

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----- X

March 17, 2016
Start: 12:14 p.m.
Recess: 12:47 p.m.

HELD AT: Committee Room - City Hall

B E F O R E:

DONOVAN J. RICHARDS
Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Daniel R. Garodnick
Jumaane D. Williams
Antonio Reynoso
Ritchie J. Torres
Vincent J. Gentile
Ruben Wills
David G. Greenfield
Andrew Cohen
Inez D. Barron

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

[gavel]

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Good morning.

Welcome to the Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises hearing this morning. I would like to recognize that we are joined by the Chair of the Land Use Committee, David Greenfield and my fellow Subcommittee members, Council Member Dan Garodnick, Council Member Vincent Gentile, Council Member Ritchie Torres and we'll be joined by others.

Today we are going to vote on modifications to two citywide text amendments that have been under consideration by the Council for the last two months. The proposals have gone through a full public review process and we are now at the stage where we must vote on the modifications that the Council will make to improve the proposals in response to the concerns of the public.

We thank all of the Community Boards, Borough Presidents, Borough Boards, the Planning Commission, and countless advocates for all of the careful recommendations on these proposals. The changes we are proposing today are an attempt to improve the proposals to achieve their core goal of

2 increasing affordable and senior housing production
3 across New York City.

4 We recognize and thank the Mayor's
5 Office, the Department of City Planning and HPD for
6 all of the countless hours of work spent crafting
7 these proposals so that they will further the housing
8 goals of this city. And for all of their hard work
9 and long nights I'd like to especially thank Raju
10 Mann, [clapping] Dylan Casey, Amy Levitan, James
11 Lloyd, Julie Lubin and the rest of the Council's Land
12 Use staff, as well as my staff members, my Chief of
13 Staff Mercedes Buchanan, Jerrel Burney and Jordan
14 Gibbons. I also have to give a special big shout-out
15 to The Speaker of this Council, who's been a
16 relentless leader in this area, Ramon Martinez, Joe
17 Taranto; I'll even say good things about Emma Wolfe
18 and Jon Paul Lupo and Danielle Decerbo from DCP; I
19 wanna thank you for your partnership through this
20 entire process.

21 Before I lay out all of the modifications
22 to these proposals, let me make this clear; that we
23 cannot please everyone, but we are confident that the
24 modifications we vote on today will improve both
25 proposals and that the final text amendments will

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

help the city address its senior and affordable housing needs for years to come.

Let me put this on the record as well that this is the most aggressive mandatory affordable housing plan in the country and we expect this to be a model that many other cities will follow in the future.

I will now describe the changes that the Subcommittee will be voting on today. I will try to be brief, but because of the complexity of these proposals, I will definitely need a few minutes. So we did try to put the sexy back into zoning, but it's a very hard thing in this area to do.

The first proposal submitted by the administration, Zoning for Quality and Affordability, is a package of zoning changes affecting height, building shape, parking and floor area regulations intended to facilitate the development of affordable housing, affordable senior housing and nursing homes.

We have responded to many of the concerns we have heard during the public review process by proposing modifications targeting only our most critical policy concern -- facilitating the

1 construction of housing for our low-income and senior
2 populations.
3

4 The administration's proposal broadly
5 addressed the needs of our growing city, but in some
6 cases would have needlessly undone the carefully
7 crafted zoning provisions enacted after many years of
8 community planning. In order to avoid undermining
9 years of hard work to maintain the character of
10 communities while still facilitating affordable and
11 affordable senior housing, we have determined that
12 the following changes to the proposal are warranted.

13 First, we are proposing to modify some of
14 the proposed height changes. Our view is that it is
15 appropriate for height increases to be provided only
16 for housing that is affordable. Height increases for
17 the provision of housing that does not address the
18 goals of affordability and meeting the needs of low-
19 income seniors will be minimized by the following
20 modifications.

21 There will be no maximum height changes
22 for buildings not containing affordable or senior
23 affordable housing within the Manhattan core.

24 Height changes for market rate buildings
25 outside the Manhattan core will be limited to five

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

feet and only for buildings that provide quality commercial or community facility space on the ground floor.

For long-term care facilities, such as nursing homes, the height increases proposed for some zoning districts were extreme; we are now proposing to modify some of those heights to reflect the character of the neighborhood while still facilitating the construction of these facilities.

The proposal also called for loosening of the sliver rule, which would have allowed taller, thinner buildings than are allowed today, in conflict with existing context.

A special permit for irregular sites allowing DSA to waive zoning rules for buildings not providing any affordable housing and height changes for higher floor to ceiling height and ground floor in non-affordable apartments. [sic]

These changes were not justified, given their potential affects on local context and were only tenuously linked to policy goals, so we would modify the proposal so that these situations will be subject to the previous rules.

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

Second, we are proposing modifications to proposed building envelopes and open space regulations. The Council's view is that the building envelopes and open spaces should be modified to facilitate housing construction, but the proposal went too far in some areas. Such areas include how it defined shallow lots, its transition rule from high-density to low-density adjacent districts, its front setback changes, and rear yard obstructions.

Accordingly, we are proposing the following modifications:

1. Reduce the minimum dimensions of shallow lots, which get preferential treatment.
2. Adjust the transition rule heights for large buildings bordering on low-density districts.
3. Increase the amount that buildings must be set back from the street line from what was proposed.
4. Only allow rear yard obstructions in limited locations and only in connection with affordable senior housing.
5. Maintain the existing 60-foot required distance in back lots between buildings.

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

These changes protect neighborhood character and preserve light and air while still facilitating housing development.

Third, we are proposing to modify some of the proposed parking changes. The Council's view is that the area proposed for reduced parking requirements was too broad. For some areas around the edges of the zone the proposal did not acknowledge that public transit options are inadequate. The Council has removed these very limited areas from the transit zone.

We are also modifying the proposal to require that when parking is removed from a senior housing facility and new housing is developed in its place; the new housing must be affordable housing, not market rate; if we're gonna allow parking to be removed, it must be for affordable housing.

Fourth, the administration's proposal would have reduced the minimum unit size from 400 to 275 sq. ft. for affordable senior housing from the Zoning Resolution. We believe that the reduction was too drastic and seniors living in affordable housing should be ensured at least a minimum unit size of 325 sq. ft. and has added this requirement to the

2 proposal. So now my grandmother Pat can actually
3 move in to her apartment when she moves in.

4 Lastly, we are also making a series of
5 changes to increase oversight. The administration's
6 proposal would have allowed many of the changes
7 without public review. The Council's view is that
8 many of these changes are significant and require a
9 different level of discretionary oversight;
10 therefore, we are modifying the proposal to retain a
11 special permit for building nursing homes in certain
12 areas of the city with high concentrations, such as
13 the Rockaways.

14 We will also modify the proposal to
15 require the proposed BSA special permit for a waiver
16 of the parking spaces associated with non-affordable
17 apartments be subject to Planning Commission and
18 Council review.

19 We will also modify the proposal to
20 require that the Department of Buildings include a
21 clear written designation on a certificate of
22 occupancy for buildings taking advantage of the
23 increased floor area permitted for affordable senior
24 housing. This change will help ensure continued
25

1 zoning compliance for these buildings going into the
2 future.

3
4 The second proposed citywide text
5 amendment which we would establish would establish a
6 new Mandatory Inclusionary Housing program. This
7 proposal would allow the City to require that all new
8 residential development in certain areas provide a
9 set-aside of residential units for affordable
10 housing. This program represents a huge step forward
11 from the previous voluntary inclusionary housing
12 program because it would not allow substantial
13 residential development without affordable housing
14 and because it requires a more substantial portion of
15 the building to be set aside for affordable housing.

16 We are all familiar at this point with
17 the proposal that was presented to the Council by the
18 Planning Commission, so I will now describe the
19 proposed modifications to this proposal that the
20 Subcommittee will be voting on today. These
21 recommendations were crafted in response to concerns
22 by Council Members and the public and designed to
23 strengthen the program by eliminating loopholes and
24 requiring that housing be provided for lower-income
25 New Yorkers. These changes would help to achieve the

1
2 program's core goal of creating housing for residents
3 with varied incomes and enhancing the neighborhood
4 economic diversity. The Subcommittee therefore will
5 be voting to modify the original proposals as
6 follows:

7 First, we are proposing to make a series
8 of modifications to the options available for
9 satisfying the affordable housing requirement. We
10 would introduce a new deep affordability option that
11 would require developers to provide 20 percent of the
12 units in a new development for tenants making an
13 average of 40 percent of the area median income.
14 This option would only be established in areas as an
15 alternative option to option 1 or 2, and affordable
16 housing under this option would be provided without
17 public subsidy unless substantially more affordable
18 housing was provided in the development. I just
19 wanna underscore that again. Affordable housing
20 under this option would be provided without public
21 subsidy unless substantially more affordable housing
22 was provided in the development.

23 We would introduce a minimum requirement
24 that 10 percent of the building be reserved for
25 residents making a maximum of 40 percent of the AMI

1 within the existing option 1. All of the units under
2 this option would still average at a maximum of 60
3 percent AMI, but this additional set-aside would
4 ensure that some units be provided for lower-income
5 families.
6

7 We would adjust the proposed workforce
8 option to reduce the overall average income to 115
9 percent of the AMI and require that 10 percent of the
10 building be devoted to housing for families making 70
11 and 90 percent of the area median income. In
12 addition, this option would become inapplicable 10
13 years after it is established. These modifications
14 would improve this option so that it would reach
15 income levels that are not currently well served by
16 the existing subsidy programs available and require
17 the City to revisit this option in case the original
18 rationale for applying the option is no longer
19 applicable.

20 Second, we are proposing to make a series
21 of changes to improve the program's ability to
22 deliver high-quality affordable units that are
23 equitably distributed throughout the city. So we
24 would modify the options available under the program
25 so that if a developer opted to provide the

2 affordable units off-site, the requirements of each
3 option would be increased by 5 percent of the
4 building. This modification will provide an
5 incentive for economically diverse communities by
6 discouraging of-site housing.

7 Also, we will be changing the BSA special
8 permit to waive affordable housing requirement so
9 that a permit would expire in four years if
10 construction had not commenced on the project and HPD
11 would be required to comment or appear at every BSA
12 application under this section.

13 We would also be strengthening the
14 findings of the BSA waiver in order to ensure that
15 special permits would only be granted if a landowner
16 was experiencing a true financial hardship due to the
17 Mandatory Inclusionary Housing requirements.

18 We also will modify the distribution
19 requirement so that affordable units would be
20 required on 65 percent of the floors in a building.
21 We will also modify the provisions governing the use
22 of funds generated by the in lieu fee so that they
23 would be reserved for the same community board for 10
24 years in the same borough thereafter.

1
2 Lastly, we have added language to the
3 zoning text that would ensure that whenever an
4 application to establish a new Mandatory Inclusionary
5 Housing area was under review by the Council; that
6 Council would have the flexibility to modify the
7 application to apply any option available under the
8 program.

9 In addition to all of these changes
10 described for both applications, we have given the
11 proposed zoning text a close examination and made a
12 series of more minor changes that would strengthen or
13 clarify the zoning.

14 In addition to the zoning modifications
15 outlined above, the Mayor has made a series of
16 commitments in areas of city policy that are related
17 to the proposals we are considering today. These
18 commitments relate to the city policy towards
19 neighborhood investment, housing subsidy targeting,
20 labor standards, tenant harassment, hiring programs
21 on City-subsidize projects, promotion of MWBE
22 businesses, promotion of fresh food grocery stores,
23 affordable housing enforcement, and several future
24 rezoning proposals. And I do wanna say that the
25 Council will be monitoring these things very closely.

2 Overall, I think we are presented with
3 two proposals which as modified would be huge
4 improvements over existing city policies toward
5 affordable housing and senior housing. We need this
6 housing badly and I have confidence that the
7 proposals we now are considering will help alleviate
8 the housing crisis for many New Yorkers and in
9 decades to come.

10 I recommend that the Subcommittee approve
11 these modifications on the Zoning for Quality and
12 Affordability and the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing
13 Text Amendment. Are there any members now that have
14 questions or comments on these items? Any members
15 have questions or comments on these items?
16 [background comments] Alrighty. Alrighty.

17 Okay. I will now couple Land Use Item
18 No. 0334, Mandatory Inclusionary Housing and Land Use
19 Item No. 0335, Zoning for Quality and Affordability
20 for a vote to approve with the modifications as
21 discussed. Counsel; will you please now call the
22 roll?

23 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
24 Reynoso.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: I vote aye.

2 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Chair Richards.

3 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: I wanna say
4 congratulations to everyone who's made this day
5 possible. Once again I wanna thank Chair of the Land
6 Use Committee, David Greenfield for his partnership
7 through this entire process, Raju Mann once again,
8 Dylan Casey, Amy Levitan, James Lloyd, Julie Lubin,
9 and the rest of the Council's Land Use staff as well
10 for a great job done. And with that I vote aye.

11 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
12 Gentile.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: May I explain my
14 vote?

15 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: You may explain
16 your vote.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER GENTILE: Thank you.
18 First Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairmen, Chairman Richards;
19 Chairman Greenfield, thank you for your diligence and
20 skill in driving this bus and listening to all your
21 passengers on the way, right. Also, a gold star to
22 Raju Mann, as we said, and his staff for digesting,
23 interpreting and modifying the most important zoning
24 legislation in more than a generation. What we have
25 here today with MIH and ZQA is a result of hard-

1 fought for, hard-won compromise that has taken into
2 account the feedback from many community and civic
3 organizations, as well as multiple government
4 offices. We have all had our concerns, but I believe
5 that the text amendments we now see before us
6 approach the need for affordable housing in a fair
7 way and open the doors to greater variety in the
8 aesthetics of our buildings. MIH equips community
9 boards with a tool by which to ensure a range of
10 affordable housing options their respective
11 communities need without encroaching on existing
12 zoning, which the community boards still remain in
13 control of. And important to my constituents, the
14 MIH maintains the workforce option so that teachers
15 and firefighters and policemen and women with or
16 without families who live in my district can qualify
17 for affordable housing within the district. With new
18 allowances for the use of space available to our
19 seniors through ZQA, New Yorkers will be able to age
20 in place and no longer fear the space they will need
21 to rely on as they grow older won't exist or worse,
22 they'd be priced out of it. As a result of the
23 compromise we've reached, these buildings, while
24 still being a great support for our seniors, will not
25

1
2 be allowed to be built so large that neighborhood
3 character is at risk. I am please, therefore with
4 the height modifications made in the R3-2, R4 and R5
5 zoning districts in this regard. The transit zones
6 that had first extended well beyond what we
7 considered acceptable have been shifted to a more
8 reasonable model and will be of more service and not
9 be as detrimental to our city. Parking spaces for
10 our congested neighborhoods will be far more
11 protected than as first proposed, but when the need
12 arises for more housing, some neighborhoods will be
13 able to supply it.

14 Finally, we have mediated the changes
15 that can be made to improve the quality of our
16 buildings so that there is a fine balance between
17 allowed improvements and maintaining the context of
18 the neighborhoods. And so I thank the Mayor's staff
19 for working with me and my colleagues in getting to
20 where we are today, because I believe that what we
21 have is a new but careful way to work with our
22 growing and aging city, which I will always serve
23 with a well-tempered response to the big questions
24 and what I believe these matters before us today
25 represent. So accordingly, I vote aye on all.

2 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
3 Garodnick.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Mr. Chairman,
5 I too would like to ask permission to explain my
6 vote.

7 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Yes, sir.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you.
9 Well first of all, I wanna share the praise for you
10 and Chair Greenfield and The Speaker and Raju and the
11 entire staff for working through a very difficult
12 challenge here. I am gonna support both of these
13 proposals today because, at least as to MIH,
14 fundamentally I think we all recognize that this was
15 clearly the right route that the City should be
16 heading; when a developer is getting a density bonus
17 from the City to make their sites bigger and more
18 profitable, we should be demanding that he or she
19 provide affordable housing in return. The existing
20 voluntary program has yielded insufficient returns
21 and making this mandatory will generate more units in
22 a city that desperately needs them. So I'm pleased
23 that we were able to add additional and more
24 affordability for lower-income New Yorkers; I think
25 it should not be understated the significance of the

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

changes we are making on creating additional incentive for on-site affordability; the requirement that you do more if you're going off-site I think is an important one and also, tightening that waiver process at BSA; we don't want people to simply find their way out of this obligation for any reason or no reason. The mandatory nature of this process should be just that and to the extent that a waiver is granted, it should have the participation of the City's housing agency as well as clear notice to the public.

ZQA was burdened, in my view, because it had everything and the kitchen sink thrown into it and impacted existing contextual zoning districts in a way that it did not need to, which is why I was pleased that the Council has removed height bumps from market rate housing, except for affordable senior housing in certain areas, you know, obviously that increase is warranted, given the desperate need for such housing in New York City; the number of 111,000 seniors who have been languishing on waiting lists for an average of seven years was a meaningful statistic and we need to deal with it.

2 Also, eliminating the sliver law changes
3 and dramatically reducing rear yard obstructions,
4 which are very important in my area, yielded a result
5 for me that was much more tightly focused on
6 achieving its goal of providing space for quality,
7 affordable senior housing while limiting the side
8 effects of the effort.

9 So as a result, I will be voting for --
10 actually, I'm gonna vote for them right now; I vote
11 aye on both and thank you for the opportunity to
12 explain my vote.

13 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
14 Williams.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Surprisingly,
16 I'd like to explain my vote also.

17 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: No. [laughter]
18 Go ahead, sir.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Thank you.
20 First, I do wanna say that the Mayor and the
21 administration should be applauded for tackling this
22 issue; it is a tremendous issue; the affordable
23 housing crisis hasn't been tackled for quite some
24 time. We definitely shouldn't understate the
25 difficulty in trying to create a housing plan that

2 would please everyone and my guess is that this one
3 will not please everyone, but it shouldn't prevent us
4 from trying and for moving forward.

5 The City Council, under the leadership of
6 Melissa Mark-Viverito, both Chairs Donovan Richards
7 and David Greenfield should be applauded for the
8 changes that we made in hearing our constituents and
9 our community boards and our borough boards; I think
10 the plan is exponentially better than the one that we
11 received.

12 First, on ZQA, I believe that a lot of
13 the issues that concerned my constituents were
14 addressed, from the height density for contextual
15 districts, from the nursing homes as-of-right, from
16 the BSA sliver law; there were a lot of things that
17 were addressed. Really, I think if folks now uphold
18 ZQA, it is more about wanting everything everywhere
19 except for where you live and we would not be able to
20 address the affordable housing crisis with that type
21 of thinking. There was some concern of the time that
22 we had; I wish, obviously, it wasn't as rushed as it
23 was, but I do know with Raju Mann in charge and his
24 staff, that all the time needed was dedicated to
25 this; I think now will be a function of resistance to

1 chance as opposed to time that will be the only
2 factor that folks would push back on and no amount of
3 further thinking is gonna change a resistance to
4 change, whether it's one month or is two years, so
5 I'm very happy with the ZQA.
6

7 When it comes to MIH, I'm actually proud
8 to be part of a bunch of council members and
9 advocates that pushed for further affordability and
10 pushed for changes in off-site and also pushed for
11 making sure that there were commitments for
12 preservation. Unfortunately, I do think the current
13 plan still does not require a mandatory minimum
14 amount of low-income units and I think that's
15 significant because we have to make sure that -- we
16 provided some great tools, this plan is great, I
17 believe; it even touches, plausibly, 30 percent, but
18 it is for those elected officials and those
19 communities who welcome low-income units; it does not
20 mandate those elected officials and communities that
21 historically have not welcomed low-income units and
22 so that was a non-starter for me; unfortunately, I
23 will not be able to support that, but I do understand
24 why people **[inaudible]** because of the progress and
25 changes that we were able to make, but I believe as

2 we move forward we have to break up the segregated
3 communities that are in this city and the only way to
4 do that, I believe, is to mandate certain things as
5 we're moving forward, so even though we made some
6 great progress with that, I'll be voting no on 0334,
7 which is MIH and voting aye on all the rest. Thank
8 you.

9 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Council Member
10 Torres.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Permission to
12 explain my vote.

13 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: You may go, sir.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Yes. First I
15 wanna extend my congratulations to The Speaker, to
16 Donovan, to David, to Raju, to the whole Land Use
17 team and if you were to retire tomorrow, you would
18 have the satisfaction of knowing that you negotiated
19 the best mandatory inclusionary scheme that this
20 country has ever seen, and that is a far greater
21 achievement than most of us will ever accomplish and
22 so you deserve enormous credit; we are changing the
23 paradigm in favor of deeper affordability and
24 permanent affordability; no longer in the City of New
25 York will a developer be able to rezone a

2 neighborhood without a guarantee of permanent
3 affordability and that in and of itself is a
4 staggering achievement and I'm honored to be part of
5 a city council that's about to pass that... [interpose]

6 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: For the
7 record, Council Member, neither Chair Richards or I
8 are retiring tomorrow, [laughter]... [crosstalk]

9 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Yeah, I said if...

10 COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: but we
11 certainly are gonna sleep in late.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Yes, if and I
13 mean every word of it. I was one of the few members
14 who would've been content to pass ZQA as initially
15 crafted, but I was very much in the minority, but I'm
16 happy that we're preserving the core of it, which is
17 a density bonus for senior affordable housing; the
18 City's gonna be far better positioned to address
19 what's been a chronic shortage of senior affordable
20 housing, so I'm grateful that our modifications kept
21 the end game in mind.

22 On MIH, again, the good outweighs the
23 bad, but I wanna share the concerns that Council
24 Member Williams has. If I could vote against the 30
25 at 80 option; I certainly would. You know, the

2 notion that you could rezone a whole neighborhood
3 without creating a single unit below 80 percent of
4 AMI; the fact that that's even a theoretical
5 possibility is deeply alarming to me; I believe every
6 neighborhood should have a broad mix of incomes; we
7 should be putting a mandatory minimum in both option
8 1 and 2 to ensure mixed-income housing, because the
9 goal here is not only to create more housing; the
10 goal here is to create mixed-income communities that
11 promote social mobility; that should be the purpose
12 of government, and so to the extent that MIH has a
13 flaw, I believe we're missing an opportunity to
14 promote more mixed-income housing. But as I said,
15 the merits of this plan far outweigh whatever flaws
16 that I identify and for that reason I proudly vote
17 aye.

18 COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Land Use Item 0334 is
19 approved with 5 votes in the affirmative, 1 in the
20 negative and 0 abstentions and Land Use Item 0335 is
21 approved with 6 votes in the affirmative, 0 in the
22 negative and 0 abstentions, and all items are
23 referred to the Full Land Use Committee.

24 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you all. I
25 just wanna thank my colleagues for all your

1 thoughtfulness through this entire process; genuinely
2 I think I got to know some of you more than I knew
3 you before, but I wanna truly thank you for, and your
4 communities at that, and I wanna just put on the
5 record; we have some fierce fighters for their
6 communities and it's not necessarily just when the
7 cameras are on, you know, there were many members in
8 here on the Subcommittee and beyond the Subcommittee
9 who really fought tooth and nail to ensure that their
10 communities would be better after both these
11 proposals were crafted. And I just wanna end once
12 again by saying that this Mandatory Inclusionary
13 Housing policy is the most aggressive, most ambitious
14 in the country and I can assure you that other cities
15 are gonna look at this now and go back to the drawing
16 board again to say we should be moving in this
17 direction. And I just wanna add, with ZQA we made
18 some very good changes that I thought were very
19 thoughtful; we really took into community board
20 consideration; community consideration and I just
21 wanna echo what Council Member Williams said, you
22 know, yes, we wanna protect the character of our
23 neighborhoods and we must do that, but cars should
24

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

not have a place to live before people do and I think that's the message we're sending by passing ZQA.

I wanna thank the AARP representatives who are here; I hope to get my card in another I think like 20 years, 25 years or so, but God willing I'll get an honorary card. Oh no, I guess we shouldn't do that; we have press in the room; don't wanna be accused of, you know, any unscrupulous behaviors, but I wanna thank you all for coming out and spending 20 hours nearly with us at a hearing a few weeks ago, so thank you all. With that being said, I am closing this hearing.

[gavel]

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 March 19, 2016