CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND BUILDINGS

-----X

September 17, 2008

Start: 10:20am Recess: 11:20am

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

ERIK MARTIN DILAN

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Tony Avella

Leroy G. Comrie, Jr.

Lewis A. Fidler Robert Jackson Rosie Mendez Joel Rivera

Vacca

Thomas White, Jr.

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

Joseph Rosenberg

Deputy Commissioner of Intergovernmental Relations Department of Housing Preservation and Development

Vito Masticcullo

Department of Housing Preservation and Development

Michael Kaplan

Representative, Assembly Member Richard N. Gottfried New York State Assembly

Frank Ricci Director of Government Affairs Rent Stabilization Association

Morris Benjamin

President

Mutual Redevelopment Houses, Inc. commonly known as Penn South Houses

2.0

2.3

2	MALE VOICE: On this day, September
3	17, 2008. Committee on Housing and Buildings
	recorded by Nick

CHAIRPERSON ERIK MARTIN DILAN: I'd like to call this Committee hearing to order. My name is Erik Martin Dilan and I'm the chairperson of the Housing and Buildings Committee. Today the Committee will consider two bills, Intro 823-A, a local law to amend the administrative code of the City of New York in relation to tax abatement and exemption for multiple dwellings. As well as Intro 824-A, a local law to amend the administrative code of the City of New York in relation to filing the registration statements by owners of dwellings.

Intro 823-A would permit Penn South Houses, located within the Speaker's district to obtain J-51 tax benefits if it continues to remain a limited equity cooperative.

Intro 824 would require owners of one and two family dwellings, which are not occupied by the owner or family member, to register with the Department of Housing

Preservation and Development. Under this

legislation owners who fail to register would face a civil penalty of \$2,000.

Today's hearing, the Committee
anticipates hearing from the Department of Housing
Preservation and Development as well as residents
from the Penn South Houses and housing advocates
and representatives from the real estate industry.
I believe it was stated earlier but if you'd like
to testify on any of the two items on today's
agenda please see the Sergeant at arms.

As of now I'm joined by Council

Member James Vacca, who is a member of the

Committee and these two hearings are the initial

hearing. There's no vote today. We will hear the

bills and the bills will be later decided and we

will look to dispose of them shortly thereafter.

With further a due, if the members of the Housing Preservation and Development team, if they are here please come up and testify. You can introduce yourselves and any members of the staff you'd like to introduce. We look forward to receiving your testimony.

JOSEPH ROSENBERG: Good morning Chairman Dilan, Councilman Vacca. I'm Joseph

2.0

2.3

2	Pogenhera	Denuty	Commissioner	Ωf
∠	Rosemberg,	Deputy	Commissioner	OT

Intergovernmental Relations out of the Department of Housing Preservation and Development. Sitting to my left is Mr. Chulo, who you all know,

Associate Commissioner of Code Enforcement at our agency.

There are two bills on the agenda today I would like to discuss. Both of these are program bills and initiatives which we therefore very strongly support. The first one deals with Penn South. It's Intro 823 that amends the administrative code exempting multiple dwellings owned and operated by an Article 5 redevelopment company from the J-51 co-op and condo eligibility limitation.

This current limitation provides that any multiple dwelling formed as an Article 5 cooperative through the New York State Private Housing Finance law can not receive a J-51 tax incentive unless the assessed value of each unit in the multiple dwelling does not exceed an average of \$40,000. The only Article 5 building in the entire that meets this criteria is Penn South, a large complex containing over 2,800

2.0

2 apartments located between West 23rd and West 28th 3 Streets in Chelsea.

This bill also requires owners to remain organized as an Article 5 mutual redevelopment company for at least an additional 15 years, which therefore preserves the units as affordable housing for this entire term.

This bill rectifies an archaic state legislative reference that failed to recognize the important of keeping Article 5 companies affordable. In 1987 the state legislature established a ban on permitting cooperatives from receiving J-51 benefits if their assessed value exceeded \$30,000 per unit. In 1992, at the request of the City of New York this cap was increased to \$40,000 per unit.

The purpose of this language was to prevent luxury cooperatives from using this incentive program. But due to the rise of assessed values in New York City in recent years we find that the units at Penn South are now assessed at over \$40,000 per unit. We believe that this current law therefore harms this development by not allowing them to utilize the J-

2	51	program	when	making	much	nee	ded	repai	rs,
3	upo	grading	the b	uilding	's ag	ing	syst	ems.	

The state legislature passed and the Governor recently signed Chapter 383 of the laws of 2008 to remedy this situation. And Intro 823 implements this new state provision. This legislation is very similar to Intro 204, which corrected the same issue regarding Mitchell-Lama Co-ops in which you passed and the Mayor signed at local law number 15 on April 17, 2007.

The J-51 program has been responsible for the rehabilitation and upgrading of the New York City's housing stocks since 1955. It applies to a variety of building improvements including but not limited to the installment or replacement of heating systems, plumbing, wiring elevators, windows and a range of other major capital improvements.

We believe that this program is an important tool for encouraging owners to maintain and rehabilitate their property and at the same time, enabling owners to maintain rents to low and moderate income households.

As I stated previously Penn South

2.0

2.3

is a 2,802 unit development. It has become a
naturally occurring retirement community and is
the only remaining Article 5 limited equity co-op
in the entire city. The residents of this
development are concerned with the continuing
maintenance and affordability of their buildings,
not the resale of their units.

It was first occupied in 1962.

Passing this bill would enable the shareholders to make the necessary repairs with the assistance of our J-51 tax benefit program, thus preserving this unique and affordable housing resource.

The second bill, Intro 824, also amends the administrative code and proposed three changes. The first change addresses an issue where building owners who have sold their property continue to receive a notice of violation on the property because the new owner has not yet registered the building in their own name.

Currently HPD must send notice of violations, known as NOVs, to the last validly registered owner. This bill will allow previous owners to contact HPD to invalidate a building registration for the limited purpose of sending an

NOV. The previous owner must show sufficient proof such as an affidavit, a deed or a transfer of title that they have legally transferred the property. HPD would then send all future NOVs to the managing agent or owner at the building address. Many of you have received complaints from constituents over the years that have sold their properties yet continue to receive violations. Intro 824 would rectify this ongoing problem.

The second provision provides a civil penalty of \$2,000 if a new property owner does not register their building within 30 days. Currently there is a \$500 penalty for not registering one's building.

The last amendment requires all non-owner occupied one and two family dwellings to be registered. Presently all non-owner occupied dwellings must be registered only if the owner lives outside of the City of New York. This provision in the bill requires owners that live within the city limits but rent their property, to register their buildings. It's important from a maintenance and safety standpoint that HPD has an

owner to contact so violations may be corrected quickly and an owner can be reached in case of an emergency.

Thank you again for placing both of these bills on the Housing Committee agenda and we urge your support on both of them. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Okay. I just have a few brief questions. In Intro 823, which is the J-51 bill. I guess there's three criteria that Penn South would have to meet to, I guess, take advantage of this benefit? According to the bill that I've read could you just go through that for me.

MR. ROSENBERG: Actually what it is, is that it's really the \$40,000 assessed valuation issue. As I testified, back in the 80s and early 90s we did not want to be in the position of providing luxury buildings with a J-51 benefit. Frankly, as you know tied to the J-51 benefit is affordability so a lot of the luxury--

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: [interposing]
But what I'm getting at is they have to continue
to stay organized as a mutual redevelopment
company, is that correct?

2	MR. ROSENBERG: That's correct.
3	That's the 15 year requirement of affordability.
4	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Okay. I guess
5	that agreement is irrevocable, right? If they try
6	to get out or create a new company then they lose
7	the benefits.
8	MR. ROSENBERG: That's correct,
9	yes.
LO	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I want to jump
11	over to Intro 824 for a second. I think
L2	principally I like this bill but there's some
L3	components in it that I disagree with. I think
L 4	everybody knows here how I feel about one and two
15	family dwellings and raising penalties on them.
L6	So I think that the \$2,000 penalty is too severe.
L7	I think the \$500 penalty that's in place right now
18	is fine. It just maybe needs to be enforced a
L9	little bit better, I guess.
20	Do you have any ideas in terms of
21	how much HPD currently collects from owners who
22	failed to register and pay the \$500? What's the
23	revenue stream?
24	MR. ROSENBERG: Yeah. We don't
25	actually know that. We can get that information

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

2	to you but certainly from the agency's
3	perspective, although this is an important
4	provision, the other two provisions are far more
5	significant. So we can certainly look forward to
6	working with you on that.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Sure. understand that but I don't think--a lot of small homeowners are going through a lot of pain right I don't think I'm in the position where I want to increase penalties and fines on homeowners just to make things a little bit more easier for the city.

I do thin this is a good bill. think it's a great bill. I think it's going to cost owners of one and two family homes, maybe a little bit too much. I do think that it will be enforced a little more because the penalties are higher and it will be come an increased revenue stream. I understand the city needs the money but I think the people out there in the communities need the money as well.

How many one and two family dwellings to you think will get captured by this legislation?

2	MR. ROSENBERG: But the legislation
3	that requires the registration for owners who live
4	in the city?
5	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Yes.
6	MR. ROSENBERG: I don't have
7	numbers in that. I can get that for you. I think
8	one of the things here is that we were thinking
9	amongst ourselves while we were drafting this
LO	letter. What were the origins in not requiring
11	owners who lived in the city, not having to
12	register those outside to register?
13	We realized it was time to make it
L4	equal. But certainly we can get you some numbers
L5	on those who reside outside and on those who
L6	reside in one and twos.
L7	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: What's steps
L8	does HPD take right now to let homeowners know
L9	that their registration is incomplete or needs to
20	be completed? Is there anything that the agency
21	does?
22	VITO MASTICCULLO: Hi, good
23	morning. My name is Vito Masticcullo. Currently
24	we have two cyclical mailings that are sent out.

One mailing addresses the buildings that are 60

2.0

units or greater. The second mailing addresses
the three to five family homes, multiple dwellings
and private dwellings.

So within these two mailings there are approximately 68,000 pieces within each mailing that are sent out. These are the annual registration notices. If an owner does not complete the registration properly, we send a notice of invalidated registration.

We also have recently put the registration forms on our web site. The way that it is designed is before you print it for signature, the required criteria have to be completed. Otherwise it will not allow you to print it. So we've actually made it a lot easier for owners to register.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: At what point is an owner required to register, at the completion of the sale of the home? At what point, basically, are you looking for these owners to register?

MR. MASTICCULLO: Again, it's on an annual basis or within a certain period of time after title has transferred.

2	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: All right. So
3	annually they have to register even if it's not a
4	sale of a new building they have to register
5	anyway?
6	MR. MASTICCULLO: Yes. But that
7	registration, the form will provide you with the
8	information that was provided on the last
9	registration. If there are no changes you just
10	indicate no change, sign the form and send it back
11	to us. So you don't have to really complete the
12	entire form. When we send the registrations out
13	they're pre-populated with the information from
14	the last registration.
15	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Okay. I see
16	we've been joined by Lewis Fidler who is a member
17	of the Committee. Do any of my colleagues have
18	any questions?
19	COUNCIL MEMBER VACCA: Yes.
20	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Council Member
21	Vacca.
22	MR. VACCA: Yes. I really don't
23	have a question. I do think that the legislation
24	concerning re is a good idea. I would echo the
25	remarks of the Chair regarding the \$2,000 fine. I

2.0

think we should do something a little more
reasonable. But I think it's important to know
where you have such housing, who to contact, how
to contact. And I think registration is a good
step so I would be support of that and, of course,
the other piece of legislation as well.

What is the revenue, though, involved in the other piece of legislation that we're talking about? Tax exemption, abatement for that development, what is the money involved and the loss of revenue to the city? Is there a significant financial implication??

MR. ROSENBERG: No. Actually it's around \$420,000 annually. Clearly when we're dealing with making major capital repairs to 2,800 units and preserving the affordable housing for 15 years, this is clearly a good cost benefit analysis.

MR. VACCA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: All right. I'm just going to follow up. With the current penalty structure at \$2,000 on Intro 824, what do you think the revenue impact will be in terms of new revenues to the city? And is there an ability to

25

2	cure the violation if an owner were to receive it,
3	how would they do that?
4	MR. ROSENBERG: Actually if I could
5	address that. First of all, this is not an
6	automatic penalty. This is a civil penalty that
7	we would seek in Housing Court for an owner who
8	failed to register. We don't typically bring an
9	action against homeowners specifically for that
10	condition. It's generally incorporated into a
11	comprehensive litigation case. So these are not
12	automatic fines. They would have to be imposed in
13	Housing Court. We would be seeking that civil
14	penalty in Housing Court for failure to register.
15	Again, the civil penalty would only be sought if
16	an owner does not register on an annual basis.
17	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: That's current
18	practice now, is that correct?
19	MR. ROSENBERG: Currently there are
20	civil penalties that can be imposed for this
21	violation.
22	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Yeah. But your
23	current practice is what you just said, you go to

Housing Court and you seek it that way?

MR. ROSENBERG: Correct.

2	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Okay. And how
3	would this effect the service of other notices and
4	bills required by state law?
5	MR. ROSENBERG: It wouldn't. This
6	is purely dealing specifically with the NOVs on
7	the local level so it does not have a broader
8	effect on that.
9	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: No broader
LO	effect, okay. We've been joined by Council
11	Members Avella and Mendez. I'm not sure if they
L2	have any questions on these two items. No and I
L3	guess not.
L4	I'm going to jut end here by saying
L5	conceptually there's a lot of things I like but I
L6	would want more detail. I would want more numbers
L7	before we pass this. We don't have answers in
L8	terms of revenue impact. I think I would want
L9	that. I would want to know what the current
20	picture looks like in terms of how many violations
21	are collected and issued and to what amount before

So I look forward to that. Again, to my colleagues, this is the last. I'm about to release the panels so if anyone has questions on

we proceed with passage of this bill.

2	these two items. If not, I'd like to thank Mr.
3	Rosenberg and Mr. Masticcullo for coming and
4	talking about these two items. And I look forward
5	to working with you on 824.
6	MR. ROSENBERG: Thank you. We'll
7	get you that information on 824.
8	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you.
9	MR. ROSENBERG: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I want to call
11	Mr. Michael Kaplan from Assembly Member Richard
12	Gottfried office.
13	MICHAEL KAPLAN: Good morning. My
14	name is Michael Kaplan. I'm here to speak on
15	behalf of Assembly Member Richard Gottfried.
16	My name is Richard M. Gottfried. I
17	represent the 75ht Assembly district in Manhattan,
18	which includes the Penn South Houses. I regret
19	that I am unable to attend this hearing in person.
20	I thank Committee Chair Erik Martin Dilan for
21	holding the hearing today.
22	As a sponsor of the state
23	legislation to amend real property tax law section
24	489 to enable the limited equity Penn South Houses

development to continue to be eligible for the

2.0

program	commonly	known	in	New	York	City	as	J-51
program.								

I strongly support Intro No. 823, which would implement the change in this state authorizing legislation.

Under the J-51 program if the owner of an apartment building makes capital improvements that would ordinarily increased the assessed property value of the building, the building does not have to pay the property tax on that increased value. For Penn South Houses, J-51 is important for enabling the development to make needed improvements without having the raise the rent to pay for higher taxes.

State and the city law try to target J-51 benefits to affordable housing so they do not subsidize high priced housing. J-51 benefits are only available if the assessed value of each apartment is less than \$40,000. Earlier this year Penn South's assessed value went above that limit mainly because of rise in property values in the Chelsea neighborhood in which Penn South is located.

Because of Penn South's strong

2.0

"limited equity policy" - repeatedly renewed by
the residents - is truly affordable housing
despite its higher assessed value. To maintain
the developments affordability and eligibility for
J-51 benefits, I urge the City Council to pass
this legislation, which would exempt the
redevelopment company co-op from the limit as long
as it preserves its limited equity rules.

Penn South is the only development in the city that would be affected by this bill.

As the Assembly Member representing Chelsea I know that Penn South is an extraordinary gem in the New York housing world that must be protected. Mayor Bloomberg and Council Speaker Quinn recognized this and strongly support the bill as well.

I thank you for the invitation to testify today.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you. I just want to give the members of the Committee a chance to ask any questions if they so desire. If not, thank you for your time this morning and thank you for submitting testimony on behalf of Assembly Member Gottfried.

Next I want to call up Mr. Frank

Ricci from the Rent Stabilization Association.

FRANK RICCI: Thank you Chairman

Dilan, members of the Committee. My name is Frank

Ricci. I'm the Director of Government Affairs to

the Rent Stabilization Association. I'm only here

today to talk about Into 824. I have written

testimony, which I've handed it in to you. I'm

not going to bore you with reading it, I'll just

get right to the point of it.

We also have similar feelings, as you do Mr. Chairman, we think this idea of 824 is a good idea. We get many complaints from time to time from our members who have transferred title to a building, they continue to receive the violations. They continue to HPD and say I don't own the building and it's just a headache for them. And a potential liability because sometimes they may own other buildings and because the way the City system works, it's just a blight on their record even though they no longer own that piece of property.

We think that the fine, the \$2,00 fine is excessive. We have a possible solution to this whole problem. It seems to me and I'm told

2.0

by people at HPD, many of members tell me they
can't transfer title to a building unless they
actually hand in the registration card to have the
title or the deed recorded at the Department of
Finance. So that's common practice for many
owners or professionals.

Department of Finance's performance in this area is inconsistent at best, that they don't always require it. So it just seems to me the easiest thing to do, and I'm surprised that someone from the Department of Finance isn't here today. Maybe they should be at the next hearing on this bill. Why don't they require it every time they transfer title, record a title or record a deed? That's the easiest way to do it. You just can't record your deed unless you hand in your registration card at the same time, which then gets sent to the HPD.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: They should do it every time they collect the mortgage recording tax.

MR. RICCI: Right. And obviously in this day and age of computers, when I need to

2.0

2.3

look up who owns a building I got to the
Department of Finance web site and I see who
they're sending the tax bill to. So that's
ultimately the final resting spot as to who's
controlling the building

It just seems that either you get the registration at the recording the title or the deed or HPD just goes to the DOF web site and sees who's paying the taxes and that's who they the violation to. It just seems that simple without going through a lot of this other stuff.

But as I said, in concept we support it. I've told HPD we're more than happy to sit down and talk to them about it. If Council, members of the Council staff or Council Members would like to talk to us, we have some ideas but it's something that needs to be done. There is an issue there.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: I would have thought—that was going to be my question to Mr. Masticcullo is why doesn't the City have the owners register at the time they transfer and collect the mortgage recording tax.

MR. RICCI: Apparently from what

2.0

2.3

2	I'm told the attorney should do this, who do a lot
3	of closings on a regular basis on multiple
4	dwellings do do that. They're professional
5	enough; they know that they have to get that
6	multiple dwelling registration statement there.
7	But then you get attorneys who maybe don't do it
8	all the time and maybe that's where the problem
9	is. But DOF should not accept the transfer, in my
10	opinion.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Yeah. I would think that that's one way to do it. Then what threw me off a little bit was I wasn't aware that owners had to renew this every year. I thought it was only at the time of sale.

MR. RICCI: Well this bill doesn't deal with the renewal; this is only with the transfer of title or deed.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: It doesn't--

MR. RICCI: [interposing] But once you register once. Yeah. If it's three units or more or a non-owner occupied one or two, HPD sends you a renewal statement each year, which you have to do. Often times what owners do for the same reasons is they may transfer managing agents in

2.0

2.3

the middle of the year. So the old managing agent
certainly doesn't want to keep getting all the
violations or any correspondence from HPD so they
automatically do that.

Now, I heard Deputy Commissioner
Rosenberg say, they made it easier. You can just
go online and change it. That makes sense.

of my colleagues have any questions? I see we've been joined by Council Member Rivera and Council Member Jackson. I have Council Member Avella followed by Council Member Lou.

COUNCIL MEMBER JOEL RIVERA: Thank you for your testimony, Frank. I think it's very appropriate and I certainly support his request that DOF be here for the next meeting. I don't have a number of a lot of multiple dwellings in my district. I basically have one, two and three family homes.

But the one thing I would add to your testimony is I have found that there has been a significant delay by DOF in registering new deed information and the new owners of properties.

I've even had in my district where people get

2	violations or notices and they no longer own the
3	building; maybe for a year they've no longer owned
4	the building. So I think you brought up an
5	interesting issue and I would hope that when we
6	are able to get DOF at the next hearing on this.
7	MR. RICCI: That's actually a
8	complaint we also hear is that when they do
9	actually file the new multiple dwelling
10	registration and they do it at closing that it
11	takes a long period of time for it to show up on
12	the HPD web site. Quite frankly, this day and
13	age, when it used to be all paper I could
14	understand it. But nowadays there's no excuse.
15	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Council Member
16	Fidler.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER LEWIS A. FIDLER:

Thank you. Frank, do you know if it is a requirement of the law that a multiple dwelling statement be given with the deed or is it an administrative reg?

MR. RICCI: I'm not sure. I was told by HPD when I spoke to them yesterday about this that they said well it's already a requirement. I didn't have a chance to see if

2	it's in the Housing Maintenance Code or in the
3	Finance Code or whatever. We're going to look
4	into that to see what type of requirement is this.
5	MR. FIDLER: And when you find the
6	answer, if you pass it on. It would seem to me if
7	it's not a requirement of the law that we want to
8	make it one so that Finance has to.
9	I guess the next question I have is
10	in the case where an owner under this bill would
11	notify HPD that they're no longer the correct
12	property owner? Is there any reason why we can't
13	make the person or persons who are receiving the
14	tax bill the presumptive owner of the property?
15	MR. RICCI: I've seen a reason why.
16	The only reason would be that sometimes the tax
17	bill does go to a bank instead of the owner.
18	MR. FIDLER: I would think that
19	that might be a greater incentive to a property
20	owner than even the fine, to know that the bank is
21	receiving notices of violations on the property
22	that they've given a mortgage to. Which is

MR. RICCI: On top of the fact that the bank is usually present at the closing also,

probably a violation of the mortgage.

2.0

2.3

you would think they would make it their business
to make sure the seller does the multiple dwelling
registration.

MR. FIDLER: To tell you the truth,

I think if we made it a requirement of law I think

title companies would make sure. And there's a

title company at every close.

MR. RICCI: I agree.

MR. FIDLER: No matter how experienced the attorney is, the title company is the one that will straighten them out and say you have to have multiple dwelling cards. I think that makes more sense even than what we're doing in 824. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Thank you

Council Member Fidler. I just have to note for

the record, the Committee including myself did not

reach out to the Department of Finance and ask

them to be here today. So I want to clarify that,

that's our oversight and not any fault of the

Department of Finance. But we will reach out to

them and get their input on this item.

We've been joined by Council Member Leroy Comrie. If there are no more questions, I'd

2 like to thank Mr. Ricci for his time and we look 3 forward to working with you on this item as well.

Lastly, I have Mr. Morris Benjamin of Penn South Houses. Mr. Benjamin if you could introduce your colleague and then he could fill out the paperwork later. You have to push the button on the mic. When the light's off, it's on and then you could start all over again because we need to get you identified for the record.

MORRIS BENJAMIN: Okay. Good morning. My name is Morris Benjamin and with me is Walter Mancroft, who is treasurer on our board of directors. I am president of Mutual Redevelopment Houses, commonly known as Penn South. And I'm here today with my colleagues to urge you to approve Intro 823. It will correct an inequity that currently prevents our housing development from receipt of J-51 tax benefits.

I want to express our thanks to the Mayor and the staff at HPD for securing the needed state legislation and to Speaker Quinn, Chairman Dilan and other council members for sponsoring the measure here at the City Council.

Penn South is a 2,820 apartment

2.0

2.3

limited equity co-op in the Chelsea section of
Manhattan. It was organized in 1962 under the New
York City Redevelopment Companies Law. At all
times since its founding, it has been under
contract to the city to provide affordable housing
to low and moderate income families.

Penn South is home to a large number of senior citizens and others on fixed income. In exchange for real estate tax benefits, our residents are subject to income limits and occupancy standards as well as supervision by HPD.

Resale prices are controlled by state law and are limited to the amount of equity invested, assessment and a proportionate share of mortgage amortization. The current maximum resale price is \$11,600 per room, a tiny fraction of the price that would be obtained on the current market. The current non-revocable agreement with the City remains in effect for 14 more years, until 2022.

J-51 tax benefits have helped make several major infrastructure projects more affordable to our residents. Among them were window replacement, facade work, power plant

expansion and modernization of our elevators. You can imagine our dismay to suddenly learn that because of our location, one of the hottest real estate areas in the City, our assessed value has so sharply increased that we exceeded the \$40,000 per unit limit for J-51 benefits designed to exclude luxury co-ops.

Future J-51 benefits are important to us to help offset the high cost of future infrastructure improvements. Our buildings are approaching the 50-year mark, are in constant need of work to maintain them in sound, physical condition. We are very proud of our record in providing New Yorkers with quality, affordable living quarters and hope to continue to do so for many years to come.

As I am sure you know, changes in J-51 legislation requires parallel changes in both state and city law. The \$40,000 limit is imposed by section 421 of the state's real property tax law and then duplicated in the city's J-51 law, Section 11-243 of the administrative code. An exception restoring J-51 benefits under specified conditions have previously been provided for

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	HOUSING AND BUILDINGS 33
2	Mitchell-Lama Housing but not for development
3	companies.
4	The necessary state enabling
5	legislation covering Penn South, the only
6	remaining redevelopment company, was signed into
7	law this year by Governor Paterson. All that
8	remains to restore our benefits rights is passage
9	of Intro 823.
10	On behalf of the residents of Penn
11	South, I thank the Committee for listening to us.
12	And I trust that you will correct the existing
13	inequity. We are glad to answer any questions you
14	may have. Thank you.
15	CHAIRPERSON DILAN: Okay. And with
16	that do any of the members of the panel have any
17	questions for Mr. Benjamin? If not, I'd like to

questions for Mr. Benjamin? If not, I'd like to thank both of you gentlemen for coming in and providing testimony.

> Thank you. MR. BENJAMIN:

And that, at CHAIRPERSON DILAN: this point, will conclude this hearing. items on the agenda, Intros 823 and Intros 824 will be laid aside and this Committee is adjourned.

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.

Signature_		41.	NAIN_	
Date	_September	25,	2008	