

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----- X

March 28, 2017
Start: 10:02 a.m.
Recess: 10:55 a.m.

HELD AT: 250 Broadway - Committee Rm.
16th Fl

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

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

Jerry Johnson, Legal Counsel
Fox Rothschild

Jesse Masyr, Legal Counsel
Fox Rothschild

Richard Lobel
Sheldon Lobel PC

Brian Brown
SEIU, Local 32BJ

Yohay Albo, Architect
Albo Liberis

2 [gavel]

3 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Good morning. I'm
4 Donovan Richards Chair of the Subcommittee on Zoning
5 and Franchises, and this morning we're joined by
6 Council Member Corey Johnson. We have two
7 applications on public—for public hearing
8 consideration today, West 23rd Street, text amendment
9 Land Use Item No. 591 and 901 Manor Road commercial o
10 overlay Land Use Item No. 592. [background comments]
11 Oh, wrong. Oh, I'm—I apologize. Actually Rose
12 Castle Land Use Item No. 589 and 590 and West 23rd
13 Street Text Amendment Land Use Item No. 591. First,
14 we are going to lay over Land Use Item No. 592 until
15 our next public hearing, and we will now move onto a
16 public hearing on Land Use Item No. 591, the West
17 23rd Street Text Amendment. This application is for
18 an amendment to the zoning resolution that would
19 modify the bulk regulations applicable to the Special
20 West Chelsea District. The amendment would allow for
21 the transfer of floor area between portions of the
22 development site and facilitate the development of an
23 approximately 228,000 square foot mixed-use building.
24 This application affects property located in Council
25 Member Johnson's district. I will now open the

2 public hearing on Land Use Item No. 591. Corey, do
3 you want to say anything? Okay. So we'll begin and
4 we'll call the first applicant Jerry Johnson from 60
5 Columbus Circle? Am I right?

6 JERRY JOHNSON: [off mic] Oh, Rochelle.
7 Okay and Jessie--

8 JERRY JOHNSON: Mazer.

9 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Mazer.

10 JERRY JOHNSON: Has stepped out for a--

11 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay. No problem.
12 So you may begin.

13 JERRY JOHNSON: [pause] Good morning,
14 Chair Richards, Committee Members and Council Member
15 Johnson. My name is Jerry Johnson with the firm of
16 Fox Rothschild and we representing 23rd and Eleventh
17 Avenue Associates, LLC, the applicant for this
18 action. The action before you today is a request for
19 text amendment that will permit floor area generated
20 in two different C63 districts to be located on the
21 zoning lot without regard to district boundary lines.
22 If approved, the action will facilitate the
23 redevelopment of the property on the southeast corner
24 of the intersection 11th Avenue and West 23rd Street
25 in the West Chelsea District, the site currently

1 occupied by a U-Haul facility. The proposed mixed-
2 use building will contain approximately 288,000
3 square feet of floor area, rise to 13 stories in the
4 mid-loft and 20 stories–22 stories on the Eleventh
5 Avenue frontage, fully compliant with the existing
6 underlying bulk regulations of the district. The U-
7 Haul use will remain on the zoning lot with
8 consolidated operations and in an existing three-story
9 building located on the east side of the property. A
10 bit of history. In 1999, Council approved the zoning
11 change that created the MX3 dis-mixed-use district
12 spanning the two blocks fronting on West 23rd Street
13 between the Tenth and Eleventh Avenues. The MX
14 District paired an R9A district with the underlying
15 M15 regulations permitting new residential
16 development and an FAR of 5–7.52. In 2005, the area
17 was again rezoned with the creation of the Special
18 West Chelsea District. For the subject block and the
19 subject site, the mid-block portion changed to a C63A
20 district, which is also an R9A residential equivalent
21 with a consistent 7.52 FAR, and the Eleventh Avenue
22 frontage became a C63 district within Subarea D of
23 the Special District. When the West Chelsea District
24 was created, they regulated the FARs to reach subarea
25

2 by way of a chart where the old height factor FARs
3 were normalized and rounded down. So 6.02 became 6.
4 7.52 became 7.5. The change had the unintended
5 consequence of allowing--of not allowing floor area to
6 be moved across the district boundary lines in an as-
7 of-right manner. This application seeks only to
8 break that movement in existing floor area between
9 the C63-A district and the C63 Subarea D district on
10 the single zoning lot, and I'm available for
11 questions.

12 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Great. Thank you
13 so much, and--and before I go to Council Member
14 Johnson just a few quick questions. So I--I noticed
15 the Community Board obviously voted against this
16 application. Can you go into what--what some of the
17 concerned raised at a Community Board?

18 JERRY JOHNSON: The Community Boards for
19 this application they were--they were fine with this
20 project itself. Their vote was conditioned on some
21 things happening on another site nearby and we are
22 working with HPD to resolve that.

23 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And can you go
24 into that a little further, and are the some
25 affordable housing issues or--?

2 JERRY JOHNSON: There was a--there an
3 existing--existing building that was demolished that
4 seems to have been contrary to the underlying
5 regulations in the harassment district for a Special
6 West Chelsea, and we're resolving the--the question of
7 having to do that right now.

8 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And those issues
9 are not resolved. From what I heard, there was a
10 breakdown somewhere perhaps in communication and--

11 JERRY JOHNSON: [interposing] Well, we're
12 working with HPD to try to resolve the issue.

13 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay, and then can
14 you just go through so I know U-Haul is there. If
15 you can just go through how you're going to ensure
16 that they can remain and any issues around U-Haul as
17 well.

18 JERRY JOHNSON: U-Haul one of the
19 conditions of--of dealing--we've worked with them for
20 over 10 years on the site, and one of the conditions
21 is that they remain on the site, and so their
22 existing three-story building is--will need to be
23 retrofitted, but they will be working to do that.
24 They've got the plans to do that, and they will
25 remain on site, but obviously reduced operation, but

2 it was very important that they remain a presence in
3 this part of Manhattan, and this location is a very
4 popular location for them and they and they—that was
5 one of their conditions of going forward with this,
6 and so we will work with them to maintain on the
7 site.

8 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Reduction in
9 parking or anything of that nature in terms of--?

10 JERRY JOHNSON: Their—their operations
11 will be a little bit reduced—

12 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing]
13 Okay.

14 JERRY JOHNSON: --only because they now
15 span the entire site, but they are comfortable with
16 the space they have in their existing two-story
17 building that will accommodate the--

18 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] And
19 with the reduction have any impact on the local
20 community?

21 JERRY JOHNSON: It should not other than
22 consolidating it all in one location.

23 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alright, I'm going
24 to go to Council Member Corey Johnson.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you, Chair
3 Richards. Good to see you this morning. Thanks for
4 being here. So I just want to dig a little deeper
5 into the unresolved HPD issue. I know that related-
6 your applicant [coughs] or your client has been
7 looking to resolve this with HPD, but there is now a
8 process that has to take place, a cure process for
9 the replacement of I believe it was six units that
10 had to be replaced. So do you have any sense right
11 now of the actual timing or what-or what needs to
12 happen because it doesn't sound like these issues are
13 going to be resolved before this come up for a vote
14 at the Council.

15 JERRY JOHNSON: The timing we we're-we're
16 trying to work with HPD to do that, and that will
17 not-I mean we've committed to resolving the issue.
18 There is nothing we can do on that property. I mean
19 we can't move forward with that property or anything
20 with until these issues are resolved. We're a
21 longstanding member of the community. You know that.
22 You're-we're-we're part of-in a number of locations
23 here and-and it is our full intention to resolve the
24 issues in a positive manner that works for everybody
25 including HPD, the Community Board and yourself.

2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So, I'm supportive
3 of this project, and I've worked with you all and I
4 have a great relationship with-you're client related,
5 and I think they've done a lot of really important
6 stuff in the community. At the same time, I don't
7 want to give anyone special treatment. S o what I
8 mean by that is no one should be illegally
9 demolishing buildings. It doesn't matter if you're
10 related, it doesn't matter if you are Mr. X, you
11 should not be illegally demolishing buildings. So it
12 just--the Community Board I believe, and I understand
13 the perception and related for whatever reason
14 demolishes a building that has six units of
15 affordable housing where the underlying zoning didn't
16 permit that, and now they're coming to us for
17 rezoning. It doesn't look great, but I'm willing to
18 see the project. We just need to sort this out. I
19 know sorting it out is not all entirely within your
20 control that HPD has a process that likely will play
21 out over a longer time horizon than has allowed or
22 contemplated under the remaining time on the ULURP
23 clock, but what I need from--from you all from the
24 related team and--and you as their counsel, you and
25 Jessie are counselors, is some type of sort of

roadmap and plan or document sort of stating kind of just sort of stating this is in writing how-how we're going to resolve this issue given that are Community Board concerns. That's all I need. Something along those lines. Make sure the light is on.

JESSE MASYSR: Jesse Masyr. I'm Counsel to the related and a member of the firm of Fox Rothschild, and that's the longer part of my statement because the shorter part is yes we'll—we'll deliver to this committee exactly what you're saying, the road map to the solution and the steps and—and in concurrence with HPD.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: And the commitment is to have related somewhere in its portfolio replace the six units that were lost with six affordable housing units? That's the—that's sort of the contours of this?

JESSE MASYSR: Or of an equivalency, correct like a—one of the things that was discussed with the Community Board was extending and creating additional units and then—and building at a lower affordability, something like that.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: That's—that's
3 fine, but just to have that delineated and have a
4 document would be really helpful.

5 JESSE MASYSR: We'll—we'll prepare and
6 supply the committee with such a document.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: And how long do
8 you think it will take to get that?

9 JESSE MASYSR: Barring a snowstorm
10 hopefully less than week.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay, great so
12 next week would be great.

13 JESSE MASYSR: Yeah.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: And then lastly,
15 the—the 23rd Street portion of the site and not just
16 of-of your site, but of a significant portion of the
17 block, you know, is pretty beat up given the U-Haul
18 operations, the trucks being parked on the sidewalk
19 and coming in and out. As part of the redevelopment
20 of the site, are there plans to redo the sidewalk,
21 keep the current council where they're needed (sic),
22 but also ensure that the sidewalk is a safe, good
23 sidewalk for the folks that are living in the
24 building and also the folks in the public that use
25 that sidewalk.

2 JESSE MASYSR: Absolutely.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: And are there
4 plans?

5 JESSE MASYSR: They're working on the
6 plans for the building now. There will be—I don't
7 know what they're going to do with curve cuts, but
8 there will probably be a replacement of the sidewalk
9 when it's all done. At the end of the day it's going
10 to be a new building, and it will be replaced when—
11 when we're done. They're still working on the Roy
12 Adam Group (sic) because there may be on 23rd Street.
13 I'm not sure.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: And is there—

15 JESSE MASYSR: [interposing] and in the
16 existing group.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: But replace—but
18 ensuring the sidewalk is a--

19 JESSE MASYSR: [interposing] Right.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: --good sidewalk?

21 JESSE MASYSR: Oh, yeah, absolutely,
22 absolutely.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay, and where
24 are the renderings of the building and the materials
25 used in the building?

2 JERRY JOHNSON: They haven't. They're
3 still working on that.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: But I need to
5 see those.

6 JERRY JOHNSON: We can try to get you
7 something to the extent that they have it before--

8 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: Again, I love
9 related (sic), but you don't come to a zoning
10 subcommittee hearing without renderings of what the
11 building is going to look like when you're seeing
12 rezoning. Who does that?

13 JERRY JOHNSON: They're still working on
14 the building. I-I--

15 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: [interposing]
16 Well, they shouldn't have come to the Zoning
17 Subcommittee hearing.

18 JESSE MASYSR: We'll get--we'll get you--

19 JERRY JOHNSON: We'll get you an
20 illustration of what they're building.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: I mean I never
22 have developers come to me for a hearing without
23 renderings of what the building--what are the windows
24 going to look like--.

2 JESSE MASYSR: We'll get you renderings,
3 Council Member.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay, well
5 thankyou, Chair Richards.

6 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. So
7 we'll have that within a week?

8 JERRY JOHNSON: Yes, sir.

9 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And if you can add
10 to that—Council Member Johnson certainly pointed out
11 some valid issues, the sidewalks as well. If you can
12 make sure that--

13 JERRY JOHNSON: Sure.

14 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: --item as well.

15 JERRY JOHNSON: Yes. Absolutely.

16 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alrighty. Thank
17 you.

18 JERRY JOHNSON: Thank you.

19 JESSE MASYSR: Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: I just want to
21 acknowledge we've been joined by Council Member
22 Vincent Gentile. [pause] We're going to take a two-
23 minute break and we'll begin. [pause] Okay, right
24 before we begin the next hearing, are there any other
25 members—members of the public who wish to testify on

2 the last item, Land Use Item 591? Okay, seeing none
3 we will now close the public hearing on Land Use Item
4 No. 591. We will now move onto a hearing Land Use
5 Item No. 589 and 590, the Rose Castle Development.
6 This application is for a zoning a map amendment and
7 text amendment. The map amendment would change two
8 parcels currently zoned M12 to establish and R7A with
9 a C24 overlay on one site and an M1-2 R6/R6A district
10 on the on the other site. The text amendment would
11 establish a mandatory inclusionary housing area on
12 this site. These actions would facilitate a
13 predominately residential mixed-income development
14 with approximately 296 units of housing. This
15 development would be located in Council Member
16 Levin's district. I will now open the public hearing
17 on Land Use Items No. 589 and 590. I'll go to Steve.
18 Do you have any opening statement?

19 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: No.

20 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: No and I just want
21 to acknowledge we've been joined by both Council
22 Member Steve Levin and Antonio Reynoso.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: I want to
24 acknowledge this development team. I think when I
25 first took over this portion of the district upon

2 redistricting in 2014, I think one of the first
3 meetings I had with Community Board 3 was regarding
4 this site, and—and this development team came and—and
5 that conversation to—to my knowledge commenced back,
6 you know, in probably January or February of 2014.
7 So this is three years later. So just to—to go on
8 the record and saying that this has been probably an
9 ongoing conversation for those past three years?

10 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you, Council
11 Member Levin. So our first panel is Richard Lobel,
12 Sheldon Lobel, Riverside Developers USA, Frank St.
13 Jacques, Sheldon Lobel, Riverside Developers USA
14 Yohay Albo, Project Architect and Mr. Weiss, River-
15 Riverside Developers as well. So, you may begin, Mr.
16 Lobel.

17 RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you, Chair
18 Richards. Good morning and good morning to the
19 Council Members. Again, Richard Lobel from Sheldon
20 Lobel PC, and we're here today to discuss the Rose
21 Castle Rezoning. We're happy to be here before the
22 subcommittee. This has been as Council Member Levin
23 stated a longstanding project, and one which we've
24 been before Council—before Community Board 3 no fewer
25 than five times. So it's been a really long engaged

process. We've made modifications to our proposal to -to try to cater to some of the desires of the community board. We're really proud of the progress we've made and here we are at the subcommittee hearing. The project itself, the Rose Castle Rezoning involves some existing M12 zoning districts. Those zoning districts are—can be seen in the dotted areas on the map, and they're along Flushing Avenue between Tenth and Frankly as well as between Franklin and Skillman behind Flushing Avenue, and the districts are currently zoned M12. M12 districts, of course, allow 2 FAR for commercial industrial uses as well as a 4.8 FAR for community facility uses. And so these properties were under consideration by the community board and by the Council previously. In the 2001 Flushing-Bedford Rezoning there was a discussion to make that site that is currently zone M12 on the eastern portion of the rezoning area into an R6A M12 mixed use district, and was taken out of the rezoning at the time, and in the ensuing 15 years nothing happened to that site. And so after approaching the Community Board once, twice, three times and now after five attempts with the Community Board, we've now reached a point where there is a

1 consensus with regards to the rezoning, and so the
2 rezoning would rezone the western portion of the
3 rezoning area to an R-7A C24 district, which would
4 permit a mixed-use residential and commercial
5 development with 8,800 square feet of commercial use,
6 retail use on the corridor and 168,000 square feet of
7 residential, and would rezone the eastern portion to
8 that same mixed-use district, which already exists on
9 the block, which would allow for 128,000 square foot
10 residential development. The development would, as
11 was stated, have 296 units including 88 units of
12 affordable housing. The—the properties right now are
13 currently home to one to two-story commercial
14 buildings as well as a vacant lot. And so this would
15 really produce some usable housing for the area. The
16 Community Board itself would have considered this,
17 but the full board for the vote initially voted 18 to
18 17 to 2 in favor of the rezoning, but due to the
19 abstentions, the rezoning vote did not pass. The
20 Community Board then reconsidered this rezoning
21 application. I had further conversations with the
22 applicant and eventually approved the rezoning 24 to
23 4. I think I would add prior to taking any questions
24 that Zelig and Riverside Developers is not a stranger
25

2 to the area. They have—they have produced no fewer
3 that 25 buildings within Community Board 3. They
4 have produced 18 residential buildings, six mixed-use
5 buildings. They have—they have employed no fewer
6 than 20 people from the community in these buildings.
7 The Community did a thorough review of those
8 buildings and was satisfied with the quality of those
9 buildings, how they were kept. The—the tenants in
10 those buildings and the tenancy, and so they really
11 viewed this applicant as being someone who is
12 committed to the community. So, we're hopeful that
13 the Council will reflect the decisions of the
14 Community Board, the Brooklyn Borough President and
15 eventually the City Planning Commission in approving
16 this rezoning and the applicant team is happy to
17 answer any questions.

18 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you so much
19 and before I turn it over to Council Member I had a
20 few questions. So let's start up with the big
21 million dollar questions on affordability. So I see
22 I believe you have not selected an MIH option yet. If
23 you can just speak to that a little bit.

24 RICHARD LOBEL: Sure. The MIH option,
25 which was initially proposed by the apps—the

2 applicant was to zone—was to map Option 1 and Option
3 2 to allow for the maximum amount of flexibility for
4 properties within this area, but the rezoning option,
5 which was selected by the applicant would be option 2
6 with workforce housing. Workforce Housing, of
7 course, being an option, which would permit AMIs an
8 average of 115% with 5% of the 30% of the building
9 guaranteed for 70% of AMI, 5% of—

10 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Can you say that
11 again?

12 RICHARD LOBEL: I'm sorry. So 30% of the
13 building would be for affordable housing, and be
14 reserved for four of the units. (sic) Of that 30%, 5%
15 would be for—for 70% AMI households, 5% would be 90%
16 AMI and the remainder would be for averaging at 115%
17 all the way up to 130. So what that translated into
18 was 88 units of affordability and in our rough
19 numbers it would be 15 at the 70% AMI and 15 at the
20 90% AMI levels.

21 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And can you just
22 go into why—and I noticed both Borough President
23 Adams and the Community Board wanted to see option 1
24 used in the—in the scenario so why--

25 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct.

2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Yes, so can you
3 just speak to why we didn't go with that option?

4 RICHARD LOBEL: This was a—a long and—and
5 thoroughly reviewed discussion, and it was the
6 product of—much reviewed by the applicant in
7 accordance with the hearings that we attended, and
8 what happened was that the applicant here looked at a
9 building which was not going to request any subsidy
10 from the city. So we did a really through review of
11 the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing program, the—the
12 City Planning Report approving that, the Council's
13 discussion of that report. And the—the workforce
14 option basically would allow this building to exist
15 without any subsidies from the city. So while Option
16 1 and Option 2 are often utilized with regards to in
17 a very strong market low—lower subsidy, and in a
18 weaker housing market would exist only with HPD
19 subsidy or city subsidy. The permanent affordability
20 of the workforce option allows that building to exist
21 without any subsidy whatsoever. It's basically
22 reserved for moderate emerging areas, which we'll be
23 able to internally subsidize this property. So when
24 we looked at the BA Economic Study produce in
25 September 2015 in support of the Mandatory

1 Inclusionary Housing program, this particular NTA,
2 this Neighborhood Tabulation Area, was identified as
3 one of the areas within Brooklyn, which would allow
4 for imposition of the—of the workforce option. And
5 so that's the decision that was made by the
6 applicant. The idea here, and we've talked to HPD
7 and reached out to them providing them with all the
8 information with regards to this building. But the
9 idea was that—would be that this building would be
10 self-sustaining and would provide permanent
11 affordable housing for middle-income families. And
12 so I think that that discussion was important to the
13 applicant, and one of the reasons is because we come
14 in here a lot for rezonings and we in here a lot for—
15 for upzonings, and the truth is that the underlying
16 district here in the M12 allows either the bulk
17 they're asking for or actually M12 allows greater
18 than that bulk. So we're asking for an R7A, and that
19 would allow for a 4.6 floor area ratio. The existing
20 floor area ratio under the M12 for a community
21 facility and commercial building would be 4.8. So I
22 think that there's been a recognition that—that we're
23 asking for what amounts to less bulk in the building,
24 but in order to really provide for a continuing
25

2 feasible here, the applicant chose the workforce
3 option.

4 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So, just getting
5 back to this before I pass it to Council Member
6 Levin, so--so you said you approached HPD. Did you
7 approach them for subsidy or no subsidy?

8 RICHARD LOBEL: We--we basically
9 approached them at the request of City Planning. We
10 gave them all the information regarding the appli-
11 regarding the application, and we asked if they did
12 have any input about the affordability levels we
13 asked them for that. We never--we never really got
14 anything back--

15 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing]
16 Okay.

17 RICHARD LOBEL: --but the discussion
18 basically with them was that HPD was at the time that
19 Mandatory Inclusionary Housing was approved in
20 February and March 2016, was a strong proponent of
21 the workforce option. So, then came--

22 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Right because they
23 don't have to then subsidize that.

24 RICHARD LOBEL: There you go.

2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Right, so I--I get
3 that, but my--but my question to you is so did the
4 developers--did your team just not foresee the need
5 for a subsidy here or--?

6 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct. They basically
7 looked at the--

8 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] So
9 you were looking to basically--and I--I appreciate your
10 truth in this. So you're appreciate--you're--you
11 technically were looking just to build for the middle
12 market based on the--the study.

13 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct, to build for the
14 middle market, and to--to not require city subsidies
15 for a building, which provide permanent affordability
16 for middle income families who are in many respects--
17 don't have the--the available housing options that
18 would otherwise be around that?

19 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay. I'm going
20 to move from that. Can you go through parking and
21 any other issues that the Community Board brought up.
22 So 262 units?

23 RICHARD LOBEL: 296 only.

24 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: 296 units. Can
25 you speak to those?

2 RICHARD LOBEL: The parking that would
3 provided would actually be above and beyond what
4 would be required under zoning. I believe that there
5 would be 84 spaces provided in the—on the Flushing
6 Avenue site, and 64 spaces provided on the Franklin
7 Skillman (sic) site. That provides spaces for 50% of
8 units including the inclusionary units, which would
9 otherwise be extracted from the calculation. So we—
10 we do—and we—you know, it was—I mean it was a really
11 great process. My history as far as Community Board
12 3 is in the past. I brought applications and frankly
13 as a matter of public record that application is with
14 applicants who were—who were as a—as a—you know,
15 really is a legal matter, and a—and a matter of
16 record with applicants who were Jewish applicants,
17 who did not receive really the—a really welcoming
18 discussion from the Community Board, and again as a
19 matter of public record, there was a—a discussion
20 back then of who is this property being—who is this
21 housing being built for? Will it be built for
22 members of the community? And there—it was the cause
23 of much divisiveness. It was great to now come to
24 the Community Board and to have a project, which
25 there was an understanding, and that was an

2 understanding is that the developer now will be held
3 to a standard, which has been set forth by the City.
4 This is Mandatory Inclusionary Housing. This is the
5 law, and we know as a matter of fact that 50% of
6 those affordable units are going to go community
7 members. So it's—it was a, you know, this was a—full
8 discussion with the community and—and—and we're happy
9 to we're into that.

10 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

11 Alright, I'm going to go to Council Member Levin, and
12 I'll come back.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Thank you, Chair
14 Richards. So, on the workforce because this will be
15 the first time that the workforce option was taken.
16 So I just want to make sure that I have it—I have it
17 clear. So, it's 30% of the units are—are quote,
18 unquote affordable, right?

19 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Five percent of
21 the total units are at 70.

22 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Five percent of
24 the total units are at 90.

25 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: So then we still
3 have another 20% affordable left. Now, does-is-is
4 115 the average of that 20% or is 115 the average of
5 the 30%?

6 RICHARD LOBEL: The 30%.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: The 30%. Okay.
8 So then—so then that would—I mean we'd have to do the
9 math to see exactly what the span then would be, but
10 going up to 130 there will probably be more on the—on
11 the upper end to balance—to average out to 115 if
12 you've—if you've got, if you're factoring in the—the
13 70s and the 90s.

14 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct.

15 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Okay. With regard
16 to—to unit size, how—there's—the application has
17 identified unit size breakdown, and they're different
18 for the two different sites.

19 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: But if you could
21 speak to that, and then—and then how is that—is that—
22 is that—that's—you're not legally bound to that,
23 right? So that—how—what would—what or are you legally
24 bound to that under the Zoning Application?

2 RICHARD LOBEL: We are--well, first I'll
3 just--just--

4 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: [interposing] Go
5 ahead.

6 RICHARD LOBEL: --discuss the unit size
7 for a moment. So the--the mix that was proposed was--
8 well for the--for the Flushing Avenue Building, which
9 is 168 units, 20 studios, 66 1-bedrooms, 26 2-
10 bedrooms, and 56 3-bedrooms. For the Franklin Avenue
11 site, and we'll be--we can--we're happy to provide this
12 to the Council, to the subcommittee in writing.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: We have it as far
14 as the--

15 RICHARD LOBEL: 40 studios, 34 1-bedroom,
16 28 2-bedrooms and 26 3-bedrooms. They're--that was
17 the--the subject of discussion with the Community
18 Board and was something, which was approved by the
19 Community Board and they were happy to see this mix.
20 While the--while this mix is not--Is not memorialized
21 in the sense of it does not become a binding
22 commitment. The binding commitment would be that the
23 affordable units would need to be--would need to be--
24 reflect the same numbers as the unit count overall.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: The same ratio.

2 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: So-so-so-yeah, so
4 percentage wise, I mean I don't-I can't do it off the
5 top of my head, but it-that would-that would be
6 totally reflected within the-the--

7 RICHARD LOBEL: [interposing] Correct.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: --so there were-if
9 there's a, you know, if-you know, a third of the
10 units on the Flushing Avenue site are one-bedroom
11 that means a third of the affordable units are one-
12 bedroom?

13 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Okay, and that's-
15 that's required under like-that's a-that's under the
16 law or our HPD rights?

17 RICHARD LOBEL: Under MIH.

18 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: MIH. Okay, and is
19 there-I'm sorry. Is there any like community
20 facility space or anything like that included in the
21 application?

22 RICHARD LOBEL: There's-there's no
23 community facility space currently earmarked?
24 There's 8,800 square feet of commercial, which would
25 be along Flushing. The Community Board noted that

2 they did want to see retail in this area that
3 currently if you take a look at the uses particularly
4 on that block, you've got a catering facility and
5 window and door company, and so, they were anxious to
6 see retail there. So that would be—that would be
7 provided on that street there.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: In terms of the—
9 the BP recommendations, one of the recommendations is
10 choosing from local not-for-profits to work with on—I
11 imagine on the affordable marketing, is that right?

12 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: And you have
14 agreed to that?

15 RICHARD LOBEL: We've discussed that and—
16 and the requirements t MIH require a regulatory
17 agent, administering agent as per MIH guidelines, and
18 so we're happy to work with one of the local
19 development corporations that was offered by the
20 community board. It's—it is—in the—in the views of—
21 of Zelig, it's—it's someone who is going to be more
22 familiar with the area anyway so we're happy to do
23 that.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Okay, and that's
3 something that--that--that you'd commit to in some type
4 of binding fashion?

5 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: In terms of the
7 MWBE efforts, can you speak a little bit to that?

8 RICHARD LOBEL: Sure. Riverside has as
9 we talked about already developed 25 buildings within
10 Community Board 3, and so there was discussion--
11 discussion of MWBE participation, and the community
12 board was actually happy with their level of MWBE
13 participation that had been utilized to date. So in
14 their prior developments we talked about some of the
15 larger buildings that they built, and talked about
16 some of the MWBE participation, but I think the short
17 of it is that the developer here is committed to local
18 hiring, and to MWBE, and so that was something that
19 the Community Board offered that we said we would be
20 happy to comply with.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: And that would be
22 committed to in some type of legally binding fashion?

23 RICHARD LOBEL: Yes.

24

25

2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Just on that, and
3 can you—so there's no percentage—I'm sorry I
4 interrupted. There's no percentage.

5 RICHARD LOBEL: [interposing] Correct.

6 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So, 30%, 20%?

7 RICHARD LOBEL: There was no percentage
8 that was like specifically identified by the
9 Community Board, but we're happy to have subsequent
10 conversations to include this.

11 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [interposing] If
12 you can for this subcommittee get us some goals.

13 RICHARD LOBEL: That's fine.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: The other—other two
15 items that are from the community board and the
16 borough president about ongoing complication with
17 Community Board 3, one around street trees, and I
18 think Community Board 3 just that there's, yeah,
19 continue to meet with Community 3. Is that something
20 again that the applicant would be willing to commit
21 to in some type of binding fashion—

22 RICHARD LOBEL: Um--

23 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: --or to—to the
24 extent possible. I know whether you can include that
25 into the current data?

2 RICHARD LOBEL: I'm—I'm a little bit
3 unclear. Is this with regards to the sustainability
4 measures?

5 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: It says we have
6 an—that we plant additional street trees in—in-in-in
7 consultation with CB3?

8 RICHARD LOBEL: Yes. Council Member
9 Levin, may I introduce the Project Director Claribel
10 (sic) to discuss this briefly?

11 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Sure.

12 YOHAH ALBO: Hi. I means as far as
13 obviously the regulations that govern or application,
14 absolutely, you know, it will be Parks Department
15 application and so forth, and it depends on what the
16 Parks Department requires of us on the site itself.
17 I'm not sure if that particular statement was asked
18 to go beyond that particular assessment. It's very
19 hard actually in terms of I already know that just a
20 little bit in terms of a preliminary total picture of
21 the Parks Department, is that a lot of these
22 commercial districts are—tend to not be desirable
23 spaces for trees just simply from the nature of the
24 storefronts and—and the commercial trucking and items
25 and such that happens in these areas. But as far as—

2 as-as let's say paying towards the bank of the Parks
3 Department so that we can commit to a certain amount-
4 -a number of trees and so forth. It was absolutely
5 something that we're very much open to.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: In terms of
7 sustainability measures. So this is a-this a fair
8 amount of-of root space. Have you-have you explored
9 any type of green roof or solar panel options. It's
10 a lot roof space.

11 YOHAY ALBO: Correct. So the main-the
12 main thing that we've tried to actually achieve, we
13 are really open to achieve with this with the
14 projects with our previous experiences we Zelig Weiss
15 that remind-our first spaces are a remarkable
16 investments in your business-in your buildings--

17 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Uh-huh.

18 YOHAY ALBO:--and especially the fact that
19 this is going to be a great mix of union talk and
20 we're assuming all the families with kids and so
21 forth, and so we are looking to capitalize on
22 actually a lot of the roof surfaces such as the roof
23 surface over the cellar level of the parking,
24 possibly with-good portions of the main roof surfaces
25 of the building. He turned them into actually

2 recreational spaces for the clemencies. It will be
3 a—Oh, I don't know, you know, it's—it's a very
4 healthy object for any building for the neighborhood.
5 So we hope to truly capitalize on that.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Okay, and those
7 would—for those spots that are not going to be
8 recaptured for recreation space, have you explored
9 doing anything around, you know, sustainability
10 measures? I think green roofs can help with your—
11 with your CO² emissions. It also helps with your own
12 heating costs so on and so forth. Heating and
13 cooling costs.

14 YOHAH ALBO: Correct. I mean solar
15 panels and items of such have been improving
16 themselves in over—you know, economically it's for
17 such developments and—and owners on a really scales
18 of reservation units, and as far as the majority of
19 the—the surface of—of--

20 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: [interposing] And
21 also plantings and things like that.

22 YOHAH ALBO: Correct. The majority of the
23 surfaces of this roof—main roof surfaces are going to
24 end up being planted or paved or areas for--for
25 tenancies, and then some of the few areas such as

2 lifts and some of the main roof focus obviously will--
3 will fully comply with the--with the latest
4 regulations in--in New York State and the code--the
5 requirements--

6 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Okay.

7 YOHAY ALBO: --for flexibility and items
8 as such.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: And then lastly,
10 have--have you been in discussions around building
11 service workers and--and how--what--what the--or where
12 the service will be prevailing wage, and--and we're
13 seeing it in this development site, or is that
14 something that you have not explored at this point?

15 RICHARD LOBEL: We haven't explored that
16 yet, and we did--we did just enter into that
17 conversation with the Community Board given that our
18 current employment by Riverside of--of local community
19 residents in their existing buildings, but we didn't,
20 you know, no--no--no details were--were decided.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Okay. That's
22 something, you know, I--I--I--I generally like to get
23 in the middle of that, but certainly it's--if a
24 conversation happens, I'd like to see that continue.

25 RICHARD LOBEL: Okay.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER LEVIN: Okay, I'll this
3 back to my Chair.

4 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. We're
5 going to go to Council Member Reynoso. Just want to
6 acknowledge we've been joined by Chair Greenfield as
7 well.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Hello, guys. I
9 just wanted to ask questions regarding the CB3 vote.
10 It says MIH Option 1 must be used. Should you have
11 told them that you were going to use Option 4, that
12 you're considering Option 4? Would they have
13 approved this project?

14 RICHARD LOBEL: I think that when we
15 approached them with the workforce option, it was a--
16 it was a distinctive conversation over the course of
17 about a year and a half to two years, and the answer
18 is I don't know. I think that the--the conversations
19 that took place after the first turndown were very
20 stark in that I think that the Community Board
21 recognized that it was a very feasible outcome here,
22 which was that there would be no housing produced on
23 the site, and I don't see that in the way of anything
24 threatening. It's more that the available bulk of
25 the site would be able to produce a building of

2 greater square footage so we're seeking 176,000
3 square feet, and the building that could be produced
4 would be over 180,000 square feet, but for uses,
5 which would not be and it's really going to fit to
6 the local area. So, I think that the--the change in
7 the vote, which is fairly drastic from 18 to 17 in
8 favor to 24 to 4 in favor was a reflection of some
9 real conversations on behalf of the Community Board
10 that they didn't want to see this project slip away.
11 So I can't speak for the Community Board, but I can
12 say that we're honest with them about the--what was
13 intended, and that's where we ended up.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Okay, it's just
15 the thing--the MIH Option 1 must be used? Is the
16 powerful--must is a powerful word, right. It' not--

17 RICHARD LOBEL: Sure.

18 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: --a preferable.
19 They said must, and--and coming here to--from Option 2
20 or Option 4 just going straight to, you know, that--
21 going straight to Option 4 from Option there's like
22 no middle ground there.

23 RICHARD LOBEL: I understood and I--and I--
24 excuse me for a minute. [pause] So I think if
25 you'll excuse me for one moment. [pause]

2 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Is there anyone
3 here from Community Board 3.

4 MALE SPEAKER: [off mic] No, I don't
5 think there is.

6 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: No, okay.

7 RICHARD LOBEL: So the--when we looked at
8 the--I guess the recommendation of the Land Use
9 Committee to support the application the text that we
10 have is--is consider option 1 average 60% AMI level of
11 affordability. So I don't--I don't--the--the copy that
12 we have doesn't reflect that language. It says
13 consider Option 1, average 60%. So, and that was the
14 Community Board recommendation, the resolution that
15 was attached to the City Planning Commission
16 approval.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: And we'll--we'll
18 be in contract with Community Board 3 and they'll--
19 they'll be able to let us know--

20 RICHARD LOBEL: Absolutely.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: --how they fare.
22 So that--that won't be a problem.

23 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And that's
24 correct. That's actually correct with these--

2 RICHARD LOBEL: [interposing] That was--
3 that was the language was--

4 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: That language is
5 correct. (sic)

6 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Alright, and
7 we'll work on with it with the Chair and see what
8 they say. You know, it's still from 1 to 4.

9 RICHARD LOBEL: Understood.

10 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: So they dropped,
11 and the second thing is the change from R7A to R6A on
12 the Flushing Avenue site. Is that something that
13 we're seeing here in our renderings when you
14 presented to us as the--the change from R7A to R6A on
15 Flushing?

16 RICHARD LOBEL: We did not reflect that.
17 The--there is an R6A component and an R7A component in
18 the zoning, and the community board discussed the
19 bulk on Flushing, and so again this is--this is their--
20 that was their preference and it would--it said to
21 consider the existing built character of Flushing
22 Avenue. The built character of Flushing Avenue as
23 reflected in the City Planning Commission approval
24 discusses the fact that there are many seven to eight
25 story buildings in this immediate area, and there's -

1 there's an R7-1 District that was rezoned to R71
2 across the street. You can see it on the top of the
3 gray area, R71 across Flushing Avenue. So, I think
4 that the discussion with the Community Board
5 understanding what's in the resolutions, and from an
6 architectural standpoint we did make modifications to
7 the building design in order to satisfy the Land Use
8 Committee. We removed bulk and we set the bulk back
9 from the street. It's really kind of heartening to—
10 whenever you looked at a process over the course of
11 two years because there were aspects of the building
12 design where the community board asked for changes in
13 the design, and the—the two—the applicant team did
14 that, and there was a very positive response. So,
15 again, you are correct. It does say, you know, there
16 was a request to reduce from 7A to 6A, but-but while
17 we did not do that, I think there was a fairly
18 thorough discussion in the Community Board, and
19 there're were architectural methods that were
20 explored as well as a modification of layouts and
21 parking layouts and traffic layouts, which tried to
22 respond to a lot of the Community Board comments.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Alright, so
25 you're saying even though you might have not gotten

2 to this year, you've done other things already in the
3 conversations with the Community Board that speak to
4 the character of the buildings and how they've been
5 laid out.

6 RICHARD LOBEL: Correct. Absolutely. As
7 a matter of fact, Yohay just wanted me to that we did
8 reduce the height from 90 feet to 80 feet at the
9 request of the Community Board.

10 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: On Flushing?

11 RICHARD LOBEL: On Flushing. They really
12 asked us to provide more architectural treatments,
13 which allows it to kind of modify—modify the height a
14 little bit. We did that, and I think produced and
15 would produce what would be a rather attractive
16 building.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: And the last
18 thing here for—for us the Community Board hasn't met
19 with the principals or the owners of the property
20 yet?

21 RICHARD LOBEL: Right, I think that there
22 was a—a discussion at the Community Board. One of
23 the gentlemen who stood up was not one of the
24 officers of them. He was—he was a—an employee, but
25 he's known—he also—Mr. Weiss subsequently appeared at

2 the Brooklyn Borough President's hearing as well as
3 in subsequent hearings, and we've—we've engaged them
4 in conversation through our representatives. So
5 there's—there's the awareness of who the applicants
6 are and—and we're tipping down a little bit.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: So, just the
8 history that we have with developers in our districts
9 is that developers stand in the shadows. When things
10 go awry or go wrong they're nowhere to be found. No
11 one knows what they look like, and we're just trying
12 to make sure that we put a face to the—their
13 buildings. I—this is their property. We just want
14 to know who it is.

15 RICHARD LOBEL: Absolutely, and—and—and I
16 think to—to—to the credit of Riverside and to Zelig
17 subsequent to the Community Board hearing we did
18 reach out to some community representatives who had
19 introduced themselves that CB3 full board hearing,
20 and that's reflected in the Brooklyn Borough
21 President's hearing, those individuals who identified
22 themselves at Brooklyn Borough President's hearing
23 said that, you know, on the record said that—that the
24 applicant did reach out to them and there's been an
25

2 open dialogue. So, you know, so it's—there's a good,
3 there's a good discussion going on.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Thank you. The
5 face-to-face is what I'm asking.

6 RICHARD LOBEL: Understood.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Okay, but thank
8 you. Thank you for your time.

9 RICHARD LOBEL: Sure, thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Council Member
11 Williams.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr.
13 Chair. Mine is mostly comments. I'm kind of
14 disturbed about what I'm seeing here in terms of the
15 affordability. First, I think this body was derelict
16 in supporting these AMIs to begin with. I think we
17 should have—I think we should have—

18 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: I don't know if
19 it's the right thing to do, but—

20 COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: No, maybe it's
21 not, but we can have a discussion. We—we have the
22 opportunity mandate a minimum months affordability.
23 Of all the options we didn't do that, and the most
24 reprehensible option I think is Option 4. That is
25 the option that you have chosen here not because they

1 have a higher AMI. I believe that people who have
2 high AMIs are also in assistance, but if they need
3 assistance, we certainly know that people at lower
4 AMIs need assistance, and this doesn't include 80.
5 It doesn't even go below 70, and what you're asking
6 for, and I think that's reprehensible? I just want
7 to put that on the record. My hope is that this body
8 will revisit MIH. We are in a crisis now. Too often
9 we're speaking about homelessness in separate terms
10 than the housing client. This directly contributes
11 homelessness. Most of the things that make the news
12 are the larger re-zonings, but I think what's
13 damaging more are these projects. These are the ones
14 that chip away at communities. They go under the
15 radar. They do not get the attention that they
16 deserve, but they are destroying these communities
17 and causing more and more homelessness. It is your
18 job and the people who come here to look at it very
19 myopathy I guess. We look at it as the basis of that
20 one particular project. We as the body should be
21 looking at it and how would that one project overlays
22 with the entire city, the borough and the Community
23 Board? We were derelict in that when we did the MIH.
24 My hope is that we're not derelict any more as we
25

2 continue moving these projects forward. I just want
3 to make sure I put my concerns on the record. Thank
4 you.

5 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you, Council
6 Member Williams. Also, can you just go into—so you—
7 you spoke of MWBEs. So I see that there are few
8 partnerships that's reporting that you spoke of. So
9 I would love to see local hiring also included in
10 that some goals around that, and reporting to perhaps
11 some of these local organizations on both of these
12 aspects as well.

13 RICHARD LOBEL: We're happy to do that.

14 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alrighty, so we'll
15 appreciate it if you have that in writing before we
16 obviously look to meet—support this application and
17 not support this application.

18 RICHARD LOBEL: Hopefully, support, but
19 thank you, Chair.

20 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: [laughs] Thank
21 you so much. Thank you for your testimony.

22 RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: I will now call—we
24 have one applicant another one person testifying from
25

2 the public, Bryant Brown representing SEIU, Local
3 32BJ. [pause]

4 BRYANT BROWN: Good morning, Council
5 Members. Thank you for the opportunity to testify
6 this morning. My name is Bryant Brown, and I am here
7 speaking on behalf of the 163,000 Building Service
8 Workers that our Labor Union, SEIU 32BJ represents
9 nationwide. 32BJ members maintain, clean and provide
10 security services in schools as well as residential a
11 commercial buildings all across the five boroughs
12 including buildings like the proposed Rose Castle
13 Redevelopment. Building service jobs can be jobs
14 that pay poverty wages with no benefits, or they can
15 be quality jobs that pay wages that allow people to
16 put a roof over their head. This is why I'm here
17 today. I want to ensure that Rose Castle will create
18 good building service jobs that pay prevailing wage.
19 This commitment to good jobs is important. The city
20 has an affordable housing crisis, and an income and
21 equality crisis. That's why we need to do all that
22 we can to ensure that new developments like Rose
23 Castle are creating the housing and the jobs that
24 Brooklyn residents need to be able to afford and
25 support themselves and their families in New York

1 City. SEIU 32BJ has repeatedly called on developers
2 to make a commitment to providing high quality jobs
3 at Rose Castle. We have reached out to Riverside
4 Developers USA and their head officer David Weiss
5 many times, but to this day they have not committed
6 to create good quality jobs. Until the developers
7 make this commitment, we cannot and will not support
8 this project and, therefore, call upon the Zoning and
9 Franchises Subcommittee to not approve the project
10 until this is a—until there is a commitment to good
11 jobs. The prevailing wage is the industry standard
12 wage across the five boroughs, and I urge the Zoning
13 and Franchises Subcommittee to ensure that it is
14 upheld as the standard in this community. Thank you.

15
16 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you so much
17 for your testimony today. Alrighty, are there any
18 other members of the public who wish to testify on
19 Land Use Items No. 589 and 590? Okay. So we are
20 laying over Land Use Items 589, 590 and 591 and 592
21 for a future meeting, and with that being said, this
22 meeting is now adjourned. [gavel]

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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 April 21, 2017