

From: [John Oros](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#); [Kelley, Chelsea](#)
Subject: Re: Against 1620 Cortelyou Road Upzoning
Date: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 11:17:31 PM

Land Use Committee,

I understand that today's vote has been postponed as CM Eugene continues negotiating with the applicant for the upzoning of 1620. I look forward to hearing more details about that because from where I stand, after re-reading the BP's recommendation and the re-watching last month's hearing, the applicant did little to address those real concerns.

For example, I don't think the bedroom mix for R7D lives up to the BP's affordable housing recommendation. Also I don't think the applicant addressed any concrete plans to ensure the supermarket stays open during construction -- which seems impossible.

Furthermore what about non-binding conditions from our community Board like donations to CAMDA and the tot lot down the street.

I am not against development of all kinds, just against development that is precedent-setting for out of context height in my neighborhood, with insufficient community benefits -- aka the bare minimum. I'm increasingly convinced that's what this project represents.

warm regards,
John

On Mon, Feb 22, 2021 at 12:18 PM John Oros <jcoros43@gmail.com> wrote:

Land Use Subcommittee,

With the vote tomorrow for the upzoning of 1620 Cortelyou Road, I wanted to reach out and build on my statement.

I am against the upzoning and have been very vocal to our councilmember about it. I think it will be out of context for our neighborhood and will set a bad precedent for Cortelyou road and our community. I do not think that the long-term benefits are enough to counteract the short term and long term harms this upzoning will provide. I understand that as of right the developer can build higher --- but pushing for R7A or R7D is extremely higher than any surrounding buildings.

The applicant claims that the project will bring much needed affordable housing to our neighborhood, but, there is nothing stopping him from building affordable housing as of right. The motive is greed from the developer.

Furthermore, my concern is that all of the conditions and recommendations that the CB and BP Adam's office has made would not be met. The vote tomorrow, from my understanding is only on the bare minimum of the zoning and MIH options -- what kind of contractual and binding side agreements have been made with the developer to ensure other conditions are met?

The expansion of FRESH incentives into our neighborhood is a real possibility for the

coming months and that is another developer-friendly incentive that the applicant could take advantage of, another reason to not cave to upzoning.

In short, I strongly urge you and the sub-committee to consider voting against this upzoning application.

best,
John

On Tue, Jan 26, 2021 at 11:19 AM John Oros <jcoros43@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello --

I was hoping to testify today against the development of 1620 Cortelyou Road but I am caught up in some work meetings and will be in and out.

For the record, I want to make it clear that I am fully against this upzoning. I have spoken out at the CPC meeting; and at Borough President Adams hearings. Our City Councilmember has been incredibly difficult to get a hold of. There was a death in my family the only day that he afforded to speak to our group SaveCortelyou, and at that time he was not up to speed with the application and why there is such community pushback against it.

I would like to see this rejected outright by the City Council, or at least to stop it from the R 7D which allows for excess FAR and is unnecessary. To quote the report from BP Adams : "Borough President Adams does not agree with the applicant's assertion that an R7D district is necessary to realize both a larger supermarket and affordable housing units."

This is clearly a back door for unnecessary and not contextual development in our neighborhood. If City Council wants to approve this based on the MIH offers -- much more must be binding in the resolution.

But I do not believe that the applicant and his lawyer have acted in good faith to engage the community.

I apologize for the quick email; I am balancing a wfh job right now and hope I can also testify via the link later today if my days of meetings allow it.

-John

--

John Oros

C: (914)-522-7388

--

John Oros

C: (914)-522-7388

--

John Oros

C: (914)-522-7388