber's support for the proposed rezoning of 47  
8 Hall Street. This development reflects an innovative  
9 approach for a neighborhood that has lacked  
10 significant investment given its location between the  
11 Brooklyn Navy Yard and the BQE. The planned mixed-  
12 use development will include a significant amount of  
13 housing, including affordable housing, on a  
14 superblock that currently has none. The block-long  
15 campus would also introduce ground floor retail and  
16 commercial space and activate a public plaza and  
17 pedestrian corridor while revitalizing a long-  
18 neglected part of the City. The area sandwiched  
19 between the BQE and Flushing Avenue will benefit from  
20 the introduction of a mixed-use campus and a great  
21 example of how new zoning can help spur economic  
22 development. Introducing a livable, usable  
23 superblock with ground floor retail in a neighborhood  
24 lacking options will usher in a new era of community  
25

connectivity north of the BQE. The Brooklyn Chamber believes that this project will be a great benefit to the surrounding neighborhood and we are in full support of the rezoning. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. Sara?

SARA PENENBERG: Hello, my name is Sara Penenberg and I'm here representing SEIU Local 32BJ to testify in opposition of the zoned rezoning at 47 Hall. 32BJ is the largest union of property service workers in the country, representing over 175,000 members, 90,000 in New York City. 32BJ members work and keep city buildings, stadium, airports, and public facilities safe, clean and running. 32BJ is fighting to ensure that property service in residential, commercial, and security sector in New York are offered sustainable, family-sustaining wages and benefits so people who keep New York safe and clean can afford to live in buildings that are built there. To-date RXR has not been able to make a commitment to any of the property service jobs including security at this development, and those would be not good family-sustaining jobs. And just to reiterate, we represent a large-- so about 25,000 security guards that represent and protect New York.

1 We represent those members, and they work in those  
2 buildings. We are looking to secure an agreement for  
3 that workforce. We are asking the City Council  
4 Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchising to vote no on  
5 this project, because we are concerned that it will  
6 bring bad jobs to Brooklyn, not good jobs that 32BJ  
7 fights for, and we call on RXR to demonstrate a  
8 commitment to good jobs by using responsible  
9 contactors that provide industry standard wages and  
10 benefits to security, residential, and cleaners at  
11 this specific 47 Hall property. Thank you so much  
12 for your time.

14 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Mark?

15 MARK LANDOLINA: Good afternoon. My name  
16 is Mark Landolina, the Senior Director of Real Estate  
17 and Economic Development at the Downtown Brooklyn  
18 Partnership. Although 47 Hall is just outside of our  
19 district boundaries, we strongly support this  
20 rezoning because of its broader potential to benefit  
21 surrounding neighborhoods. The proposed mixed-use  
22 campus brings over 600 units, including over 25  
23 percent affordable, many of them family-sized along  
24 with new retail, office and community space. This  
25 directly supports the ongoing need for more housing



1 near major employment hubs. The site located just  
2 across from the Brooklyn Navy Yard which provides  
3 subsidized industrial space and include-- continues  
4 to grow. The local housing is essential to support  
5 the workforce fueling that growth. Importantly, the  
6 plan responds to longstanding community priorities.  
7 It delivers pedestrian connections to adjacent  
8 neighborhoods, traffic calming, and active and safe  
9 24/7 streetscape, retail and public space. RXR's  
10 proposal will transform an isolated, underutilized  
11 block into a vibrant and connected part of Brooklyn.  
12 We believe this project is a smart community-focused  
13 investment in the borough's future and I urge your  
14 support for the rezoning of 47 Hall Street. Thank  
15 you.  
16

17 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. Council  
18 Member Hudson, you have any questions? Alright.  
19 There being no questions, this panel is excused.  
20 Thank you so much. Next panel we'll call will  
21 consist of Frank and Tosha. And we'll begin first  
22 with Frank.

23 FRANK CLARKE: Good afternoon, Chair  
24 Riley and Council Member Hudson. My name is Frank  
25 Clarke, Director of Government Relations at the New

1 York Building Congress. NYBC represents over 500  
2 organizations and 250,000 skilled tradespeople  
3 dedicated to the growth and prosperity of our city,  
4 and we strongly support the proposed rezoning and  
5 redevelopment of 47 Hall Street. RXR's plan  
6 transforms a 2.6 acre predominantly vacant site into  
7 a vibrant mixed-use community offering more than 600  
8 new homes, including over 150 permanently affordable  
9 units alongside commercial and job-generating retail  
10 spaces. Planning to create a public corridor from  
11 Flushing to Myrtle Avenue through activation of  
12 public plazas demonstrates a strong commitment to the  
13 public realm investment, extending the impact of the  
14 project beyond the development itself and into the  
15 lives of the valued community members. Over 60  
16 permanent parking spots for residents and commercial  
17 use, indoor bike storage, connections to MTA transit  
18 lines and bus routes, and ferry access for the Navy  
19 Yard, the development offers a range of  
20 transportation options appealing to a diverse array  
21 of residents. This is a shovel-ready blueprint for  
22 exactly the kind of equitable growth New Yorkers have  
23 been demanding, growth that preserves historic  
24 character while unlocking new opportunity, growth  
25

1 that brings jobs, housing, and vitality to an area  
2 long-isolated by planning decisions of the past. The  
3 economic upside is real and immediate. More than 500  
4 construction jobs and 350 permanent positions paired  
5 with long-term investment in streetscape  
6 improvements, transit access, and small business  
7 space, and with family-sized units in a layout  
8 focused on community connection, this project meets  
9 the moment with genuine livability. We urge you to  
10 approve the rezoning of 47 Hall Street and help bring  
11 this transformational project to life. Thank you.

12  
13 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. Tosha?

14 TOSHA MILLER: Good afternoon, Chair  
15 Riley and members of the Committee. My name is Tosha  
16 Miller and I am the President of the New York City  
17 Black Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for the  
18 opportunity to testify today in support of the  
19 proposed rezoning of 47 Hall Street. Our Chamber is  
20 committed to creating opportunities for Black-owned  
21 businesses and advancing economic mobility by working  
22 families across all five boroughs. That's why we  
23 view this project as not just a development, but a  
24 reinvestment of a community that's been overlooked  
25 for far too long. 47 Hall reflects an innovative,

1 forward-looking approach to revitalization. For too  
2 long, the area between Brooklyn Navy Yard and BQE has  
3 been underutilized. 47 Hall presents a chance to  
4 change that by transforming a largely vacant site  
5 into a vibrant mixed-use campus that includes retail,  
6 commercial space, and critically hundreds of units of  
7 mixed income housing with family-sized units. This  
8 is the kind of thoughtful inclusive growth our  
9 community needs. The plan also preserves space for  
10 light manufacturing and creative businesses, uses  
11 that reflect the identity of the area. Nearly half  
12 of the site remains non-residential, including areas  
13 that will retain M-only zoning. The balance ensures  
14 we're meeting today housing needs while still  
15 supporting small business and makers. Without this  
16 rezoning, the site could default to as-of-right  
17 storage, an outcome that serves no one. With it, we  
18 get jobs, housing, small business opportunities and  
19 community reinvestment. We urge the Council to  
20 support this rezoning. It's a model for equitable  
21 forward-looking development. Thank you so much.

22  
23 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you so much for  
24 your testimony. You're now excused. Thank you.  
25 There being no one else here to testify on Pre-

1 considered LUs relating to the 47 Hall Street  
2 proposal, the public hearing is now closed, and the  
3 item is laid over. I'll now open the last hearing on  
4 Pre-considered LUs relating to 42-11 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
5 proposal located in Astoria, Queens. Applicant is  
6 seeking to develop a new residential mixed-use  
7 building that will have approximately 28 apartments.  
8 Mandatory Inclusionary Housing will be mapped as a  
9 part of this application. So, approximately seven of  
10 the apartments will be permanently affordable. I  
11 will now like to call up the applicant panel for this  
12 proposal which consists of Joseph Sbarro and Manny  
13 Russell [sp?]. Counsel, can you please administer the  
14 affirmation?  
15

16 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Good afternoon. Can  
17 you please state your name for the record?

18 JOSEPH SBARRO: Good afternoon. Joseph  
19 Sbarro from Akerman LLP. I'm not joined by Manny  
20 Russell today. He couldn't make it, so.

21 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: No problem, Joseph.

22 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Coull you  
23 please raise your right hand? Do you swear to  
24 [inaudible].

25 JOSEPH SBARRO: I do.

1  
2 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Joseph.  
3 You may just reinstate your name and organization for  
4 the record and you may begin.

5 JOSEPH SBARRO: Good afternoon, Chair  
6 Riley and Committee Members. Joseph Sbarro from  
7 Akerman LLP. We represent the applicant CG Stone  
8 Realty LLC in this rezoning action. CG Stone Real--  
9 next slide, please. CG Stone Realty operates the Key  
10 Food Grocery Store at 4211 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Astoria.  
11 The applicant is seeking a zoning map amendment from  
12 an R5C12 to an R6AC24 and changing the R5C12 to R5  
13 generally along the north side of 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue between  
14 42<sup>nd</sup> and 43<sup>rd</sup> Street. The applicant is also proposing  
15 a zoning text amendment to establish a Mandatory  
16 Inclusionary Housing area with MIH option one. This  
17 will facilitate the enlargement of the existing  
18 grocery store-- existing one-story grocery store into  
19 a five-story mixed residential commercial building.  
20 These actions will enable the applicant to continue  
21 to operate their grocery store business and remain  
22 competitive in the market for years to come. This  
23 project will also provide for new affordable housing  
24 in Astoria on a wide street in a transit-oriented  
25 area. Next slide, please. So, here we have a zoning

1 change map. This zoning change map shows the  
2 proposed rezoning area outlined with the black dotted  
3 lines to the right, mapping the R6AC24 zoning  
4 district. It encompasses lots one, two, part of 39,  
5 40, 41, 44, 45, 47, and 48. That's nine lots in  
6 total. R5C12 zones allow for residential uses and  
7 have a maximum FAR of 2.0 for residential.

8 Unfortunately, the district's low permitted FAR  
9 significantly restricts the applicant's ability to  
10 expand on the site. The proposed rezoning to R6AC24  
11 will increase the permitted residential floor area to  
12 3.9 FAR and continue to allow for commercial uses.

13 Next slide, please. So, here we have a land use map.  
14 The development site is outlined with a dashed red  
15 line and the rezoning area in the black. The  
16 development site includes two adjacent lots at the  
17 corner of 43<sup>rd</sup> Street and 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue. That's lots 41  
18 and 44. Lot 41 is presently occupied by the grocery  
19 store, and the adjacent lot 44 is vacant land, both  
20 controlled by the applicant. The rezoning area  
21 encompasses the southern portion of block 698 and is  
22 between 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the south and 28th Avenue to  
23 the north. For context, 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a key  
24 east/west corridor, and it forms the southern  
25

1 boundary of the block. Existing land uses in the  
2 surrounding area primarily include mixed-use and  
3 commercial buildings along 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Steinway  
4 Street with mostly residential use on the mid-blocks  
5 ranging from one to five stories in height. Next  
6 slide, please. Here we have a photo of the  
7 development site taken looking to the north from 30<sup>th</sup>  
8 Avenue. You can see the vacant lot 44 to the left  
9 and the grocery store adjacent at the right. Next  
10 slide, please. So, a little bit of information about  
11 the proposed development. The enlarged building will  
12 be five stories, rising to a height of 60 feet. It  
13 will have setbacks along 43<sup>rd</sup> Street and also 28<sup>th</sup>  
14 Avenue. It will have 39,916 square feet of floor  
15 area in total at a 3.9 FAR. It will also have 15  
16 residential bike spaces, and we're proposing a green  
17 roof with recreation space at the fifth floor for  
18 building tenants to enjoy. It will also include solar  
19 panels along with stormwater bioretention system to  
20 reduce runoff, improve water quality and help cool  
21 the urban environment. The building will have 28  
22 dwelling units in total as designed including seven  
23 MIH units under option one. This will include a mix  
24 of studios, one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and three-



1 bedroom apartments, and I will show you a breakdown  
2 of those units by size in the next slide. The  
3 project will also facilitate the expanded grocery  
4 store on the ground floor, an additional 2,768 square  
5 feet with a new entryway, increased capacity, and an  
6 improved layout for business operations, and it will  
7 also have additional accessory storage in the cellar.  
8 Here we have a rendering of the building looking from  
9 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the north and 43<sup>rd</sup> Street. You can see  
10 the grocery store at the corner with the four stories  
11 of residential above. Next slide, please. This is  
12 an illustrative site plan. We will have setbacks, as  
13 I mentioned, on 43<sup>rd</sup> Street and 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The  
14 residential and commercial entrances will be located  
15 along 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue on the north side, as you can see  
16 here. Next slide, please. Here we have the  
17 illustrative first floor plan. Again, you can see  
18 the commercial and residential entrances along with  
19 the improved store layout for the business. Next  
20 slide, please. And last, we have an illustrative  
21 massing showing the commercial at the ground floor  
22 with the four residential stories above. Next slide,  
23 please. So, this is a proposed illustrative unit  
24 distribution with percentages of the total project.  
25

1 So, again, 28 units in total with seven MIH under  
2 option one; 25 percent of the residential floor area  
3 will be restricted at 60 percent AMI with 10 percent  
4 at 40, and the seven MIH units will be distributed  
5 across 40, 60, and 80 percent AMI income brackets.  
6 Next slide, please. And this is the illustrative  
7 unit distribution with the percentages of the total.  
8 I would note that the applicant is providing a large  
9 percentage of family-size two and three-bedroom  
10 units. It's 57 percent of the total. And in response  
11 to feedback from Community Board One, we increased  
12 this from 38 to 57 percent. This concludes my  
13 presentation, and I'm happy to answer any questions.  
14 Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you so much. I  
17 just have a few questions. Your initial filed  
18 application proposed 32 units. However, today you're  
19 proposing 28 units. What accounts for the unit count  
20 change?

21 JOSEPH SBARRO: Thank you for the  
22 question. So, in response to feedback from Community  
23 Board One, they requested us to limit the amount of  
24 studios in the project and increase the number of  
25 two-bedrooms. So we basically combined--

1 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: [interposing] I love  
2  
3 it.

4 JOSEPH SBARRO: a number of the studios--

5 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: [interposing] I love  
6  
7 it.

8 JOSEPH SBARRO: and we wound up with 28,  
9  
10 so.

11 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. I just  
12 want to state for the record, I'm not against  
13 studios. I just think that in New York City I think  
14 more people will find livable situations with one-  
15 bedrooms as opposed to having more studios. I know  
16 the objective is, you know, housing as much people as  
17 possible, but we want to make sure we're housing  
18 people in dignity, and I just personally believe that  
19 one-bedrooms are, you know, a more livable situation  
20 than studios. So, I appreciate the approach that you  
21 guys took to make sure that you're producing more  
22 livable units.

23 JOSEPH SBARRO: Thank you. So, the  
24 amount actually was originally proposing 12 studios,  
25 and we're down to four now, and we had four two-  
bedrooms which is now eight in total. So,  
definitely--

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: [interposing] Great.

JOSEPH SBARRO: larger family-size units.

CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. The building you are proposing is only five stories which is much shorter than the allowed maximum height of 95 feet under the R6A zoning district you are requesting. Why are you not proposing a district with a shorter height, and is the community okay with the building that is potential nine and not five-stories high?

JOSEPH SBARRO: So, for this project, we-- the R6A we thought was most compatible with what's in the neighborhood, and 2021 and also in 2023, two sites, one to the north and one to the south, were rezoned to R6A. So, I think it just fit the context of the building, the area, well, and we're also-- the additional floor area that we get through the R6A is being accommodated within the four residential stories that we're proposing. So, the building envelope here doesn't allow for higher and it's not the applicant's intent to build to the nine stories. So, this was the proposal that we discussed with the Community Board and they were comfortable with it.

2 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Okay. And the site is  
3 currently a supermarket. What would happen to the  
4 supermarket during construction?

5 JOSEPH SBARRO: So, the intent is to  
6 remain open as much as possible. Construction will  
7 hopefully start in 26 or 27, and again, response to  
8 concerns from the Community Board, this grocery store  
9 is a vital part of the community. They're not many in  
10 the district, so it was important to them that it  
11 remain open as much as possible. So, the  
12 construction will be in two phases. Phase one is the  
13 horizontal enlargement of the grocery store where  
14 they'll put the steel beams in. Phase two will be  
15 the vertical enlargement of the building, and the  
16 goal is to just remain open as much as possible and  
17 to do construction work during non-operating hours of  
18 the grocery store business. So, I think as the  
19 project progresses we can provide further updates  
20 once we have the work permits and what that looks  
21 like in terms of scheduling.

22 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. There  
23 being no more questions, you're now excused. Thank  
24 you so much.

25 JOSEPH SBARRO: Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Okay. There being no  
3 members of the public who wish to testify regarding  
4 the Pre-considered LUs relating to the 42-11 30<sup>th</sup>  
5 Avenue proposal, the public hearing is now closed,  
6 and the item is laid over. That concludes today's  
7 business. I would like to thank the members of the  
8 public, my colleagues, our Committee Counsel, Land  
9 Use and other Council staff, and the Sergeant at Arms  
10 for participating in today's meeting. This meeting is  
11 hereby adjourned. Thank you.

12 [gavel]

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES

C E R T I F I C A T E

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 August 31, 2025