CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES

----X

August 12, 2008 Start: 10:16am Recess: 12:55pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

TONY AVELLA Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Simcha Felder
Eric N. Gioia
Robert Jackson
Melinda R. Katz
James Sanders, Jr.
Larry Seabrook
Helen D. Sears
Albert Vann

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

Michael Silverman Attorney Kramer Levin, counsel to Park Ave

Sam Schwartz President Sam Schwartz Engineering

Neal Kwatra Political Director New York Hotel Trades Council

Galina Marchenko Member 55-56 Block Association

Paul Novosel President West 56th Street Tenants Association

Veronica Conan President West 54-55 Street Block Association

Bill Shea West 54-55 Street Block Association

John Young Director Department of City Planning, Queens Office

Brendon Pilar Project Manager Department of City Planning, Queens Office

Jordan Most Representative Yeshiva Darchei Torah

Vincent Castellano Member Community Board 14

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

Kevin Callaghan Resident Rockaway Park

Hank Iorii Member, Vice President Community Board 14, Bell Harbor Property Owners Association (BHPOA)

Maureen Walsh Coalition to Save the Rockaway

Andrew J. Patti Resident Rockaway Park

Fran Stathis President Rockaway Park Commerce and Residents Association

Marlena Alvarado Resident Rockaways

Ellen O'Reilly President Broad Channel Civic Association

Paul King Resident and Business Owner Rockaways

Rita Hayden Resident Rockaways

Renee Rosenberg Resident Rockaways

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

Margaret Powers
Resident
Rockaways, Coalition to Save the Rockaways

Michael Tubridy Executive Committee Member Community Board 14

Michael O'Toole Resident Rockaways, Rockaway Homeowners Association

Noreen Ellis Resident, Member, Board Member Rockaway Park, Coalition to Save the Rockaways, Rockaway Park Homeowner's Association

Kathleen "Barbie" Hart Resident Rockaways

Dr. Geraldine Chapey President Atlantis Tenants Association

Cynthia Hernandez Resident Rockaway Park

Allen Steinhardt Resident Rockaways

Bernard Warnock Vice President Rockaway Park Homeowners and Resident Association

2.0

2.3

2	MALE VOICE: Testing one, two,
3	three. Testing one, two, three. Sub Committee is
4	going to be on Zoning and Franchises. Today's
5	date is August 12, 2008 and the meeting is being

recorded by Ibierto Coriaso.

CHAIRPERSON TONY AVELLA: Council
Members Robert Jackson, Melinda Katz, Helen Sears,
Larry Seabrooks, Simcha Felder, and I know Council
Member Al Vann is here as well. I see we're being
joined by Council Member James Sanders who has an
item that is here before us this morning.

In order to expedite the hearing,

I'm going to skip around a little bit. The first

item we will take up is the Qdoba Mexican Grill

sidewalk application, which is Land Use number

86020065552TCN. Application to establish,

maintain and operate an unenclosed sidewalk cafe

at 216 8th Avenue. I do have in front of me a

letter from the attorney representing the

applicant to withdraw the application. So there

will be a vote to accept the withdrawal.

But I do want to make mention and publicly criticize the architect in this situation. There have been too many situations

where the architect for these sidewalk cafe applications submit plans, Department of Consumer Affairs does not do their proper review. find is the application is totally wrong, the figures are wrong and if they did the application correctly, they wouldn't qualify for a sidewalk cafe to begin with. Staff from the City Council Land Use Division went out and looked at this particular application. Everything was wrong on it. I think the quote that I've been given from staff, in 18 years of doing this; this is the worst application they have ever seen.

We will not accept this and I can tell you from my point of view and it's not obviously within my district. It's within the Speaker's district. But I will ask that the Speaker take moves against the architect. I am actually doing that in the sidewalk cafe in my district. You falsify the plans, you take the consequences. I think as a City Council we have to start stepping on those people who deliberately falsify plans and hope to get away with it. So we will have a motion to accept the withdrawal of this application later on.

We have three other items. Again,
I'm going to skip around to make this an efficient
meeting. The next item we will do is Land Use
number 832 and 833, commonly notified as 610
Lexington Avenue. NO80177 ZRM, application
submitted by Park Avenue Hotel Acquisition for
changes to the zoning map. I will call the
applicant up to give their presentation. This
application lies within Council Member Dan
Garodnick's district.

MICHAEL SILVERMAN: Good morning
Mr. Chair, Committee members. My name is Michael
Silverman of Kramer Levin, counsel to Park Avenue
Hotel Acquisitions LLC. The applicant for this
zoning text change and a special permit for
transfer of landmark air rights per section 74711
for the construction of the 63-story hotel and
residential building at 610 Lexington Avenue, the
southwest corner of 53rd and Park.

The second building in the New York
City designed by Foster and Partners, which would
include approximately 200,000 square feet of
landmark floor area transferred from the adjacent
landmark Seagram building, one of the greatest

2.0

masterpieces of 20th century architecture, the building shown to my left, with the Seagram building next to it. In addition to the floor area transfer, the special permit would allow five bulk modifications to harmonize the composition of the building with the Seagram building. The most significant of which is a heightened setback modification to create a pure simple massing for the building.

The issue is that the as-of-right zoning creates a wedding cake kind of building, which is not as symmetrical and harmonious with the building. And the waivers would allow a pure geometric form, something, which was supported by the preservation groups in the Landmarks

Commission and by the City Planning Commission.

Of the five bulk waivers that were granted, I want to comment a bit on the loading dock waiver, which was necessary when the project changed from primarily a residential building to primarily a hotel. And had over 100,000 square feet, which requires a loading dock on the site. That creates an issue because both 53rd Street and Lexington Avenue are restricted streets where curb

building.

cuts are not permitted. Providing a curb cut with
a turntable wasn't physically or functionally
feasible in this very narrow 46-foot wide

The City Planning Commission in approving this concluded that there was no significant impact on traffic congestion by waiving it. In large part because when this issue emerged at the Community Board and borough president level, we retained Sam Schwartz and Company to come up with modifications and mitigations to alleviate that impact.

We thought from the get go that this hotel, which only generates a small number of total trips, did not have, as we showed, any traffic impact. This is not a convention center hotel; it's a luxury hotel with unusually large rooms and only 4,500 square feet of meeting space. It would only require 12 to 16 daily deliveries, which would be generally small trucks arriving at night and remaining on the site for only 10 minutes. The elevators have been designed to expedite deliveries. Mr. Schwartz will talk about the responses.

But in particular the operator of

2

6

7

9

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the hotel, Shangri-La, has committed it will only
contract with suppliers that will commit to make
deliveries at night and has committed to higher

deliveries at night and has committed to higher police officers through the New York Paid Detail program to patrol the streets outside of the hotel

8 to ensure compliance with curbside regulations.

10 applicant here, Park Avenue Hotel Acquisitions,

11 LLC. has no relationship to the Hines organization 12 or to the project being designed on 53rd and 54th 13 Streets to the west of this, which is a Hines

One other point, I want to emphasize that the

14 project next to it. Thank you.

SAM SCHWARTZ: I'm Sam Schwartz, president of Sam Schwartz Engineering. We've done the parking analysis. As Mr. Silverman said, we were brought into this project to assist with orchestrating the parking and loading. We did this after meetings with Community Board 5, the borough president and City Planning Commission. We have incorporated many of the modifications that they requested.

In fact, this revised plan was approved by the City Planning Commission and I

quote that they stated that the lack of an off street loading birth will not create significant vehicular congestion on East 53rd Street and would improve pedestrian circulation on the southern sidewalk of East 53rd since the sidewalk would be uninterrupted by curb cut and associated vehicular traffic.

We looked at the loading activities planned for the proposed hotel and this parking plan we feel is superior to the parking plan that's out there right now. The current regulations to allow truck loading from 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday through Friday for the entire length. Metered car parking is available from 6:00 pm to midnight, Monday through Fridays and all day on Saturdays, free parking on Sundays.

The hotel requires a hotel loading zone for guests arriving by cars and taxis. We've worked with the Department of Transportation and 60 feet, or three spaces will be provided, which is more than they typically provide for a 191 room hotel. But even more important, the hotel has agreed to nighttime deliveries and they're expecting 12 to 16 trucks. They spend an average

2.0

of about 15 minutes per truck and again, while these trucks spend less time at the curb than other trucks. This amounts to three or four space hours in a seven-hour period. So there's more than enough space. At night there are other spaces that are available should there be any overflow.

New York City DOT has agreed to a 43-foot truck loading area. That area now is free parking between midnight and 7:00. It will be truck loading only between midnight and 7:00. The hotel has committed to employ police officers through the paid detail program. I've seen that work successfully. IKEA had a whole big paid detail program you saw yesterday story in the New York Time's about that. We were the engineers on that as well.

Many years of studying traffic,

I've found that midtown traffic problems, the

truck loading problems, were not so much caused by

the trucks at the curb but the fact that the

elevator system took so long for those trucks. So

the trucks ended up spending an inordinate amount

of time. Two elevators will be dedicated to this.

2.0

2.3

2	It will have four service elevators at night.
3	Those elevators will be dedicated to this
4	operation. This will be the fastest turnaround.
5	In fact, it's almost a model for how we should

deal with truck activity at the curb. The

truckers don't want to be there for a long period

of time. It doesn't serve them.

In short, the loading activities at this proposed hotel will have minimal traffic impact. Having cars at the hotel loading zone in place of trucks during peak hours will actually facilitate the turn onto 53rd Street. Thank you.

NEAL KWATRA: Good morning. My name is Neal Kwatra. I'm the political director for the New York Hotel Trades Council. Our organization represents 30,000 hotel workers here in New York City. I'm here to testify on behalf of the project and on behalf of our 30,000 members. Our organization has worked very closely with RFR Realty and Shangri-La Hotels. We're very excited about this project and we look forward to working together with RFR and Shangri-La.

RFR Realty and Shangri-La Hotels have made excellent concrete commitments about the

creation of quality jobs at the future hotel. We estimate that there'll be approximately 200 full time equivalent jobs created by this project. The quality of those jobs will be outstanding and will live up to the standards that our organization has worked to create here in the hotel industry in New York City.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you for your testimony. As I mentioned, this lies within Council Member Dan Garodnick's district. So my colleagues know we have a number of people signed up in opposition. We'll take the public testimony. Before I see if any of my colleagues have questions, I do want to make a comment. For the future, do not have somebody who's not connected with the actual application testify at your deus without asking the chair first.

MR. KWATRA: My apologies.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: The

representative from the Hotel Trades Council should have been just like any other member of the public testifying. If you want that special consideration you should ask for it first. So just for the future please do that. I think

2.0

2.3

that's unfair to members of the public who have
three minutes to testify and he's allowed, because
he's part of your application, to testify as long
as you want. So please don't do that in the
future unless you ask for permission. Any
questions from my colleagues? Council Member
Sears.

COUNCIL MEMBER HELEN D. SEARS: I think maybe this is addressed to the Chair because I'm noticing that the Community Board and the borough president disapprove this project. I just would like to know what was the disapproval based on. Okay. I'll ask the Chair, what was the disapproval of the borough president and the Community Board, where is that 'cause I couldn't find that? Can you do it in one sentence? I couldn't find it. Maybe you can; I'll look for it. Hello Mr. Schwartz, how are you?

MS. SEARS: Can you tell me what was it based on? It doesn't need a long elaboration.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Hello, how are you?

MR. SCHWARTZ: I think that the primary concern, there were a number of things to

2.0

2	numerate, but I think the largest issue was this
3	issue of the elimination of the loading birth. As
4	I said, we tried to address that post borough
5	president and post Community Board. I think the
6	responses are evidenced by the fact that the
7	Planning Commission approved it and the Manhattan
8	borough president's representatives on the
9	Planning Commission supported the application and
10	voted for it.
11	MS SEARS: The borough president

11 MS. SEARS: The borough president
12 was opposed to it?

MR. SCHWARTZ: At that point--

MS. SEARS: [interposing] I just want to get all my ducks in a row.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Primarily I think in fairness you should speak to them directly I think primarily because of the loading birth issues which we tried to respond do.

MS. SEARS: I think you brought up,
Mr. Schwartz, an interesting point about the
elevators. I think that that is something that we
need to look at when we look at applications
because it's the first time that I have heard
that. So I think that's a big plus for this

2	project, that you have considered that. I thank
3	you.
4	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Any other
5	questions from my colleagues? Just for the
6	record, and then actually I've been asked to make
7	this comment. The Hotel Trades Council is not
8	part of your application; you just invited them to
9	sit at the deus with you, correct?
10	MR. SCHWARTZ: That's correct.
11	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Okay. Seeing
12	no other questions, thank you. We'll now go to
13	the public testimony on this item. Galina
14	Marchenko, Paul and I'm not sure how to pronounce
15	the last name.
16	PAUL NOVOSEL: Novosel.
17	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Novosel, okay.
18	Veronika Conant and Bill Shea.
19	VERONIKA CONANT: Testimony is
20	supposed to be in a certain order so can we do
21	that. This is Paul Novosel and then I'll be next.
22	Thank you.
23	MR. NOVOSEL: Good morning
24	everyone. My name is Paul Novosel. I'm president
25	of the West 56th Street Tenants Association and

2.0

2.3

written.

also liaison to the Merchants Association there.

I am reading this testimony for Hugo Hoogenboom,
who is president of the Board of Directors for the
West 54th Street Corporation. I'd also like to
say that my association is in association with the
54th and 55th Street Block Association. And
here's the testimony that Mr. Hoogenboom has

We strongly oppose the proposal for text amendments to the zoning resolution, 81-212 for the special midtown district. WE have three main objections. First, it is unnecessary.

Second, its scope is too broad. Third, it would undermine the system of public participation and government scrutiny of development plans.

The changes in zoning requirements that the applicant seeks could as well be done through special permits. Why, then, do the applicant and its lawyers, Kramer and Levin, seek these broader text amendments? The effect of the text amendments may give us a clue as to the motivation.

The planned 1,100 foot Moma Hines tower at 53 West 53rd Street also represented by

2.0

2.3

Kramer Levin would be a beneficiary of these text amendments. The effect of the text amendments would extend to any project in the special midtown district where development is burgeoning. This amendment would enable developers to seek changes in zoning requirements in one special permit and thus bypass a lot of the normal review public hearings and review mechanisms established for this kind of thing.

The applicant describes the effect case for the amendments solely on the proposed hotel condominium at 610 Lexington Avenue. We believe that a proper consideration of the text amendments would have to take into account the impact on development now, in or near entering the ULURP process as well as generally their impact on projects that may be proposed. What we have here is a kind of Trojan Horse application.

These amendments would mean that more zoning decisions would be made by the City Planning Commission, cutting out the borough president and cutting out Community Boards, which are the main means through which the voices of local residents are included in the ULURP process

2.0

2.3

and severely undercutting community based planning. It is well known that regulatory bodies like the Lnadmarks Preservation Commission and the City Planning Commission tend to become dominated by the very groups they are supposed to regulate, which underscores the important need for community participation.

We respectfully ask the City Council to oppose these plans. Thank you.

VERONIKA CONANT: I'm Veronika

Conant. I'm president of the West 54-55th Street

Block Association located north of the Museum of

Modern Art in the preservation sub district of the

special midtown district. As you have heard the

developer is seeking a SR Section 7479 transfer of

air rights from landmark Seagram building on Park

Avenue to a very small adjacent development site

on Lexington.

The developer requests zoning amendments, a special permit on zoning amendments, which would apply to the entire special midtown district. The developer would loosen requirement for a loading dock, cut back on how close windows be built to air lot line, cut pedestrian

circulation place, size of our courts and access to light and air by changing alternative heights and set back requirements. The applicant issues an omnibus in order to affect all future zoning regulation in the special midtown district. The applicant doesn't reveal the consequences of the advantage of attachment G.

Missing from the list of that
marked with floor area available for similar
transfers is university club. At 5th Avenue and
West 54th Street where the same lawyer, even if
not developer, is planning to use ZR Section 7479
for the transfer of unused air rights to the Moma
Hines development site. For all environmental
effects from shadows, hazardous materials, traffic
and parking to transit, pedestrian and air quality
they claim site specific analysis can not be
provided.

Since the developer admits not to know the consequences of the text amendment as thorough study is needed to show that impact on future developments before accepting them. This would be better addressed by a comprehensive approach to the section by the Department of City

2.0

Planning and a full public debate on the merits of changes then allowing developers to dictate zoning regulations.

The developer argues that the modifications are not significant because all developments under 7479 will still be subject to the special permit process. However, the modifications will set a precedent. For example, if a waiver for the loading dock requirement is granted in this case at a busy intersection, it will be very difficult to deny an application anywhere else. Both Community Board 5 and 6 voted against 610 Lexington. The borough president conditionally opposed it however the City Planning Commission voted for it.

Now the development plants would be possible without zoning amendments. Since 610

Lexington is adjacent to the landmark Seagram, the developer could use ZR Section 74711 instead, which will allow bulk modifications without zoning text changes. Present landmark laws already allow unlimited sale of air rights by landmarks and unlimited buying by developers at sites with avenue zoning on which these groups concentrate.

2.0

2.3

Additional zoning amendments would seriously weaken 7479 and the benefit to the landmark is not balanced by the negative impact on the community, especially the loss of air and light to the side streets, increasing congestion and loss of pedestrian circulation space.

The developer cites a recent 7479 special permit application approve block four at 400 5th Avenue with text amendments for the special midtown district and 5th Avenue sub district. The lawyer for the project was once again the same, Kramer Levin.

Council Members, please do not allow developers and their lawyers to write our laws. Protect ZR 7494 from negative effects on our neighborhood and city; please oppose this project. Thank you.

Now I just wanted to add something. You were asking about why the Community Board voted against it. I have here the Community Board's, if any wants to hear it, can I just read you one part of it? It says—I don't know how much of it you want to hear but there is one part of it, which applies to this.

2.0

2	Community Board 5 remains concerned
3	about the immediate and long-term impacts of the
4	proposed text amendment to Section 7479 of the
5	Zoning Resolution for the special midtown
6	district. The principle of amending the zoning
7	resolution for one building and the precedent that
8	would be set in the special midtown district for
9	future application with similar modifications. So
10	this is one of their statements so you understand
11	in addition to the deep concern about the traffic
12	congestion and not to have a loading dock. Thank
13	you. Bill.
14	BILL SHEA: You want me to go next?
15	MS. CONANT: Are you next or
16	Galina? Okay.

GALINA MARCHENKO: Hi, my name is Galina Marchenko; I'm a member of 55-56 Block Association. Thank you very much for letting us speak this morning. In my experience, the best and most effective decisions are made when the cost and benefits of an important decision are borne by the same party. However, under the proposed zoning text modifications, this would not be the case.

3 5 6

11

8

9

10

12

14

15

13

16

17

19

18

2.0

21

22

2.3 24

25

It is clear that the benefits of the request modifications would be realized by the developers. The incentive for the developers to propose these modifications are also very clear, which are of course to maximize the profit from the project and from the building. However, the continuing long-term quest of these modifications would be borne by the public and nearby communities. Therefore, we oppose this proposal for text amendments to the Zoning Resolution Section 7479 and 81212 for the special midtown district.

Since the City Planning Commission chose to ignore the stated commendations of both Community Boards 5 and 6 and voted for the development plans and zoning amendments, we think that an independent agency, which does not have a special vested interest in this project should make an independent study and perform a sufficient due diligence of the fact that the building of this size with the request modification before you would create on current and future public midtown community. Like surrounding communities, pedestrian traffic circulation and all

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

infrastructure including water, sewage, garbage collection, electricity, telecommunications and so on.

In addition, the impact of this development on public safety should be evaluated, in particular fire truck access and fire regulation along with ambulance and police access and ability to pass through this already busy westbound through street. Morning to early evening general traffic along with proposed street loading, uploading of trucks which developers and lawyers addressed a little bit today. But I don't think that's enough extent, effect on public traffic and daytime and nighttime pedestrian flow, all of which are impacted by the modification requested in the plan before you. Based on the results of such study analysis, the independent agency would be best suited to make appropriate accommodations to the City Planning Commission, City Council subcommittees and to the public.

We also think that there should be a public debate on the merits of changes to the zoning regulations or other mechanisms that will include public opinion in the decision making

process. Our main concern is that if we continue to allow massive building construction by stretching zoning regulations, it will create significant impact on infrastructure and safety of the current and future of the city.

Again, allowing the developers to decide zoning regulations misplaces the benefits and costs of those decisions. Furthermore, these modifications will set a precedent for further modifications by the developers and will clearly make other modifications easier, which in turn would create a cumulative impact on the midtown district's already loaded infrastructure.

Therefore, we're respectfully asking members of the City Council Zoning and Franchise subcommittee to please vote against the development plans.

Thank you very much.

MR. SHEA: Let me address Ms. Sears question again in another fashion. I think that you have been seriously misled by Kramer Levin's representative so I'm going to go for Community Board 6, you heard Community Board 5. The key part of theirs, which if you choose I can give to you is.

2.0

2.3

2 Community Board 6 objects

strenuously to the zoning text amendments proposed by the Department of City Planning as these are tailored for specifically for their site and the implications of the broader language of the text amendments could lead to unforeseen or unintended consequences.

What we're talking about here ladies and gentlemen is 7479. 7479 is a zoning regulation; it's been around since 1968. It's been used nine times. It is now being bent by Kramer Levin to benefit its client, Abby Rosen. Okay. Not the first time that's ever happened. What's that other one?

74711 has been the traditional way to transfer large blocks of zoning abilities from a landmark place to a development place. It does not give you a bonus. That is why 7479 is being used. It's about a 10% FAR bonus. It's about money. It's about profit. It's about bending the zoning regulation. It's about screwing around with it.

Since 1968, nine uses of 7479, in the last two decades over 100 uses of the other

2.0

2 74711. What's happening? It's about bonus.

What's being bent? Precedent. Those of you who are lawyers understand what case law means and what precedent means. Precedent was set a 400 5th Avenue by Abby Rosen and Kramer Levin. The reason it was set there was to set up 610 Lexington, same guys. The reason it was set in these two places will be to set up Moma, same lawyer, different developer. What's going on? Law change. You're the legislators.

A lawyer is not supposed to sit there and set up a law. A lawyer is supposed to be hired by a client, do the best job he can for whatever the client wants, whether it's 200 stories or 2 stories. It's unfortunately falls upon the elected officials and legislators to set public policy and to do the public good, to do the public benefit, to do it for the future and to do it for today.

I might also remind those of you from the other borough that what happens in Manhattan regarding large developments does not stay in Manhattan. It bleeds out to your boroughs and you get the same zoning regulation messes that

2.0

2	we get, it's just a little later. So the effect
3	of 7479 is important as a considered legal point.
4	It's being bent. It's being bent to get the bonus
5	and all the benefits that was formerly used by a
6	zoning regulation. I don't know how to put it any
7	way else. CB5 said no, CB6 said no and the
8	borough president said maybe. To hear that the
9	borough president is decided along with CB 5 and
10	6, then we have accepted something is ridiculous.
11	They don't like it, they didn't accept it, they
12	still don't like, they still didn't accept it.

You're way over time. If you could sum up and by the way you didn't introduce yourself for the record.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA:

Sir, sir.

MR. SHEA: I'm sorry. I apologize.

My name is Bill Shea and I'm the quiet guy at the

Community Park Association. All I can request

this Committee to do is consider the long-term

harm of a landmark place giving bonus benefits

plus development benefits to builders so that we

have a landmark place, whatever it is. And then

we have all these big buildings around it. What's

the point of that?

2	The second thing that's really
3	important here is history. Everything that was
4	asked for at 400 5th Avenue by Abby Rosen and by
5	Kramer Levin is asked for in 610 Lexington, is
6	going to be asked for at Moma. It's history;
7	they're setting precedent. I would ask
8	legislation to consider that the elected people
9	decide what we're supposed to have for zoning and
10	who gets a bonus. The bonus at 7479 is very
11	simple; you're supposed to have a full plan for
12	preservation. The preservation plan has to be
13	within the scope of what the benefit is to the
14	developer. There's none of that in here. You're
15	not going to find that. So take a shot and thank
16	you.
17	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.
18	Seeing no one else to speak on this item I will
19	close this hearing.
20	MS. SEARS: Well.
21	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Do you have
22	any questions? I'm sorry Council Member Sears.
23	MS. SEARS: I just want to make a
24	comment because I think there were a few things

that were said. One, I don't know her name but to

2.0

2.3

your left, you made a comment about there should
be public input. When it gets to us, there has
been a very lengthy, lengthy process and I say
this all the time. That includes public debate,
the borough president has public hearings and so
does the Community Board. And that is where
everyone really should be giving their opposition.
So it's not foregone conclusion

And to you, sir, we don't have to be a lawyer to understand our zoning regulations because we pass the laws to do that. So when it comes to this, we're pretty well informed and knowledgeable about what our responsibilities are. So I just wanted that cleared. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you Ms. Sears.

MALE VOICE: Thank you Mr.

Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

Seeing no one else signed up to speak on this item, I'll close the public hearing. And we will move on to the Rockaway rezoning and I'll call City Planning up to give the presentation.

ی

We just got a slip for David

Mulkins. David, are you here? You're for the

next hearing not this meeting, so for Landmarks

subcommittee? So why don't you take this back.

We'll give it back to you.

JOHN YOUNG: Good morning Chair

Avella, Chair Katz, Council Members and ladies and gentlemen. My name is John Young and I'm the director for the Queens Office of the Department of City Planning. On behalf of City Planning director, Amanda Burden, I'm very pleased to be here on this beautiful August morning to present the Department's efforts to update zoning designations for 280 blocks containing more than 6,000 lots in five neighborhoods on the Rockaway peninsula.

This rezoning proposal is the longest rezoning proposal that has been presented before this subcommittee, stretching six miles from the Nassau County line to Beach 130th Street. It is a comprehensive effort to provide zoning that more closely matches building patterns and ensures for predictable and orderly development in the future for the communities in this magnificent

2.0

2.3

2 ocean front setting.

I'm joined by Brendon Pilar who will present our rezoning proposal before you.

And you should have already received some handouts that will accompany this presentation.

As you're probably aware, the
Rockaway peninsula has evolved over the past 100
years from a summertime seaside destination to a
series of unique and varied oceanfront
communities. In recent years, there's been rapid
increase in new development sustained by the
success of the Arvin by the Sea project and the
desirability of living near the city's magnificent
oceanfront. Much of the newer development,
however, has been out of context with traditional
types and Brendon will review the problems of the
existing zoning for you.

For this proposal, the Department has developed a careful delineated rezoning strategy to ensure that future housing more closely corresponds to established developments of one or two family residences that predominate in most neighborhoods. And in only certain locations, on wide streets and near transit will

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the proposal allow moderate density developments to strengthen these locations.

The proposal will also comprehensively update commercial overlay designations, provide additional locations along prime corridors for retailers and servicers to be located near residences and customers. contextual rezoning is consistent with many of the Department's recent rezoning efforts to support orderly growth that curbs inappropriate development and provides for targeted future development opportunities to strategically spur reinvestment. It builds upon the contextual rezonings already adopted in Far Rockaway in Mont Creek in 2005 and Bay's Water in 2006. updates an earlier 1989 rezoning in Rockaway Park. However, most of the area's rezoning is unchanged since 1961.

In addition to changes to the zoning map, the proposal has two locations specific zoning text amendments. One is to bolster accessory parking requirements in this community, whose location is very distant from the city's core and where auto ownership is very high.

2.0

2.3

So a proposed text amendment would apply to new, medium density developments within R6 or R7 zones within Community District 14. And increase accessory residential parking requirements from the minimum requirement of accessory parking for 70% of total dwelling units to minimum accessory parking requirements for 85% of dwelling units.

The second text amendment would provide zoning flexibility for residents seeking to enlarge their one family homes in the 22-block portion of Far Rockaway, where the zoning text amendment would allow an R2X district within Community District 14. Currently available only on Ocean Parkway in Brooklyn, the proposed R2X would allow more floor area and lot coverage for detached single-family residences.

Protecting the appealing qualities of the communities on the Rockaway peninsula has been an important goal for Community Board 14, local civic organizations and elected officials.

And it's been the Department's privilege to work closely and intensively with them for more than two years to shape and refine this proposal. We know it's taken considerable effort to reach this

2.0

2.3

point and substantial discussion and debate has occurred. But we could have not made it here without their contributions. Likewise, Council Members James Sanders, Jr., who is present and Joseph Addabbo, Jr. have provided valuable assistance during the rezoning process to organize meetings and provide input.

rollowing the April 21st
certification of the proposal, we were very
pleased with the support received from Community
Board 14 as well as borough president, Helen
Marshal and are grateful that they expedited their
reviews of the proposal. Last month the Planning
Commission carefully considered the full testimony
presented during the public review process and
made changes, two discreet modifications to it and
they the unanimously approved it on July 23rd.
Brendan will review these changes for you.

In summary, we hope that you, too, will support this well considered rezoning initiative to reinforce the build character and development patterns of these cherished neighborhoods on the Rockaway peninsula. Thank you. Now Brendon will present the details of it.

2.0

2.3

BRENDAN PILAR: Good morning. My
name is Brendan Pillar and I'm the project manager
for this rezoning. The Department of City
Planning has proposed to amend the zoning map on
approximately 280 blocks on Rockaway peninsula.
The proposed zoning changes will encompass five
neighborhoods, Far Rockaway, Summerville, Edgemere
in the eastern section, Rockaway Beach and
Rockaway Park in the western section. Study area
for this rezoning stretches six miles and contains
over 6,000 lots.

The rezoning builds upon previous contextual changes in the Mont Creek and Bays Water section in Far Rockaway. And was developed in close consultation with Community Board 14, local civic associations and elected officials.

The neighborhoods of the Rockaways have begun to experience significant development pressures in the last several years with return of private investment to the area. Much of the development, however, has not been in context to the existing neighborhoods largely due to outdated zoning which has remained unchanged since 1961. The current zoning permits a variety of housing

2.0

2.3

types that are inconsistent with the prevailing scale, density and build character in many Rockaway neighborhoods. In addition, existing zoning restricts opportunities for mixed used development along the areas wide streets and does not reflect the need for higher accessory parking demand in medium density areas.

In order to address these issues, the rezoning have five objectives: to establish a low scale framework to protect and reinforce established building scale, to ensure the provision of front and side yard, street trees and sidewalk planting strips, to address community concerns for additional accessory parking requirements in auto dependent locations, to provide zoning flexibility for residents to enlarge one family homes in Far Rockaway and to also facilitate a mix of residential and commercial activities in select locations to strengthen the existing context along wide streets and in areas close to the transit.

We're now gong to take a look at this rezoning on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis. We will work our way from west to the

2.0

eastern end of the peninsula. For each neighborhood, we will begin with the existing zoning, take a look at the proposed zoning as it relates to land use and finally review the zoning objectives for each neighborhood.

The first neighborhood in the rezoning is Rockaway Park. Rockaway Park is characterized by two main corridors, Rockaway Beach Boulevard which goes east to west and Beach 116th Street which goes north to south. AS John mentioned, the area to the west of Beach 116th Street was updated in 1989 with a zoning change. That zoning change included R7A on nine waterfront blocks. The area to the east of 116th Street is predominantly R5 and that has not been updated since 1961.

If you take a look at our proposed zoning map you can see the strong residential character of the west side of Beach 116th Street. Predominantly one and two family detached homes, which is characterized in yellow and light orange on the land use map. Again, the R7A is characterized by a more moderate density. As we move to the east of Beach 116th Street, the blue

2.0

2.3

color indicates community facilities and also along Rockaway Beach Boulevard we have pink and red which indicate mixed used buildings and commercial activities.

So in Rockaway Park there is a total of 57 blocks proposed to be rezoned, 44 of which will be rezoned exclusively for one and two family homes, that will protect the one and two family detached character in the R3X, R4A, R5A and R3A districts. These represent all the districts we have available to protect one and two family detached homes but pay careful attention to lot with end bulk.

The proposal will also rezone 11 blocks for lower density development. The R4 reflects the community facility and two and three story residential developments, the south of Rockaway Beach Boulevard. And the R5B rezone the Boulevard from R5 to R5B to reinforce the two and three story mixed use development character along Rockaway Beach Boulevard and the north side of Beach 116th Street.

We're also proposing two block be rezoned for medium density. We're proposing an

2.0

extension of the existing R7A district on the south side of Beach 116th Street. The proposed R7A extension will provide long desired opportunities for new investment to improve the south end of Beach 116th Street corridor with new, mixed use and retail residential developments at similar scales and densities, six and seven stories, as nearby existing buildings. The R7A will help achieve a critical mass of residential units, which will ensure year round pedestrian activity and incentivize new commercial opportunities.

The next neighborhood in the rezoning is Rockaway Beach, it's just to the east of Rockaway Park. Rockaway Beach also has general residents districts that have not been updated since 1961, which include the R4 district in the northwestern corner, R5 in the southwestern corner and a R6 district in the central corridor located on both sides of the Cross Bay Parkway. R6 is a general residence district, which allows for a variety of housing types. It has no set height limit and also no provisions for front or side yards. You can see in the photographs some of the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

development that's been occurring in the existing R6, very tall, moderate density developments as well as or houses in areas predominated by single family detached structures.

In our proposed zoning land use map you can see the individual characters of the blocks in the northwestern corner. proposing R41 to protect the one and two detached and semi-detached character there. If you look to the south of Rockaway Beach Boulevard, which again works it's way east to west and through Rockaway Beach, we are proposing R5A which is a district that is predominantly one and two family detached Along Rockaway Beach Boulevard we're structures. proposing a mixture R5B and R5D, this pays careful attention to the building heights in those areas. R5B is mapped on the block fronts with two and three-story development. And R5Bis mapped on block fronts with three and four story development.

As we continue down Rockaway Beach Boulevard, we have an R41 district you can see in the orange color are our one and two family semidetached homes, which will be protected by the

2.0

2.3

R41. And R5D district, which is characterized by a slightly more dense development. And finally as we work our way back towards Rockaway Park, commercial and larger scale residential development.

Begin on the right with our proposed zoning summary. 66 blocks are proposed to be rezoned, 32 of which will be rezoned to protect the one and two family character. Again, that's the R41 and R5A districts, as well as the R4B. 12 blocks were rezoned for lower density development. That's the R5B along the Rockaway Beach Boulevard corridor and also the R4 district that's just on the bayside. That's where there's a community facility that's currently zoned at C3. Since there are no waterfront commercial uses there, the R4 zoning is appropriate for community facilities and residential development.

20 blocks will be rezoned for medium density development. That's the R5D districts that stretch on both the north and south sides of Rockaway Beach Boulevard. And the proposed R6A, which implements a maximum 70-foot building height limit over the existing R6

2.0

2.3

2 district. R5B and R7A over on Rockaway Beach 3 Boulevard.

After the City Planning Commission held its public hearing, modifications were made for the proposal. The first one was to modify the proposed R7A along Rockaway Beach Boulevard on two block portions, either side of Beach 105th Street. The modification was changed to R5D to reflect a more consistent street wall, four-story street wall, that's already been accomplished on this block front, to the west of Beach 102nd Street. So the R5D district will allow for more predictability and similar building envelope along that corridor.

Our next neighborhood is

Summerville. Summerville is just to the east of Rockaway Beach. Summerville is predominantly residential. It has three main general residential districts in its existing zoning. R32 to the north of Beach Channel Drive, R5 to the south, and C3 waterfront commercial district to the north of Beach Channel Drive. Both R32 and R5 are general residence districts, which allow for a variety of building types.

You can see in our proposed zoning

2

3 map on our land use map, the predominant one and

4 two family character we're proposing R4A and R5A.

5 In the predominant semi-detached character, which

6 is shown in the orange where we are proposing R41.

7 Along Beach Channel drive we're proposing R5D.

8 This is an effort along with the mapping of new

9 commercial overlays to encourage new mixed use

10 commercial opportunities for residents on these

11 blocks. As you can see in our existing zoning map

12 there are only two commercial overlays along Beach

Channel Drive, our proposed zoning will add many

14 more.

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

So on Rockaway Beach there are 58 blocks proposed to be rezoned. As I mentioned, a majority of them will be rezoned, 45 of them, to protect the one and two family character, again, reflected in the R4A and R5A for one and two family detached homes and R41 for one and two family semi-detached homes. As I mentioned, R5D along Rockaway Beach Boulevard which will help encourage three and four story mixed use development. There's also one block proposed to be rezoned from C3 to R4 to limit future

development to community facility and residential development.

The final neighborhoods in the rezoning are Far Rockaway and Edgemere. Far Rockaway along the Nassau County border characterized by an R2 single family detached district. The area to the south of this red area, which is downtown Far Rockaway is rezoned R4 and R5, these are again general residence districts. And along the ocean front is a large R6 district, which again, these pictures help illustrate allow for a variety of building types with no set height limits, no provisions for rear or side yards and generous parking waivers.

In our proposed zoning, again, we have our single family detached district. These 22 blocks are subject to our text amendment which we're opposing along with the zoning map changes to allow for some flexibility in enlarging these one family detached homes. To the south of the downtown area, where there is a mixture of community facilities as well as one and two family detached and semi-detached homes, we are proposing R4A and R41. And on the ocean front blocks, where

2.0

the existing R6 is permitting quite varied development.

We're proposing R3A to kind of protect the bungalow blocks in that area, R41 to protect the one and two family semi-detached character and R5 to implement a maximum 40-foot height limit along with additional parking requirements and provisions for front and side yards. We're also proposing C43As and C44 to go along with the Edgemere and Auburn East urban renewal areas. This will help anchor commercial activity for those urban renewal areas.

So in Far Rockaway and Edgemere there's 116 blocks proposed to be rezoned, 22 of which will be rezoned for R2X. R2X better reflects the large single family detached character of the neighborhood and allows for residents to enlarge their homes. R2X has the same building envelope as R2A, which will help ensure more predictability than the existing R2 district. Also the narrow lot with provisions will also help bring some of the homes on these blocks into compliance.

79 blocks will be rezoned for one

2.0

and two family houses that's reflected in the R4A and R41 districts to the north of Segrid as well as the R41 straight just to the south. The R3A bungalow district just to the south of Segrid. 10 blocks will be rezoned for lower density housing, that's the R5 district which again establishes a set building height at 40 feet. And also the five blocks for medium density zoning, the R6A/C, 43A will again, help anchor commercial activity in the Edgemere renewal area. And the C44 will help anchor commercial activity in the Auburn East urban renewal area.

The second modification made by the City Planning Commission was made in Far Rockaway. It retained the existing R5 district between Beach 19th Street and Beach 15th Street just to the south of Plainview Avenue, approximately 150 feet to allow the permitting process for Yeshiva site between Beach 19 Street and Beach 17th Street to continue as planned. As well as related faculty housing to the south of Brookhaven Avenue. So the R5 district has been retained on those blocks while the R4A and R41 districts have been moved to protect the one and two family detached and semi-

2.0

2.3

detached character on those blocks.

changes we're also proposing new C13 and C23 commercial overlays to bring existing commercial uses into compliance and to provide for new commercial opportunities. The depths of these overlays on Rockaway Beach Boulevard, Beach 116 Street, Beach Channel Drive and Segrid Boulevard will also be reduced from 150 to 100 feet to prevent the commercial intrusion on residential blocks.

Finally in some 280 blocks we're proposed to be rezoned, 266 of which, an overwhelming majority, will be rezoned to protect the lower density character of the Rockaway peninsula. The rezoning also includes additional accessory parking requirements and strengthens existing context in very select locations with new mixed used commercial and residential opportunities.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I think you just set the record for the longest City Planning presentation other than a major project. I'd like to call on Council Member Sanders for his comment.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

I will then read a letter from Council Member Joe
Addabbo. I have some questions and my colleagues
have some questions and then we'll go to the
public testimony. Council Member Sanders.

COUNCIL MEMBER JAMES SANDERS, JR.: Thank you very much Mr. Chair. Having been born and raised in the Rockaways, I am delighted that we're starting to get the attention that we need to grow and develop in the 21st century. I must admit that I am an expert on my district, which is roughly 70% of the Rockaways. And I will defer to my colleague who is very versed on his area of the Rockaways. My part of the area--I was telling my colleague today that perfect is the enemy of great. Perfect exists in the mind; we will never see it on this planet but great we can perhaps get to. For my purposes, this plan is a great move towards the new Rockaways, speaking about my area from around 90th Street East.

I have always been a supporter of affordable housing and I'm told that in another part of the district, my district, that there's going to be a development and I trust that it will have affordable housing in it. I'm speaking about

2.0

the 400 plus units that are supposed to go to 116 Street. I urge everyone that affordable housing needs to be included in that development also.

So from my point of view, this has been a very long--I can agree, that we have had a million meetings on this issue. It has been very long and the community has participated, full steam ahead, in this. So I am here to say for my portion that I'm in favor of this and I'm anxious to hear how my colleague is speaking. Thank you again Mr. Chair and thank you to City Planning.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

Council Member Addabbo couldn't be here with us this morning but he did submit testimony that he asked me to read into the record. And it's addressed to me.

I hope this letter finds you well.

I want to thank you and your committee staff for convening the hearing regarding the proposed rezoning of the Rockaway peninsula. Unfortunately due to a previously scheduled event, I apologize for not being able to attend said hearing but would like to take this opportunity to express my position on the proposal before the Committee,

2.0

2.3

more specifically as it pertains to Beach 116th
Street.

If the numerous conversations and meetings with my constituents, elected officials, Community Board 14 members and executive officers, civic leaders, the Queens borough president's office, John Young of Queens City Planning, City Planning Commissioner Chair Amanda Burden and you. Meaning me, I guess. I consider my position to be a well researched and educated one.

While I will constantly be concerned with and continue to work on specific issues with the Rockaway rezoning such as but not limited to, parking, cosmetic appearance, traffic and future development, I believe that one classification of zoning would positively promote the desired commercial and residential development that the majority of the entire Rockaway peninsula is seeking and one that would complement the full rezoning plan for the peninsula. That is why I support the proposed R7A zoning for Beach 116th Street.

By supporting the proposed R7A zoning I join together with the majority of my

constituents, Community Board 14, the Queens borough president, City Planning and area elected officials in seizing the opportunity to continue the revitalization of Rockaway and encourage credible local retail development and job growth. In my educated opinion, ignoring or postponing the rezoning of Beach 116th Street would jeopardize the progress of the remainder of the peninsula's rezoning and would place the potential positive development of Beach 116th Street in a most uncertain timeframe and outcome.

I appreciate all the efforts of my constituents, both those in favor and those opposed to the rezoning plan. Their input over the past two years at various private and public meetings regarding this plan was most valuable to me. I hope that in the end we can continue to work together to ensure a future that benefits all the residents of Rockaway for decades to come.

Once again I apologize for my
absence at the hearing and I thank you and the
Committee for the opportunity to express my
position. If I can be of any assistance to you in
the future, please do not hesitate to contact me.

2.0

2	I have copies of that for my
3	colleagues. Now having read into the record his
4	statement, I have some questions for City
5	Planning. Before we get to the public testimony
6	we have 25 people signed up to speak, a few in
7	favor and many in opposition. The issue that I've
8	always had has been the R7A rezoning of Beach
9	116th Street. You and I know we've had several
10	conversations about this.

I raised the issue early on that why not take this out of the application. Proceed with all the other zoning parts of the application, which the community overwhelmingly supports. And why not come back with a special district for 116th Street, given that it is the transportation hub, it's like the Main Street of the Rockaways. Why not take a little bit more time and do a better job of it? And I hate to disagree with my colleague but he knows my opinion on this.

So I'd to now--

[Applause]

Please, it's always my policy if I allow applause I have to allow boo's. I can't do

MR. YOUNG: Certainly Council

2.0

2.3

either. So the opportunity for you to express
your comment is when you sign up to speak. So I'd
like to hear your comments. I know what it is but
for the record, I'd appreciate your responding to
my concerns.

Member. As we've said in our previous discussions. We've looked at this treatment on Beach 116th Street as one part of a two-fold treatment on the corridor. We've seen very healthy activity at the northern end and at that area we are proposing a zoning a R5B with commercial overlays that is distinctly in keeping

with the existing fabric in trying to ensure that

there's that very level of two and three story

buildings occurring on most of the corridor.

But at the southern end where we have already an existing R7A district, the idea of creating a special district when we already know the zoning that is nearby has, over a period of 10 to 15 years, reinforced the fabric that already was on the ocean promenade. Will now be able to create the opportunity for some reinvestment to strengthen the southern end.

3

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We believe there already is a zoning that has the qualities of predictability, just like the northern end, and a track record where we have seen how the new development has occurred over time. I think, in particular, what we did hear in needing special treatment in the Rockaways was about accessory parking. So we did create a special zoning treatment for the medium density buildings that will be allowed in the R7A and raise the accessory residential parking requirement to a minimum of 85%.

But I think overall just like the other rezonings that we've done, this is a balance. And it's a balance where if we were creating something totally new and foreign, we could certainly see there's the validity that this needs special and separate treatment. But I think we looked at all sides of the issue, found a zone that already is in place in Rockaway Park, and are just proposing an extension with a special treatment for the accessory parking that will be required as a minimum to be more appropriate given auto ownership and development patterns in the area.

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that in particular, the idea of the medium density that we're talking about here, the idea of taking the current FAR which can be up to 2FAR under the existing R5 and increasing it to 4FAR. That is the type of treatment on this portion of the corridor that we think is, as we've presented, going to spur year round pedestrian activity, ground floor retail and would actually strengthen this end of the corridor consistent with the ocean promenade development, which is just purely residential.

I think in balance, this treatment has been already examined and this strategy is the way we've looked at other main corridors within this rezoning and the way towns do on most of their main streets. They actually try to generate mixed use development and have the density at the And this really is where we're viewing the core reinvestment needing to be occurring at a level that's going to spur positive change.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: John, I obviously hear what you are saying. You know I don't agree with it. A couple of points and then I know Council Member Sears has a couple of

2.0

2.3

2 questions.

wrong. There were two areas that you have recommended for R7A individual application, correct? One of them you modified at the City Planning level. So if your originally plans said you thought that two areas should be but you changed the plan to reflect other issues that came up, why not recognize the fact that the community may be right in this situation and change the R7A in this second location as well? You made one change, why not make the other? I still don't understand.

I completely can understand your position but are we not doing these things in response to the concerns and the issues of the community to preserve their neighborhood and preserve the charm of their community? Why are we not just listening to them when it comes to Beach 116th Street? I don't get it.

MR. YOUNG: We have had extensive conversations and discussions on the Beach 116 issue. I think there's a separate issue about what the Commission viewed when it made the

2.0

modification on Beach 105ht Street. There wasn't a lot of public testimony about it but it was made clear during testimony and during some of the discussion that that was a novelty on that stretch of Rockaway Beach Boulevard, where most of the Boulevard was actually being treated with the R5D. We also heard that the adjoining property on the north side, the Water Pollution Control plant wanted developments kept at the 40 foot height that existed with the R5 district already in place.

I think the Planning Commission took all of that into consideration in making that modification because there was a site specific concern. I think if you look at how much of Rockaway Park is getting substantial protections with the remaining 55 blocks that are being rezoned, this is the area where I think the debate has been about what's needed to bring this into a healthier development state than it is under the current R5 zoning. The rest of the area is getting substantial down zoning and protections, this area has some challenges under the current zoning for redevelopment.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: You came very close to saying something that I wanted you to say but you used a different term. It's very interesting because you say you're doing the down zoning on a whole number of blocks in the Rockaways and everybody wants that and that's what the community asked for. But then you stopped just short of saying, basically, well we're doing a down zoning so we've got to do an up zoning some place. You used the word challenges but really what it is, is--and I don't expect you to agree

But the unwritten policy of City Planning is if we're going to do a down zoning, we're going to do a up zoning some place. And clearly, although you didn't use the word, you started to reading between the lines sort of indicate that we're doing an down zoning but here's an area where we can do an up zoning. my opinion, and you can comment on it. I know what you're comment is going to be, you're going to disagree. This is where you figured this is the only area where we can get in the up zoning.

and I know you can't agree.

You use the word challenges instead

2.0

of saying you want an exchange for down zoning
we're going to do the up zoning because I know you
guys would never admit to that policy. But it's
obviously going on. And you know I have said
categorically I find it disgraceful. If a
community wants a down zoning and needs it, they
should get it without having to get something
back. And clearly I think that's what you're
doing here. You can respond but you're not
changing my mind in this respect.

MR. YOUNG: I respectfully understand that we may disagree on this. But what we did with this setting in Rockaway Park is no different than what we did in portions of Far Rockaway or Summerville. We looked at the areas on main streets where there currently is actually dis-investment going on, or actually no investment in some of those properties.

And just try to understand, talking to the communities, what everyone I think wants in each of these locations is new businesses on the ground floor and some new amount of residential opportunity. Because I think overall what we're saying is we're trying to provide a mix of housing

2.0

options every time we do a rezoning. Primarily one and two family but there are areas of this city and in each community where they may be appropriate multi-family building types.

And that's all that we're trying to do in each of these focus locations is provide for retail with a commercial overlay and some multifamily housing opportunity, that diversity of housing type and diversity of housing choices, we think actually strengthens communities. It allows people at different stages of their households opportunities to be within the particular community. We don't want all communities to simply be one and two family communities if there's the opportunity and the tradition of having mixed housing in parts of it.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: So we went from challenges to opportunity. Council Member Helen Sears.

COUNCIL MEMBER HELEN D. SEARS:

Thank you Mr. Chair. I have just a few. I'm sorry but I'm going to have to leave for an ADC meeting. I noticed that in the borough president's approval, she also stated that—I need

2.0

2.3

to read this. She says that Rockaway Beach
Boulevard should be reconsidered by the Department
of City Planning. Beach 116th Street is
definitely in need of revitalization, however the
effects of increased heights and density may
negatively impact the bordering streets on either
side, particularly the low density areas to the
west.

My question is what happens to the conditions? When somebody approves something with conditions, what happens to the conditions they're proposing? Are they taken into consideration? Is there a response after you review that, that you can not abide by the conditions? I understand the zoning very well so it may seem like a strange question but it comes up with Community Boards. They'll vote yes but they have conditions. I think you need to clarify for me exactly what does that mean because those conditions are expressing the concerns of the people that live there.

I know, for me, if my block and half of the existing block was excluded, I'd have a big problem with that from 278 or 277 blocks that are zoned. That area and I know I've had

2.0

2.3

studies for years on the Rockaways and for years and years there is no question how do you work with the Rockaways. How do you develop them commercially because they should be self sustained. They should do that and that's very difficult to do. That is what makes communities very vital is when they have commercial areas that can sustain them.

And I understand that very well however when an area is gentrified, there's a lot of attention that has to go into it. I understand there are homeless there, etc. It seems to me huge efforts should be made to correct those unpleansantries and to upgrade a community prior to using rezoning as the last incentive. I'm not saying I disapprove; I think there's a very deep philosophical thing here.

For years and years and years the Rockaways have had a major problem in developing in a right way. It's always been very difficult. Here is this opportunity and you do it, 280 blocks. And there's an isolated little oasis that has really major problems. So has there been an effort, I think my question, in order to correct

2.0

2.3

those problems? Has that been going on for many	
years that necessitates? And also is it being	
done because the R7 is already existing in that	
existing building that's there and it's not good	
to let it stand by itself because that has	
happened on some of the stuff on the west side.	

I understand we're not voting on this today because we don't have the quorum to do that. But I raise those issues because—and I support my colleagues and certainly those whose district its in, it's not my district but I know the Rockaways. And I can tell you even though it's not a district, the Rockaways belong to everybody because they're one of the best beaches around.

[Applause]

I agree. The fact is--

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: [interposing]

Correction. Not one of, it is the best beach.

MS. SEARS: I stand corrected, I stand corrected. So this little oasis belongs to everybody and as a result, I feel very comfortable in making my comments without offending a colleague because I wouldn't do that or offend

City Planning because you have put a lot of time into it. So my comments are very respectful one.

I just have the feeling that because the area has been so poorly developed over the many years that

- and I know the time that's been put into all these blocks - I would think it needs a little extra push to look at exactly what kind of commercialism are you going to encourage. It is very laudable to go to 85% for parking; that's the first time I've seen that. And that is really commendable.

questions and you may very well end up keeping that zoning that you're [inaudible]. That's okay. If it's basically, even though the community around it, the community in that area is feeling very much that they have become a target and that everything else around them is going to be these flowering blossoms where at the same time they literally will become a dumping ground. That's a hard thing to digest.

Now if we have this little oasis that's going to be the impetus for that down zoning, that's a problem. If the down zoning is

2.0

the impetus to upgrade that little oasis and make that something very pleasant, I don't see enough there of the planning as to what kind of commercialism, who will be doing it. Is the commercial area going to be what is very vital to the surrounding community to sustain it? We don't have that; it's very bland.

I know that you don't, but I do
think that some of those things need to be looked
at when there is such a major impact of keeping,
of upgrading a tiny area, downgrading over 277
blocks. I could see by the time this goes in, or
whatever, there's going to be such a mad rush. It
needs things that City Planning doesn't do, it
needs to have the sensitivity as to what kind of
housing is going up. What is the architecture of
that housing?

I know the limitations of zoning, of City Planning and I always stress that people should not confuse what the zoning is and what people can do aesthetically. That means that there needs to be developers who have that sensitivity to doing the very things that zoning does not control. There's a lot to make that area

2.0

develop and I don't think just one simple zoning change is going to make that happen. I think it's going to happen over a very long period of time.

And I'm not so sure that—I think I've made my point so I want to thank you and I think you understand. I know that Mr. Young does.

I have great respect for City

Planning; they do a mammoth job in this city. And everything they do comes before this and when I think of what you've done in Jamaica. 280 blocks is absolutely astounding so you should be commended for that. But I do think I'd like to put another infusion into something and that is what are they really living with? What are the plans that go into making it aesthetically sound, which has nothing to do with the zoning. You're talking about depth and you're talking about height.

I'm concerned about what kind of commercial areas come in. Are they going to be supportive of this surrounding area, are they going to be little stores that can't even make a living and then they're left with empty stores?

You can't do that communities. You can not do it.

2.0

So I'm not so sure what the next step is but I do think there's a next step. That doesn't mean that this whole zoning is cast aside 'cause it doesn't. Because actually what happens to that area, if it's not right, we'll never make those 277 blocks great because they're not separate and apart. I just think that that's something to think about.

But I want to commend you and thank you because you really have done—the public may not realize the extensiveness of rezoning, just us on the Committee what we have to do. And we're not sitting there plotting and changing. We may talk and work with them but City Planning has a mammoth job. When you talk about rezoning the entire city, we're talking about shaping the entire city. City Planning does that and they do it with a great deal of sensitivity and I just have to say publicly that I commend you for doing that. Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm sorry. I took a little bit longer but sometimes I get carried away. [Laughter]

[Applause]

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you. Seeing no other questions, we will move to the

2.0

2.3

public testimony. Normally what I do is I do panels in favor, panels against. We have one panel in favor and then all the to her speakers will be against so we'll do the panel in favor first. Jordan Most, Vincent Castellano and Hazeron Mohammed.

Most in the office of Sheldon Labell. I'm here on behalf of Yeshiva Darchei Torah. It was briefly mentioned by Brendon Pilar of City Planning that several properties controlled by the Yeshiva were specifically excluded from the rezoning. And on behalf of the Yeshiva we wanted to express our gratitude to City Planning for doing this. We came forward late in the ULURP process as the Yeshiva was really unaware of the implications of the rezoning. John Young and Brendon Pilar took the time to hear the Yeshiva's plight and reacted sympathetically.

The Yeshiva has several projects in various stages in the development pipeline that would have been dramatically impacted and/or would have caused substantial hardship on the Yeshiva if the requested changes were not accommodated. The

2.0

exclusion will allow the school facility project, which is in the permitting process, to proceed without undergoing costly redesign. And the exclusion will also allow the construction of detached and semi-detached single family homes large enough to accommodate faculty and staff members of the Yeshiva, all of whom have very large families.

These projects represent the Yeshiva's commitment to the neighborhood as a major educational institution that is constantly strengthening those neighborhood and community ties. The proposed exclusion as incorporated in the present report will allow the Yeshiva to advance its important and beneficial agenda. That's all. Thank you.

VINCENT CASTELLANO: My name is

Vince Castellano. Want me to take a minute and

tell you my credentials here. I'm a real estate

broker and landlord in Rockaway for 25 years.

I've been on Community Board 14 for 19 years. I

was Chair for five years. I'm currently chair of

the Urban Renewal Committee which approved the

urban renewal plans Edgemere and Auburn. I was

2.0

mayoral appointee to the New York City ran guidelines board for five years. Some of you may know me because ten years ago I had a radio show called Real Estate Nightmares. If the Chairman is wondering and scratching his head why I look so familiar it's because about 15 years ago I did a T.V. show called Should Queens secede and you were a guest on that show.

We're here at the end of approximately three years of meetings, discussions and compromises. This plan has unanimous approval of the Land Use Committee, the Community Board voted 32-12-2 to approve it. The Borough Board approved it, Community Planning Commission approved it unanimously. The two changes they made, one was to accommodate the Darchei Torah, I think I got the pronunciation right. And they made a change on 105th Street basically to accommodate DEP.

There are only two blocks that had any material opposition. Council Member Sears said the community around, well that's not quite precise because it's the community to one side is opposed. There are some people who are happy that

2	Beach 116th Street is a slum and they want to keep
3	it that way. I will take anybody there and show
4	you our proud slum that has been described as
5	charming. It will, no doubt, soon be described as
6	quaint. If you're wondering why there are 25
7	people in opposition, here is the copy of the ad
8	from the local newspaper offering free lunch and
9	free transportation to anybody who wants to come
10	to this meeting to testify in opposition.
11	I guess when you're desperate you
12	write ads in the newspaper. Does lunch also refer
13	to council members
14	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: [interposing]
15	I don't think so. I'm afraid you have to buy your
16	own lunch.
17	MR. CASTELLANO: Council Member
18	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: [interposing]
19	That might be above the allotment that we're
20	allowed to accept under the conflict of interest.
21	MR. CASTELLANO: I'm in complete
22	support. I voted for this for a long time. The
23	reasons are quite simple. There are two blocks.
24	The block on the west is basically going to get

unchanged except for one lot, which is formerly

2.0

known as the Beach Club. The block on the east is a disaster. It's got an old building which was a hotel, which was converted to an adult home. It's got three or four SROs, 200 SRO beds on that block, numerous vacant lots, an abandoned movie theatre.

This block is a disaster. There is nothing worth saving on this block and you can't build a palace next to a pigsty. You have to create sufficient incentives to knock everything down. The Rockaway Park Hotel has a current FAR of 2.85, that at 64 legal rooms in that hotel. If you don't take that building down nobody's going to build half a million dollar condos next to it with that kind of view.

So the R7A as a result of a compromise, I think it's a good compromise. If Ms. Sears was here I would say to her that we waited a long time. The zoning hasn't changed on that block since 1961. It's been frozen in time and frankly it looks it. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Of course I remember you, are you kidding me?

MR. CASTELLANO: Well then you have

[interposing]

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA:

First of all introduce yourself.

24

25

3

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

develop this.

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. CALLAGHAN: My name is Kevin Callaghan, resident of Rockaway Park. As everyone who gets up and speaks to opposition to this proposal will be from Rockaway Park. It's hard for me to take the Councilman's position not personal because I think it's so damaging forever and always to my community of Rockaway Park.

speaking about the 116th Street R7A zoning. I think that this was a sell out of my community to

John Young talks about

opportunities for investment; I hear sell out to the community. If you look at the Rockaway peninsula from east to west, there are six lanes of traffic for most of the peninsula. It then bottlenecks to three lanes of traffic at the 116th Street area. Of those three lanes, the one that feeds 116th is two lanes. The eastbound lane is 10 feet wide. When the bus stops, the traffic They're proposing on dead end streets, eight story buildings. And they're doing this without a plan.

John Young and City Planning made

2.0

fast and loose with the build out timeline because
they should know what we know that the contracts
have been signed and development is going forward.
And they did this to avoid the mandated
environmental impact study. So we're moving
forward without the benefit of an environmental
impact study. This is the opposite of planning;
this is proceeding with no planning. This is
selling out to developers and keeping our fingers
crossed and hoping for the best

Councilman Sanders, I know you said you're very happy with the way this worked for your end of the peninsula. I think that was a consensus for many people from your next of the woods. On the Community Board, they were sympathetic to the problems of Rockaway Park.

They felt we were getting screwed but this was good for them. So I'm sorry, fellows, we voted for it.

But I'm here today to say, look, we can come out with a plan that's good for everybody. Let's just say no. Thank you.

HANK IORII: My name is Hank Iorii.

I have text here to read but before I do I just

want to say R7A. The city wants to give us an R7A on 116th Street. Once they give it to us and developers can now buy pieces of property, they have no real say if there'll be a commercial overlay. Now if any of us have gone to the beach and dig into the sand, we know the water table is very high.

So if a developer buys a 60 x 100 and wants to put in units there, he's going to realize or she's going to realize that they can't dig deep to put in a parking area. They're going to have to put it on ground floor and that's going to negate any possibility of putting in commercial overlay. And that could very well happen. Once that happens on one lot, its' going to have an impact on others.

Everybody is saying that there are developers that want to come in and build on the whole scale, take the whole block over. In these economic times, that's not necessarily so at this point. There's a lot of variables. And what happens is by giving it an R7A we lose control of what goes on because an individual could buy a simple lot and start putting something up that

would then have a broad impact on the remaining
lots.

That's why we're really calling for a special district to work with the community and City Planning to come up with a viable plan that will create incentives that will allow people to come in. Okay?

Again I said my name is Hank Iorii.

I'm against this whole plan for the rezoning. I'm a member of Community Board 14 and also serve on the Land Use subcommittee for Community Board 14.

I'm also a vice president with the Bell Harbor Property Owners Association, that's strongly against this. I have a Masters in Urban Planning from New York University. I worked with the Department of Education to develop programs and requirements for new schools and modernizations throughout this city so I've dealt with City Planning, I've dealt with issue related to planning.

I'm here to state my reservations about how the city has gone about developing and sharing key data that it was support of the ULURP plan that was voted on by Community Board 14 on

2.0

2.3

May 13th. I further feel that Community Board 14's advisory role in this city in such matters has been compromised and not been fully respected by the city. The city did not provide Community Board 14 members a copy of, in a timely fashion, the Environmental Assessment Plan that the Department of Planning developed prior to the vote taken on the rezoning plan. The city in using the EAP as a foundation for the decisions made the relationship to the ULURP doubtful. The document should have been shared with all members of Community Board 14 prior to us having to vote.

Basically what I'm saying is we were sitting, the subcommittee, voting on this and realizing that a document came out that we should have had well in advance. It should have been given to us a month in advance. It should have been given to the whole Board 14 a month in advance. Two weeks after that, meetings should have been held where we could have discussed it with City Planning and then we could have come up with a better decision; that didn't happen. That really is flawed as far as I'm concerned and disrespectful in Planning Board 14 in what we're

2.0

2.3

trying to accomplish.

Subcommittee's--basically what I'm trying to say to you right now, we'd like to postpone any kind of decision. We're asking the Council people here to postpone any kind of decision on this right now so we can look at this over again more clearly, 116th Street. And come up with a comprehensive plan that will make sense for 116th Street and not move forward. That's pretty much it.

The Department of City Planning needs to be more sensitive to the expressed needs of the community and recognizing a uniqueness of the beautiful barrier peninsula. Thank you very much.

Walsh. I'm the owner and broker of Walsh
Properties. I've lived in Rockaway almost my
entire life. I would like to commend Councilman
Sanders for being here for his area of the
Rockaways; it speaks well of how he views his
constituency, would that we had the same. You'll
be asked to vote on the rezoning of the Rockaway
peninsula.

While 99% of the proposal will work

for most of the community, the 1% we can not

support is the up zoning of the beach blocks,

Beach 115 through Beach 117th Streets, to R7A.

Because of the chaos it will create in our

community. Therefore we ask that you separate

8 this area from the ULURP process because the
9 impact of this zoning has not been fully
10 evaluated.

Councilman Addabbo, to whom you will look for guidance, will tell you that this is what the community wants. What he won't tell you is that all the civic associations surrounding the area are adamantly opposed tot he R7A and you will hear from them as they speak for their own organizations later on. Councilman Addabbo will tell you that the community board approved the package and that's the problem; it's the package.

He's tells us its a package too good to throw out for one area. What he won't tell you is that at the City Planning meeting earlier this summer, a group from Far Rockaway including a Community Board member who voted to support the package came in at the 11th hour and

2.0

2.3

asked for a zoning change.

The affected area is directly behind a private high school and the change went from a proposed R4A back to its existing R5. This down zoning would have seriously impacted the high school's development plans for faculty housing.

This suggests that members of the Community Board didn't look too closely at the zoning plan, not even for their own areas much less for the areas surrounding the proposed R7A.

Councilman Addabbo will tell you that City Planning approved the package but he won't tell you is that a last minute zoning change was made to Rockaway Beach Boulevard between 104th and 106th Streets, another area proposed for R7A. It is across the street from a sewage treatment plant and the R7A would have violated the City's own building rules and regulations regarding building near a waste treatment plant.

By the way you might want to take a look at today's Daily News. An article by Brendan Brosch to see what should have caused the city \$1 million is now costing them \$5 million to buy the adjacent properties for that water sewage

2.0

treatment plant. That change was made because for almost a year the Coalition to Save the Rockaways vigorously voiced their opposition based on the City's own rules. Otherwise, it too would have become part of the package. And suggest City Planning, despite their best efforts, does make mistakes. The R7A for our primary commercial street is another mistake.

is that developers have already purchased property on the block and other sites are schedule to go into contract once R7A is approved. There's no plan for the block, just a lot of money and opportunity for a select few. As members of the Land Use and Zoning Committee, we ask you to take out the proposed R7A area of Beach 115th through 117th Streets from the rezoning plan. We want an independent comprehensive plan developed for these blocks that will ensure us a thriving commercial district and stop the over development of our area.

You have mentioned that perhaps tomorrow you will have a quorum on this issue. We ask for a postponement until we get some kind of a

2.0

2.3

credible plan for Beach 116th Street and its surrounding areas. Thank you.

[Applause]

Patti. I've been a resident of Rockaways for 16 years. Unlike what this gentleman back here said that 116th is an eyesore. There is a couple of buildings that might need some work. To say that it's a horrible area, I'm sorry, I love the area. I feel like I'm so much of a part of the area. And to put these massive buildings in place of what's there now would be a crime.

Like Mr. Sanders here, his whole area is in agreement. Give us the opportunity to get together with the Planning Department and decide what's good for our area. Our children are the ones being raised in this area and they're going to go to the schools. We would like the opportunity to speak on behalf of what goes on in Rockaway and not people that don't live there. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I actually couldn't have said it better myself. Next panel Paul King, Fran Stathis, Ellen O'Reilly and a

2.0

2.3

10 / T	¬ ¬ -	7 .
במבו אבועו	/ I TT 2 7	$^{\circ}$
Marlena	$A \cup A \cup$	auu.

FRAN STATHIS: Good morning.

Before I begin my three minutes--no it's just me.

Before I begin my three minute speech, I just like

to ask how many people sit on this Committee?

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Well first of

all we don't take questions [Laughter] but I will

answer it. The 11 members--

MR. STATHIS: [interposing] I didn't get my position for nothing.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Well 10, that's right we used to have 11. One member asked to be taken off of it. Actually because it's too much work he said. There are 10 members now, 6 I need for quorum.

MR. STATHIS: Six you need for quorum. I just wanted to say how disappointed I am that there is no quorum here. Many of us, including myself took a day off of work, lost pay and benefits, let alone inconveniencing others that are parents or grandparents watching their children. So it's a major inconvenience and I'm very disappointed.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: The only thing

2.0

2.3

I can say is some of us agree with you.

MR. STATHIS: If I lost that day at work my head would roll but in any event, thank you very much for hearing us and for supporting us. My name is Fran Stathis. I am the President of the Rockaway Park Commerce and residents

Association. I am a lifelong of resident of the Rockaways. I'm one of ten children, we're all born here. Our family now exceeds 100.

I appear before you today to implore to you to consider the borough president Marshall's recommendation for the ULURP process regarding the R7A in Rockaway Park, our district. The Queens Borough president recommends the approval of the application with the following recommendations and I'll quote them.

The rezoning proposal for Beach

116th Street between Ocean Promenade and north

towards Rockaway Beach Boulevard should be

reconsidered by the Department of City Planning.

Beach 116th Street is definitely in need of

revitalization however the effects increased

heights and density may negatively impact the

bordering streets on either side, particularly the

2.0

low density areas to the west. Unquote.

The R7A is our only objection to this proposal. Everyone is in agreement that Beach 116th Street needs revitalization. It was mentioned earlier that 400 units already slotted for middle income housing or low income housing, affordable housing. It's not a done deal yet, is it? We need businesses not housings, we're already over saturated with many of the new units which remain unsold or unrented.

Our infrastructure is already severely overburdened. Beach 116th Street is our Main Street; it's our business area. The roads are now, in each lane there's only one lane and they're bordered by now, dead end streets. It's the hub of our fire, transit departments, our library, bank, shopping and it's the last stop on the subway and three major bus lines. Traffic congestion is constant, let alone adding hundreds more units of housing, thousand more resident and hundreds more cars.

I find it outrageous our Community
Board voted on this issue without receiving a copy
of the EAP within the legally required timeframe.

2.0

2.3

Their vote was based on incorrect information and was not the product of an informed deliberation.

How can they serve us properly if they're not informed.

Know that this R7A issue has united the surrounding civic associations and residents like never before. Along with the leaders with the Bell Harbor, the Broad Channel, Seaside, Breeze Point and other civic associations and residents have voiced strong opposition to the R7A in writing and at numerous meeting with Councilman Addabbo and others. Through the work of the Coalition, over 1,400 residents sent letters to City Planning, elected officials and others expressing outrage to the R7A proposal.

Make no mistake, we are unified on this issue. We want and deserve a quality neighborhood that enhances our quality of life, not one that threatens it. WE do not want R7A or any increase in density. In recent years developers have recognized the natural beauty of our oceanside community. They have also taken advantage of tax incentives and the economic benefits or our area. But who's benefiting? Not

MR. STATHIS: Where's the

2.0

2.3

2 us.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Can I sort of ask you to sum up?

5 MR. STATHIS: I will. I'm almost 6 finished.

7 CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Okay.

infrastructure that we need? Auburn by the Sea represents 2,300 new units. Why add more? We respectfully request that you remove the R7A from this project, from this proposal and pass it with the remaining elements. Explore the creation of a special district on 116th Street with a commercial incentive. Residents are outraged that they're being ignored by those who represent us. Listen to us and the borough president and do not pass this. You mentioned that you're going to be voting tomorrow morning at 9:00, does that mean we all now have to come back?

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Right now the Committee is going to be reconvened at 9:45 tomorrow morning because the Land Use Committee, which takes the matters up after my subcommittee votes is at 10:00. So the vote on all the items

2.0

that we've had here today will be at 9:45. But that does give you another day to start doing what you got to do.

MR. STATHIS: And another day off of work. I'd like to think with everyone's help, we can have a comprehensive revitalization plan that's best serves the Rockaway community. I'd like to thank borough president Marshall and Councilman Tony Avella for their support during this difficult fight to save Rockaway from the R7A disaster and to John Young and his team for their hard work. Yes, it is a good plan but we don't settle. Thank you very much.

MARLENA ALVARADO: Hi, my name is Marlena Alvarado and I'm a resident of Rockaway. I'd just like to agree with a lot of the things that were said. Basically how R7A zoning for Beach 116th Street should be removed from the current proposal. And that's it.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you. Short and concise.

ELLEN O'REILLY: Good morning, my name is Ellen O'Reilly. I'm president of the Broad Channel Civic Association. I am also a

2.0

2.3

member of Community Board 14. I am one of the 12 that did not vote in favor of this proposal because it was an all or nothing deal and I don't like to feel like I'm being railroaded.

The Broad Channel community is aligning itself with our friends on the Rockaway peninsula proposing the proposed R7A zoning on 116th Street. Approval of the up zoning of this area will increase the burden on an already insufficient infrastructure and we see no advantage to the existing communities. 116th Street, the hub of the peninsula, needs and deserves a comprehensive plan that will revitalize the area R7A zoning will not enhance it but be detrimental to the future growth or Rockaway.

Additional the increase in population and traffic coming through and across Bay Boulevard will put additional stress on our roads and put our residents in danger.

Construction and car traffic are at an all time high with cars speeding through with wanton disregard for our residents. Cross Bay Boulevard road bed is substandard due to its lack of a concrete foundation and the saloose [phonetic] is

2.0

2.3

already teetering on collapse.

neighbors in condemning the R7 proposal. It is not up zoning, it is downgrading the quality of life for the peninsula citizens and their neighbors. Please postpone your vote today to give all the interested parties the opportunity to glean the EAP and re-asses the viability for R7A for 115th to 117th Street. Thank you.

PAUL KING: Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. My name is Paul King. I've lived in Rockaway for 36 years and for most of the last 10 years I owned a business on Beach 116th Street, right in the middle of the so-called slum you heard about. We have some problems on the block.

What's been proposed here isn't going to solve it at all. It's not intended to solve it. It's only going to make things much worse so I urge you to remove that element from the otherwise excellent plan that City Planning has put together. Approve the Rockaway zoning.

Or at a bare minimum, please, postpone the entire vote and give us time to convince our councilman

2.0

2.3

to heed the will and the wisdom of his constituents.

In my opinion it's very clear that R7A zoning or even R6A zoning would be dangerous and detrimental to the future of Rockaway Park.

As you've been told, this particular block is only two blocks long from bay to beach. They're going to put the buildings on a dead end bock. It doesn't make any sense at all. Putting hundreds of more people on there will put people's lives at risk if there's ever an emergency.

We got little signs up there that say where to go to evacuate but what happens is this northern circle, this northern intersection will go underwater by the way the land is going. This has happened before in a previous hurricane. We know that will happen and that will leave people just to get out on Rockaway Beach Boulevard. These hundreds of new people competing with the people there, in a tight area, it's a dangerous plan to put this many people on a dead end block.

The long-term impact of R7A on Beach 116th is also troubling. It would be

2.0

2.3

detrimental to Rockaway Park's future. Beach

116th Street is our main street. With more

residents than ever, we need retail services more

than ever as do all the visiting beach goers.

Thousands of people will enjoy our beaches every

year.

R7A will wipe out more than half
the retail space on our main street without a
realistic plan to replace it. We'll have hundreds
more people and no services. It will make
Rockaway Park a worse place to live not a better
place. Even worse, these buildings are just bad
business. It's a real estate scheme that was
hatched before the bubble burst. So if these
buildings go up and they're a bust, developers
might walk away with money or not.

We're going to be stuck with the long-term consequences of failed buildings on our block and we already know what that's like 'cause that's what killed this block in the first place and we're just recovering from it.

So I would ask you to do what

Councilman Addabbo is not doing, take advantage of

our experience, listen to our voices; they are

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

2	very clear. Remove 116th Street, this poison pill
3	from an otherwise excellent plan and pass the
4	other elements as recommended. Or at least pull
5	it off the table, go forward and let's work
6	together for a better solution that really is good
7	for everyone. Thank you.
8	[Applause]
9	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

Next panel, Michael Demma, Rita Hayden, Margaret Powers and Renee Rosenberg.

MALE VOICE: Mr. Chair, please forgive me for leaving. Yes, it is true but forgive me nonetheless; I need a lot of forgiveness. I do have another Auburn East conversation that I'm going to go and hold so we don't come before you tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: If I would ask everybody, because minus this panel, we still have nine other speakers, if you can sort of keep to the timeframe. I think you can get your point across without having to go over.

MICHAEL DEMMA: Good morning. My name is Michael Demma. I'm a resident of the Ocean Grand. This was a brand new building that

2.0

was built two years ago. It's in the R7 district, it's on--I have a small cold too. I'm sorry.

This particular building is on 116th Street and the Boardwalk; it's part of the R7 district that is existing there. Is it on or am I just talking?

Closer? Okay.

In my research with some things there and I don't want to get too detailed about hat. But it seems that the R7A was designed to keep the buildings along the Boardwalk in check. It doesn't seem the R7A--I'm sorry. The R7A, in my research was showing that the buildings along the Boardwalk is to keep those buildings in check along the Boardwalk, not to be an extension of anything else.

With that knowledge I gave something very similar in size to the Borough President's Office. Myself and my neighbors attended her hearing and Mr. Marshall's office was very appreciative. They called me up at home, please attend and all that good stuff, have a petition in order and that was done. She agreed with us; she didn't want to go with this 116.

The next step was at City Planning

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Commission, which was back in mid-June. The argument was we sat there until 12:30 and by the time it was coming up, this application, half the Commissioners weren't available. So we were getting half the appreciation that we deserved there. Is that the word, appreciation? It's close enough. Consideration. How's that?

As we found out--we just got the word back on Thursday that they voted in favor of going ahead with this by a large margin of 11-0. So it was kind of shocking to see that they voted such an overwhelming against us in that fashion. If it wasn't for us making this case at her hearing, at that hearing, the CPC hearing - and this should be made known - they would be going ahead right now on 105th Street. At 105th Street there was a sewage treatment plant. If we didn't make it known to them at that hearing, it would be on the books today, right next to the major stop work order that's in effect. So what I'm going to try and be brief about, if they couldn't understand that they were suggesting this parcel be an eight-story there.

The mistake that went forward over

2	there is easily going forward here at the same
3	place. That is basically summing up very quickly.
4	Mr. Avella, this is for you. If that's okay?
5	Unfortunately and there's just a couple of things
6	over here. Amanda Burden was in the papers on
7	Friday. Friday's Daily News suggesting how
8	wonderful she is in keeping the character of
9	neighborhoods intact. You can have this too if
10	you want. Would you like that?
11	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I saw the
12	article.
13	MR. KING: Okay. And just one
13 14	MR. KING: Okay. And just one other thing if I can. The Daily News article,
14	other thing if I can. The Daily News article,
14 15	other thing if I can. The Daily News article, Rezoning Proposal Rockaway Peninsula. Let me have
14 15 16	other thing if I can. The Daily News article, Rezoning Proposal Rockaway Peninsula. Let me have a little water if you can, okay? Please.
14 15 16 17	other thing if I can. The Daily News article, Rezoning Proposal Rockaway Peninsula. Let me have a little water if you can, okay? Please. Rezoning Proposal to Protect the Rockaway
14 15 16 17 18	other thing if I can. The Daily News article, Rezoning Proposal Rockaway Peninsula. Let me have a little water if you can, okay? Please. Rezoning Proposal to Protect the Rockaway Peninsula, comments here as quoted. The and
14 15 16 17 18	other thing if I can. The Daily News article, Rezoning Proposal Rockaway Peninsula. Let me have a little water if you can, okay? Please. Rezoning Proposal to Protect the Rockaway Peninsula, comments here as quoted. The and quote, zoning will jeopardize the future of one of
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	other thing if I can. The Daily News article, Rezoning Proposal Rockaway Peninsula. Let me have a little water if you can, okay? Please. Rezoning Proposal to Protect the Rockaway Peninsula, comments here as quoted. The and quote, zoning will jeopardize the future of one of the most breathtaking neighborhoods in the entire

Low scale communities and

neighborhood community.

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

2	neighborhoods that are threatened by over
3	development must be protected, Burden said. This
4	is something I've wanted to do and something the
5	Mayor said you have to do. It's in quote in the
6	Daily News in that article.

And here is another one from their website, just very briefly again. A careful block by block approach tat reinforces and protects the special character of the five Rockaway neighborhoods. And Rockaway Park is in there. You're quite welcome to have that Mr. Avella. You've been very helpful to us. Thank you.

> CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

RITA HAYDEN: My name is Rita I've lived in Rockaway almost all my life Hayden. and I am objecting to 7A, that's my phone sorry, on 116th Street. It's my main shopping area. I live on 121st Street. I support 116th Street but I do not take my car there. Most times I walk because it's just too congested and it's all very dangerous, I thin the parking is just not there.

I'm going to address part of the reason that we have a mistrust for some of the things that the City does do. And I'm going to

2.0

address the article that was in the Daily News this morning.

Now years ago, there's a sewage treatment plant on 104th Street and Beach Channel Drive. We saw a sign saying, coming soon condos. I'm sure anybody that passed the sign would say, who would build condos directly next door to our own and only sewage treatment plant. The stench is outrageous. You drive by and close the windows.

Well anyway the article goes on to say that the city was negotiating buying this property in 2005; negotiations fell through.

Somebody said in district 14 that somebody dropped the ball. So somebody in the city administration didn't do what they were supposed to do and the Buildings Department issued a building permit.

Then they say the Building Department should not have issued a building permit.

As a result, what could have been purchased in 2005 is now going to be purchased by the EPA for \$5 million instead of \$1 million. But it doesn't say or clarify if that also includes what it's going to cost to demolish these

2 unfinished condos that are also an eyesore.

Rockaway Beach Boulevard.

They're directly next to the treatment plant, as I say. They're right next to the back and right across the street from the school. So this is why we have a distrust for some of the projects, I'll say, that the city is going to put into our Rockaway. Because we have been damaged a number of times and as another issue on 125th Street and

They put up these condos where the old Commodore hotel was and now they're all dense. The housing market fell through. They're half finished also and we're just saying enough is enough. We're just trying to protect our neighborhood.

RENNE ROSENBERG: Hello, is this
on? Yeah. My name is Renee Rosenberg and my
credentials are that I'm a Rockaway homeowner and
resident. My family's been there for over 60
years. What I'm hearing today is just really
scaring me and frightening me as a Rockaway
resident. When I was a little girl my father used
to take me to 116th Street and it was a beautiful
street; it was full of business it was thriving

and it was an adventure to go there. For me to see what's happened to 116th Street and now the plans for the future with the R7A, is something that really scares me.

Traffic is terrible in the neighborhood. We have trouble now getting out of Rockaway. The other day we had to wait a half an hour at 116th Street at the light. We couldn't leave. We had to turn around and go back home. That's without the additional building, without the additional people.

water on both sides. Where'll people go if there is an emergency or disaster? How will they get out of Rockaway? What will happen to all these plans for new cars and new parking? What will happen to this beautify charming business street that was? This is a lovely business beach community. This is nature that is there for us to all enjoy for all New Yorkers.

I urge you to delay this vote and to really investigate this further. And to not look at putting the R7A zoning into 116th Street. Thank you.

2	MARGARET POWERS: My name is
3	Margaret Powers and I'm here for the free lunch.
4	[Laughter and Applause]
5	Just kidding. I am a third
6	generation, my family is third generation to live
7	in Bell Harbor. I'm currently raising our fourth
8	generation of our family there. I am an attorney
9	and our family owns and operates a business on the
10	Beach block of 116th Street, which will be
11	directly affected by the proposed R7A up zoning.
12	We're here today to request that
13	this Council either approve the ULURP and remove
14	that R7A rezoning for the beach blocks of 115th to
15	117th Streets or at least help us in delaying this
16	vote so that it will give us more time to
17	negotiate with our councilman, who is
18	conspicuously and somewhat predictably absent
19	today.
20	Our peninsula is like a bottle. At
21	the far end you have to the west, Breezy Point,
22	Roxbury, Roxbury Point, Rockaway Point, all of
23	these areas are affected as well. As you come

25 streets in the Ponsett, four cross streets in Bell

east towards 116th Street, you have five cross

2.0

Harbor, three cross streets in Rockaway Park. And at 116th street, you have a two cross street bottle neck. It's important to understand what currently feeds into that bottle neck.

also impact the east side but from the west alone, this is our main thoroughfare to access public transportation, public schools, highways, access to the rest of Queens, hospitals, medical facilities, fire department, police department, post office and food shopping. Also feeding into this bottle neck is public transportation; this is the last stop on the A train, the Q53, the Q35, the Q21 and a major stop on the Q22. In the summertime, residents from across the city pour into this street.

There has been significant recent development in Rockaway which has already taxed our infrastructure. Some more obvious effects of this are the trafficking gridlock on 116th Street, particularly at rush hours. Our water treatment plant is reportedly at capacity, depending on who you speak with.

But it's in need of remediation for

the constant and growing odor that is emanating from it. There have been delays of police, EMT and firefighters in accessing the beach this summer to try and deal with injuries and drowning because 116th Street is already so congested. We have over crowding of our emergency rooms. We have over crowding of our schools; children are being schooled in trailers in the newly developed trailers.

R7A rezoning of this area will also effect public access to the beach and seriously jeopardize public safety in the even of coastal evacuation, which is now predicted as likely to happen. Joe Addabbo is failing to represent us. Our civic unions are united in opposing the R7A. We can't understand this refusal except to note that he is not running for re-election in our district. In addition to our civic unions, the residents are united against this R7A rezoning as evidenced by the collection—I'm wrapping it up. I promise. Collection of more than 1,400 petitions gathered in a two week period.

points to the need for a plan for balanced, well

So to sum it up, all of the above

2.0

ordered development of this area. We are not
looking to freeze population at its present level
as evidenced by the grand scale development and
rezoning of the surrounding areas, to which we
have not objected. We want to maximize this
growth by the efficient use of this land so that
we can prevent the deterioration of our community
into a blighted ghetto with the intended hazards,
health, security and social stability. Thank you
very much for listening and being here today.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

Next panel, Noreen Ellis, Mike O'Toole, Paul

Schubert and Michael Tubridy.

MICHAEL TUBRIDY: Since we're in a hurry, I'll get it going. My name is Michael Tubridy. What I state here will give you a little background on why the Community Board voted the way it voted. Our Community Board did not have copies of the environmental assessment statement when we met to vote on this zoning proposal.

Therefore we included a modification request for an EIS to be done as part of our motion approving the zoning changes. That request is not reflected in the information that

2.0

2.3

you received here; it does not state that we requested that modification. Though it was, as I will state here, impossible to occur at that time.

Planning states that there is no negative impact foreseen and therefore no need for Environmental Impact Statement. However this environment assessment statement is extremely limited and does not include the potential impacts of a fully built out R7A. The EAS only studies two locations that it feels will be built within the next 10 years. And their potential impacts as compared to a fully built out R5 zone and its potential impact. For this to be called planning, we need to know the impacts of a fully built out R7A.

At the City Planning hearing its members were asking residents testifying as to what effects the R7a would have on schools, safety and traffic. They and we should know these answers before we proceed with these excessive changes from an R5 to an R7A. Not knowing fully what the potential impacts are is not planning. These changes are proposed in the narrowest section of this barrier reef and on dead end

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

streets.

Please vote to remove or postpone or do something else with the 116th Street area. Thank you.

MICHAEL O'TOOLE: I don't need to repeat everything that's been said here. My name is Michael O'Toole. I've lived there for 30 years. I also sat on the executive board of Rockaway Park Homeowners and Residents Association. If this is the democracy, I'm sickened by it. I got to be quite honest with you, this is very disturbing to me. I can't believe it. I don't know how an educated vote is going to be taken tomorrow, I really don't. I'm just outraged. Anyway, opposition obvious. Everybody here is said everything I wanted to say already. NO matter who speaks today we all have the same thing in mind: something's got to be done with 116th and 7A isn't it.

Vince has his positions. He thinks this is the best thing, this is not the best thing. This is a joke. Up zoning to 7A, you heard it all. I don't have to keep repeating it.

Just be aware that understanding that this is just

2.0

another day at work for you. The couple of yous that stayed, I thank you and I appreciate it. I have to say, again, I'm outraged by it but that's the way it is; democracy at work.

I oppose it. I would hope that you could please--I'd like to formally request, if that's request if that's possible, that the vote be postponed because I don't know how you could make an educated vote under these circumstances. Are these people that are missing going to be informed about the testimony today? I can't ask you that question because I can't ask you questions but I don't know how. I just really don't understand how this is going to happen.

Again, the peanut butter jelly sandwich that I'm getting is not compensation for this. [Laughter] Thank you. It's not funny; it really disturbs me. That's all I have to say, thank you very much.

PAUL SHUBERT: Good afternoon

Council Members, my name is Paul Shubert. I've

been a Rockaways community activist for about the

last three, four years; fixing traffic lights and

wheelchair ramps and bringing the best things to

my community. First of all when one testifies in front of any city agency, one is presumed to be spitting the truth. Now when I was at the Planning Commission last month, Vincent Castellano stated there was no restaurants on 116th Street. There's several of them, here are some of their menus. [Laughter]

Second of all, I live in a blue collar working class neighborhood. I take objection to somebody from a gated community coming into my neighborhood who's a real estate broker with obvious financial interest at stake, telling me he's going to put condos on my block and totally destroy the nature of it. Now, I would like quality housing program, which is mandatory contextual housing as is in the zoning glossary. It's in zoning regulations actually.

The car traffic study was done during the winter time not during the summer. You can go down to our local municipal parking lot from April until October and it's full; we don't have any parking. As Hank said, the water table is less than 10 feet down, where are they going to park these extra cars? The average household has

two cars, not one. The zoning laws should be upgraded to reflect this. On my block everyone's got two cars, the average household, not one.

Also, 116th Street is an Empire
Zone. Just recently, up until six months ago the
entire Rockaway Beach Boulevard was Empire Zone to
114th Street. Then all of a sudden we're going to
upgrade 116th Street. All of a sudden it becomes
an Empire Zone magically. This means the
businesses get total rebate on the sales tax,
gasoline tax. If they're unemployment, they get
incentives from the state. All these wonderful
incentives and all of a sudden, magically, the
block becomes an Empire Zone. I don't call that
coincidence.

As far as our councilman, at the Community Board meeting on zoning our esteemed Councilman Mr. Joseph Addabbo stood in the doorway. Wasn't there five minutes, wouldn't even take off his coat. Did not state whether he was in favor or against any of the zoning. He was saying stuff without really stating anything. Mr. Addabbo is trying to become a state senator now and his not being here shows us he does not

2.0

represent our interest and hasn't for a long time.Thank you, bye.

NOREEN ELLIS: My name is Noreen
Ellis, I'm a Rockaway Park resident. I'm also
part of the Coalition to Save the Rockaways and

I distributed to each of you a

package and it outlines so that you can get a ver

sit on the board of the Rockaway Park Homeowners.

package and it outlines so that you can get a very graphic look at what the 7A will do and what the report, the Environmental Assessment Statement that City Planning conducted tells us. The yellow portion is the only two portions of this area to be up zoned that the City Planning feels will see development in ten years. You will also have pictures of the derelict properties that the City Planning says won't be revitalized in ten years. So what are they doing for us? If they give us something and by their own analysis, it's not going to help us.

Earlier someone called Tony Avella read Joe Addabbo's letter. In Joe Addabbo's letter he said he researched this and he was listening to his constituents. In a Crane's article, Mr. Addabbo was quoted saying Beach 116th

is the crossroads of the Rockaways and that is where the burned out hotel, empty movie theatre and empty catering hall exist. If you want to effect change, you have to change the zoning.

Well Mr. Addabbo better go back and do his research because City Planning says the movie theatre is going to be the movie theatre and what it is for the next ten years. The burned out hotel is going to be the burned out hotel for the next ten years. The only property he is quoted on that will possibly or have change is the catering hall, which was closed to make the appearance of the block look more derelict. It was a viable business, packed every weekend. We all look and scratch our heads and say what happened there.

Additionally in this, it shows all the properties and analysis. Of all the properties on 116th Street, a total of approximately 205,000 square feet, 25%, will change. 48% will not change and worse, 26% wasn't even analyzed. You're telling us you've done the research and you haven't even looked at the implications of everything? It is not adequate.

WE love the plan for the Rockaways. We do not

2.0

love what is being pushed upon us without proper investigation.

So I ask you, go to your members who aren't here and haven't given us the time.

Because someone said in a meeting, the Rockaways is to New York what Katrina did to New Orleans. I don't want any of you, if a category five comes to feel you could have done something. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

Next panel is Dr. Geraldine Chapey, Cynthia

Fernandez, Allen Steinhardt, Kathleen Hart and if
we could put one more chair up there we could get
the last person, Bernard Warnock. I would also
mention while those people are being seated that
we have had a representative from Council Member
Joe Addabbo's office. His aid, Jeff Gotley, has
been sitting here listening to the testimony. I
also want to thank my colleague, Simcha Felder,
for sitting through the entire hearing today.

[Applause]

And rest assured that, although our colleagues are not here, they will hear from us and especially from me what the testimony has been tomorrow.

2	KATHLEEN HART: I'm just going to
3	be brief. I'm a resident of Beach 116th.
4	Kathleen, known as Barbie, Hart. I live in the
5	Ocean Grand on 116th between 116th between 117th
6	Street in Rockaway, brand new building. We, the
7	residents there, love the building. We agree
8	116th Street could be improved on the southern
9	side, a lot of it could be demolished. But never
10	7A will be justit doesn't even hold it now, the
11	traffic. We try to get in our garage, we have to
12	wait and wait until people make the turn. We have
13	a memorial to 587 there and I just want to say
14	that I'm totally against it. I lived in Rockaway
15	for 50 years and I think it's the wrong thing.
16	They can't even rent what they have now.
17	DR. GERALDINE CHAPEY: Hi, my name
18	is Dr. Geraldine Chapey. I'm a tenured full
19	professor in the City University of New York. I'm
20	a fourth generation resident of my family to live
21	in the Rockaways. I'm an elected Democratic
22	district leader but I'm here today to address you

23 as the President of the Atlantis Tenants
24 Association. We represent 280 families on Beach
25 107th Street, right near Beach 116th Street, and

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

we are united in our opposition to the up zoning of Beach 116th Street. We are joined in our opposition by Queens Borough president Helen Marshall.

We need to down zone the current proposal to put R7 buildings on 116th Street. I have to disagree with John Young. 116th Street is not a wide street; it is one of the narrowest points in the Rockaways. As someone else mentioned, Beach 116th Street is our main shopping The up zoning would pose a public safety street. hazard and be deleterious to the rest of the neighborhood. Instead we need to revitalize this long struggling block by creating a special district which will energize retail services for current residents and visitors. The area deserves a comprehensive revitalization plan, not just an R7 zoning increase. Down zoning Beach 116th Street would encourage more reasonable development and it would prompt a consistency with the surrounding neighborhood.

In terms of the over population that this R7 would create, the Tuesday August 5th edition of the Daily News had an article entitled,

2.0

Rockaways and Hospital Emergencies, which clearly point out why we need the R7 down zone. The article states that "there's never been a good time or place to get injured for fall suddenly ill. But doing so in the Rockaways could be more risky than elsewhere in the city. Why does this emergency situation exist? It's due to a population surge in the Rockaways."

According to the article, the problem of over crowded emergency rooms in the Rockaways is expected to only get worse, the officials warn. They note that long waits in the waiting room will not become only tedious but hazardous. But the professionals and staff at our hospitals are qualified, capable and patient oriented. But there is no way to handle this over crowding condition. The Daily News article was addressing the problem of individuals who need immediate attention.

Community Planning Board district
Manager, Jonathan Gaska, notes that when you come
in with an emergency or a serious case you are
competing with all the people who have things that
are not necessarily an emergency. One would not

2.0

want to ponder what would happen if there is a neighborhood disaster.

I'm also here today representing my husband, Eugene Patterson, who is a member of Community Planning Board 14 and who voted against this. Our hospitals are over crowded, our schools are over crowded. Even the new charter school created at Auburn by the Sea is over crowded. I respectfully request that you turn down the part of this proposal that calls for the up zoning on Beach 116th Street or give us more time to adjust this issue. I request this discreet down zoning on beach 116th Street and thank you very much.

CYNTHIA HERNANDEZ: My name is

Cynthia Hernandez. I'm a homeowner in Rockaway

Park; I own a home on 119th. The gentlemen that

were here earlier would have us believe that in

order to attract business to 116th Street that we

would have to have this up zoning of R7A. They

told us that that is the only way this area would

become revitalize is to have these huge buildings.

I don't understand this for the simple reason that

if you travel throughout the city you will find

that there are many areas that have flourishing

commercial districts without having tallbuildings.

And to dramatize this, I thought I would just bring some pictures that I took the time to take. If you travel from Rockaway all the way up to Austin Street, using Cross Bay Boulevard into Woodhaven, you will not find one building that is more than three stories high. Okay? These area all areas that have incredible shopping districts.

This is Austin Street, there is not one building here—One of the most valuable real estates for all of New York for shopping districts, not one building over three stories high. That is their sole argument for insisting that we have R7A is to revitalize the commercial district in that area. Quite the opposite will be true.

There is the Ocean Grand that is seven stories high and it's nothing commercial in that. On my street they just built another seven story high building; there is nothing commercial in that. They're telling you that they're going to give you 85% parking if they build something.

Well 85% parking wouldn't even cover the people that live in the building. We live in an area that has no transit as it were to Manhattan; everyone has to drive. Everyone has a car; most families have two cars so 85% parking wouldn't even provide for parking for the people that live there. Where do they think the people that are going to use the commercial district will park?

This is all just a matter of smoke and mirrors. They want to do something and they're telling us whatever they have to tell us in order to do it. They're going to hurt this community for all time and when that happens, who is going to correct it? When this community has this over growth of 10,000 or 5,000 and it can't even support the people it has now, which is why we asked for the down zoning to begin with.

So they give us the down zoning in the peninsula and they give us this huge up zoning in a congested area that will affect the entire community. I live three blocks form there, you don't think I will be affected by this over growth of population? Everything will. And the street that they're proposing this on, go there. 116th

2.0

2.3

Street is one lane one way and one lane another way. What commercial? It's all smoke and mirrors. We're not ignorant people. WE know what's being done and it's going to hurt us permanently. Thank you.

[Applause]

ALLEN STEINHARDT: My name is Allen Steinhardt. My wife and I are babies to the area compared to everyone else. My wife and I moved to the area about two and a half years ago. We purchased a house, a Victorian home. As a builder I could have knocked it down and made condos and made a lot more money on it. Instead, I reconstructed the house and kept its beauty alive.

Jonathan Gaska and, I may pronounce his name a little wrong, G-A-S-K-A, district manager for the Queens Community Board 14 stated the Rockaways as the Siberia of City Government. And that the city uses the beaches as a dumping ground but the Rockaways held on and we need to have immediate business revitalization. We, the people who live in the area, are the ones that suffer from the dilapidation of those who do not live in the area. And those who do not, bring

2.0

2.3

millions of dollars a year to keep our communitydepressed and in shackles for over decades.

Yes, we need rezoning but not this rezoning. We need rezoning that business revitalization to our main street that is similar to our environment. As Amanda Burden, who chairs the City Planning Commission and leads the Bloomberg rezoning stated, this is the first city rezoning, the first initiative in half a century to make wise, respectful use of the beauty and charm of the area's traditional homes.

We implore the Committee to refrain from voting until more research was done. As Helen Sears so eloquently stated, we need a business district that will enhance our community. 7A zoning does not belong on Beach 116. Thank you.

[Applause]

BERNARD WARNOCK: Good afternoon.

Thank you very much for your patience and for staying. I don't think I need to explain to you what everybody else has already done; it would be redundant. But I would like to make some observations, if I may.

2	My name is Bernie Warnock. I'm
3	vice president of the Rockaway Park Homeowners and
4	Resident Association and I've been on the
5	executive board for at least five years. We
6	started meetings approximately in 2005 on the
7	zoning and we've had lots of people address us.
8	John Young has also addressed us. We had
9	approximately eight meetings concerning rezoning.
10	Not at one meeting, not at one meeting may I say,
11	that anybody has come forward to say that 7A would
12	be good for the zone or a good zone for us.
13	Everybody objects to it, I'm just passing that on
14	to you.
15	Community Board 14 and the ad hoc
16	community have done a great job in attempting to
17	get our opinion out but they're taking the whole
18	community. 116th Street is in Rockaway Park,
19	Rockaway Park means Rockaway Park people to
20	address this problem. I'll just reiterate that at
21	no time has any resident of my community expressed
22	an interest in R7A. Thank you.
23	[Applause]
24	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I want to

thank all of you for coming out. I know it was a

2.0

2.3

trip and I know you didn't come here just for the free lunch.

[Laughter]

Rest assured that Council Member
Simcha Felder has heard what you said and I think
you know what my position is on this issue. You
have support of the Chair. The vote will be laid
over until 9:45 tomorrow morning here in this
room. I'm not saying whether the vote will go
ahead. The Council Member does want the vote to
go ahead. But I think you have another day to
start lobbying and I would certainly urge you to
talk to the Committee Members and call their
offices. They're the ones that had to leave and
let them know how you feel about this issue.

I want to tell you that in the seven years I've chaired this Committee, this is one of the strongest outpourings from any community on one particular issue. So you've sent a message here and I hope that it's going to be heard. But I think the one thing you have to understand is, and you've acknowledged it, you have 99% approval of the rest of the package. It's the 1% of 116th Street. If you said

everything's wrong with it, it might be an easier vote for everybody on the Council to vote it down completely. That's what City Planning does and they'll disagree with me but it's the truth. They put every neighborhood in the situation by which, if you turn us down then you don't get most of what you want.

So the Council's in a difficult position and so is the Council Member. The key, and you suggested it is, can we take this out and go ahead with the rest. I urge you, just within a day, to try and reach out again to Council Member Addabbo and all the other council members that sit on this Committee and let them know how you feel about it. And I certainly will do that as well.

With that, seeing no one else that signed up to speak on this item, I will close the public hearing. And recess the meeting until 9:45 tomorrow morning.

I, Amber Gibson, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

wyri

Signature .

Date September 3, 2008