CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

LAND USE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES

----X

June 23, 2009 Start: 9:30am Recess: XX:XXpm

HELD AT: Committee Room

City Hall

B E F O R E:

TONY AVELLA Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Albert Vann
Melinda R. Katz
Larry B. Seabrook
Robert Jackson
Eric N. Gioia
Helen Sears
Simcha Felder

A P P E A R A N C E S

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Lewis A. Fidler Maria del Carmen Arroyo

John Young
Director
Queens Office of Department of City Planning

Joy Tien Planner Community Board 6

Ellen Ryan Director of Government Affairs and Special Assistant to Chair City Planning Commission

Henry Sealine Board Member Old Forest Hills Association

Diane Elkin Chairman of Community Affairs Chapter Woman's Club of Forest Hills

Steve Goodman Resident

James Walsh President Association of Old Forest Hills

Albert Dayan General Counsel Bukharan Jewish Congress

Varda Mizraki

Doris Sucub Resident and member Old Forest Hills Association

Alan Brownschweiger Vice President Association of Old Forest Hills

Steven Cashub Resident

Susan Peppertone Resident

Frank Gulluscio District Manager Community Board 6

Patricia Dolan Executive Vice President Queens Civic Congress

Aaron Borogoff

Penny Lee Department of City Planning

Carol Samel
Director
Bronx Borough Office of Department of City Planning

Ryan Singer
Deputy Director
Bronx Borough Office of Department of City Planning

Paul Phillips
Project Manager
Bronx Borough Office of Department of City Planning

Demaris Oleville On behalf of Senator Jose M. Serrano

Lutger Ballen Urban Divers Estuary Conservancy

Mikalia Ritz

Harry Bobbins Friends of Brook Park

Winston Von Engel
Deputy Director
Brooklyn Office of Department of City Planning

Richard Jacobs Senior Planner Brooklyn Office of Department of City Planning

Representative for Senator Krueger

Dorothy Turano
District Manager
Community Board 18

Gardy Brazela President Friends United Block Association

Wanda Ihrig President Informed Voices Civic Association

Debbie Tamafolk Board Member Friends United Block Association

Mary Anne Sallustro President South Canarsie Civic Association

Elias Weir Member South Canarsie Civic Association

Leo Cukier Member Bayview Housing Association

Daniel McCullough

Daniel Baldwin Senior Development Counsel Battery Park Civic Authority

Carol Shine Committee Counsel New York City Council

2.0

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Good morning,
everyone. I'd like to call this meeting of the
Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises to order.
Joining me are members of the Committee, Council
Members Al Vann, Melinda Katz, Larry Seabrook,
Robert Jackson. And, I see we're also joined by
Council Member Lew Fidler, who has an application
before us this morning

We have a number of rezonings on the agenda. We will try and move through them quickly. We do have a number of speakers signed up on almost every item. The first item we will take up will be the C0090283ZMQ, commonly referred to as the Cord Myer Forest Hills rezoning, which lies within Council Member Melinda Katz' district.

I'd like to call up City Planning to give their presentation.

[Pause]

JOHN YOUNG: Good morning, Chair Avella, Chair Katz, City Council Members. I'm John Young, Director of the Queens Office of the Department of City Planning. And, on behalf of City Planning Director, Amanda Burden, I'm very pleased to be here this morning to present the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

24

23

25

that date to 1961 for 32 blocks in the Cord Myer area of Forest Hills, Queens. I'm joined by Joy Tien, who'll present our rezoning proposal to you.

As Joy will explain, this rezoning

Department's efforts to update zoning designations

proposal uses the newly established R1-2A designation adopted by the City Council as part of the North Flushing rezoning to replace existing R1-2 zoning in order to set a more predictable scale for new development or alterations of existing structures. Like the R2A zoning category, which has been implemented in Bayside and other single-family communities since 2005, the proposed R1-2A zoning will provide firm building wall and roof height limits and reduced floor area exemptions, while retaining most of the current R1-2 lot requirements to guide future development of detached single-family houses.

Overall, the proposed zoning will modestly reform existing regulations and carefully balances ensuring predictable outcomes, while providing flexibility for homeowners to improve their properties. Protecting the existing built housing stock and appealing qualities of Cord Myer

2.0

2.3

2	is the chief goal of many dedicated residents and
3	civic members; some of who are in attendance
4	today. It's been the Department's privilege to
5	have worked closely with all of the passionate
6	stakeholders in Cord Myer on this important
7	proposal. We have made it here only after holding
8	many meetings and vigorous discussions with them.

Council Member Katz has provided invaluable and clear-sighted advocacy during the rezoning process. And, we're very grateful for her leadership in advancing the proposal.

certification of the proposal, we are pleased with the support the rezoning has received from Community Board 6, as well as from Borough President Helen Marshall. And, we thank them for expediting their reviews of the proposal. We hope that you, too, will support this well-considered and reasonable rezoning initiative to reinforce the built character of the cherished Cord Myer section of Forest Hills.

And now, I think Joy's set up.

And, she'll present the details of the proposal.

And, just, so you can follow along, we do have a

handout that should be distributed to each and every one of you.

JOY TIEN: Good morning. My name is Joy Tien. I'm the Planner for Community Board 6.

The Department of City Planning proposes a zoning map change for 32 blocks in Forest Hills, Queens Community District 6. The rezoning area is bounded by 66th Avenue, Grand Central Parkway, 72nd Road and 108th Street to the west.

We began this rezoning study in response to community concerns that recent residential development has been inconsistent with the established scale. Currently, about 90% of the area is residential; mostly one-family detached houses. And, the area is boarded by midrise apartment buildings and is just north of the Austin Street shopping district, which I think you might know. The entire area is mapped R1-2. And, we are proposing to change the entire area from R1-2 to the next contextual district, as John was saying, R1-2A.

To give a visual overview of the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

area's houses, please, if you'll look at the top section. These are examples of traditional Cord Myer streetscapes. The majority of houses were built between 1910 and 1940 and are typically between one and a half and two-stories tall. In the last several years, there's been an upsurge in development with houses being demolished and then, replaced with larger and taller structures that are out of scale with the neighborhood.

The street wall heights of the new construction are usually between 25 and 30 feet. The photographs in the middle, here, show examples of out-of-context houses that were recently built. The building on the left here has a building height of over 35 feet and a wall height, here, of over 30 feet. It's important to note that these changes that are being proposed are moderate. The majority of new construction would still be permitted under the new zoning. The photos at the bottom are examples of recently built or altered houses that would still conform to R1-2A. rezoning would simply make future construction more predictable and more in line with existing context.

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

I'd like to just briefly outline the primary characteristics of the existing and proposed zones. Both R1-2 and R1-2A are designations for lower density neighborhoods of single-family, detached houses on larger lots. The minimum lot width is 60 feet; minimum area is 5,700 square feet and the maximum FAR would be .5. The yard requirements would remain the same at 20 feet minimum front yard, 20 feet combined side yards, except that there would be an additional front yard lineup requirement, meaning that the

front yard would have to be as deep as an adjacent

front yard, up to 25 feet.

The primary differences involve maximum heights, floor area exemptions and lot coverage. Currently, building height limits are governed by the sky exposure plane. This means that the height limit can vary depending on the building's position on the lot. So, the maximum street wall height is currently 25 feet. But, with the sky exposure plane, each additional foot the house is pushed back give it another foot in height. Now, the new zoning would set a maximum, a firm maximum, perimeter wall height of 25 feet,

2 which is actually based on current regulations.

And, it would set the maximum building height at 35 feet, which is the standard maximum height for low density residential districts.

With current floor area exemptions, if the ground floor has a garage, the entire floor area of the lower story can be exempted from FAR calculations. Under new zoning, the floor area exemption would be limited to 300 square feet for a one-car, and 500 square feet for a two-car garage.

And, the last major difference is maximum lot coverage, which would be increased to 30%. This greater lot coverage we believe would allow more flexibility for new construction and renovation, but would still give the neighborhood the predictability and scale that it desires.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

Before I call on Council Member Katz, I would just like to recognize Ellen Ryan. Ellen, are you in the room? Ellen? Ellen, where is Ellen? Ellen, you know, has served as the Director of Governmental Affairs and Special Assistant to the

Thank you,

2.0

2.3

Chair on the City Planning Commission. And, this
is actually her last meeting. And, she's done a
tremendous job. It's always been a pleasure
working with you. And, I know I speak for the
Chair of the Land Use Committee as well, and the
Committee and the entire Council. But, you'll be
missed.

ELLEN RYAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: We want to thank you for your service. Council Member Katz.

COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ:

Mr. Chair. And, I want to thank City Planning for all the work that they did on this rezoning. I have to tell you this is one of the rezonings in my community that I don't believe I've spent more time on than this rezoning in my last seven and half years, at least in my own community. I end up spending all that time in other people's communities and their rezonings. But, this one has been, from day one of my Council seat, one of the things that we had been working on and working towards and talking with City Planning about.

I need to just thank City Planning. We have had, I have to tell you, dozens of

meetings with every side of the community on this issue. We have moved forward. We have resolved misunderstandings. And, not everyone is extremely happy. And, that's always the case in a rezoning that goes forward. And, I know we'll be hearing from a few folks that are not happy with the rezoning and many that are.

But, just to be clear, this is an area that is residential buildings, relatively small houses in our community of Cord Myer. This is the original actual neighborhood of Forest Hills from, I believe it was 100-something years ago. This was the first community in the area of Forest Hills. Everything else was built around this. So, to keep some modicum of context for these houses is extremely important to us.

The interesting part about this is you know this rezoning was probably good because no one's happy. The folks that want to keep this neighborhood exactly the same think that I should have done more in making sure the houses were smaller. And, the folks that want to build the houses bigger, think that it's too much in making the neighborhood smaller. So, it is amazing that

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you can actually move forward in this context.

3 But, just for the record, many, 4 many homes have been knocked down and built very, 5 very large out-of-context. But, even with this rezoning, even after this rezoning, 90% of the 6 7 homes that have already been put up, which are 8 totally out of context, will actually be within the new zoning. So, it really does create 9 predictability. And, I thank City Planning and our staff for all the work that they did. And, I 11 12 look forward to hearing the testimony. Thank you.

Any questions from Committee members? And, we'll

Thank you.

Oh,

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA:

move to the public testimony on this item.

I'm sorry. Council Member Jackson.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm looking at the map, the colorcoded map here. And, I see that this is a residential area of one-family detached homes and some two-family homes. But, I'm looking here in the middle of some of this yellow and I see a couple of dots of red, which indicate commercial office. And, my question is how did the commercial office get right in the middle of the

residential area? And, why is that, you know, how is that the case?

think there's a mixture of red tones. Some are actually mixed residential and commercial and some, a few, are offices. But, as was pointed out, much of the building stock here actually has been built prior to even the 1961 zoning. And, as a consequence of that, those types of activities were grandfathered and they're allowed to remain even if the zoning would, today, not allow new offices to be developed there. So, those are grandfathered activities.

of these red commercial/office, like in the middle of, I think this is north of 70th Avenue, you have one or two red subdivisions there. Those were prior to the rezoning in the 1960 or '61? Or, were they after that?

JOHN YOUNG: That's correct. No, they all predate. And, again, a number are either offices on the ground floor, like a doctor's office and that type of use. And, some of the others were, again, just preexisting buildings

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

noted, you know, we've been monitoring the recent developments, certainly since 2000, when the area's activity picked up. And, out of that, again, it's about 10%. It's a small handful. It's four or five, six of out of the about approximately 50 homes that have replaced preexisting homes.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: So, only about four or five or six, 10% of the-- of approximately 10% of those homes that have been replaced. Is that correct?

Okay.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you. We'll move on to the public hearing aspect. I would ask the Sergeant at Arms if they could put up another chair at the dais. First panel, as always, we will call alternating panels; panels in favor, a panel in opposition. I ask that everybody keep to the three-minute time limit. I don't cut somebody off. But, three minutes is plenty enough time to express your opinion. The first panel will be a panel in favor, Diane Elkin [phonetic], Steve Goodman [phonetic], James Walsh and Henry Sealine [phonetic]. [Pause] You should do is state your name.

[Pause]

HENRY SEALINE: I wanted not to be the first because I was counting on it being rebuttal. But, anyway, it's very hard to be the first one. My name is Henry Sealine. I'm on the Board of the Old Forest Hills Association.

And, what I got to say is that I

think, I've been to the last two of these affairs.

We are not unreasonable in our requests and what

we would like to occur in this situation. In

fact, I'm very friendly with all the Russians that

6 are coming into the neighborhood. And, looking

7 forward to the future, I think they are the future

8 of this neighborhood. Their children and their

grandchildren will probably outlast all of us.

My house is as old as I am. And, I don't think it can last much longer. And, what they have done, the good part, is that they set a sales plateau on the selling prices of the houses that most people who have sold are very happy about that.

But, what we are unhappy with is what most people call monstrosities. And, I think that those people should be a little more feeling about the feelings of other people on the height of the houses, the floor plans, the floor ratios are perfectly well. And, they are kept and they are done well. And, the houses, for most part, are beautiful. But, a lot of people are against the heights because it takes away their sunshine. And, I think that they should be very happy with

2.0

the way the proposals are being done now because
if they look across the way and see Forest Hills
Gardens, where you can't even put a nail into the
wall, they should be very happy with what they are
allowed to do in Cord Myer.

And, I don't think it's a hardship on their part. And, they should go ahead and obey whatever restrictions, and there are very few in my estimation. Thank you, gentlemen and ladies.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: And, if I can paraphrase, you support the application.

HENRY SEALINE: Pardon?

14 CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: You support 15 the application?

16 HENRY SEALINE: Yes, I do.

17 CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Okay.

DIANE ELKIN: Hello. My name is

Diane Elkin and I represent the Woman's Club of

Forest Hills. We have 275 members whose families

reside in Forest Hills with some in Rego Park and

Kew Gardens. I'm Chairman of the Community

Affairs Chapter. And, I've been a resident of

Forest Hills for more than 40 years. And, I'm

here to let you know that our members support the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

proposal for the Cord Myer rezoning.

The Woman's Club of Forest Hills has been around since 1913. And, although we social and philanthropic events, we're basically also charged with bettering -- civic betterment and with promoting a generous public spirit in the community. And, for that reason, we have become aware of this rezoning. We welcome and support the need for appropriate rezoning in the Cord Myer area Forest Hills. In recent years, as they said, many beautiful single-family homes that are Tutor, Georgian and Cape Cod-style houses have been demolished and replaced with larger, taller structures that are totally out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood and inconsistent with the neighborhood's established character. The Cord Myer area of Forest Hills has, for decades, been an upper middle-class neighborhood, cherished by its residents for tranquility and charm.

Our members urge the Department of
City Planning to resist the development pressure
to gain exemptions from current outdated
regulations that have allowed larger massive
buildings, high surrounding property walls and the

22

23

24

25

2 elimination of green space in front yards.

Last week, I walked through the 3 Cord Myer neighborhood from 112th to 108th Street 4 and along 68th Road, 68th Drive, 60th Avenue, Jewel 5 Avenue and 70th Avenue. And, I took photographs of 6 some of these oversized homes. Now, I couldn't 7 see the presentation. But, if anyone is 8 interested in seeing these, I'll pass them around. 9 10 Basically, what I took pictures of are lawns paved over, cars parked in front of what were formerly 11 front lawns, brick or stone walls surrounding 12 large ostentatious homes that tower and shade 13 neighboring homes, trees cut down. There is 14 15 barely a blade of grass or a flower around these homes. Some of these new so-called single-family 16 17 houses take up more than a single lot and resemble public buildings rather than homes consisting with 18 19 the prevailing scale of the neighborhood. 20 So, our Woman's Club of Forest

So, our Woman's Club of Forest

Hills applauds and endorses the proposed rezoning.

Thank you.

STEVE GOODMAN: Thank you. My name is Steve Goodman. I've been a resident of Cord Myer for 26 years and a homeowner in the area for

the past 17 years. Basically what I want to talk about today was, I mean, what we have in this neighborhood is a clash of cultures, more than anything else. People from totally different backgrounds, and it's not just Bukharans, basically learning to live together and to share a neighborhood. That's what New York City is all about. If you, as people have said, if you don't like change, live somewhere else because things are constantly changing. New people come and go. That's what New York City is all about.

But, as I see it, the key to achieving this balance and people being able to live together is compromise. And, that's really what this rezoning is all about, allowing people to bring their own cultural nuances and cultural designs. People are allowed to do that. And, but, also blending into the neighborhood in a better way, the existing neighborhood. Any one group not being allowed to just have it completely their way. The existing zoning laws have lots of loopholes that allow the building of larger houses than would really fit in. And, nobody thought about that before.

20

21

22

23

24

25

As reported in the New York Times 2 3 last July, there was this major article about how 4 the Bukharan specifically like to build big, using every inch of their property to accommodate their 5 large extended families. And, that's fine. But, 6 when we talk about compromise, if we didn't have 7 8 the zoning at all, any kind of zoning, what would happen? People would build five-story homes on 9 10 two properties and have 50 family members all living under one roof. Or, they'd build a ten-11 12 story hotel that would accommodate all the people. Why not? The zoning allows things to be 13 consistent with the tone of the neighborhood and 14 15 the rezoning will just allow, to me, allow everybody to live together better. And, 16 17 compromise is what it's all about. 18 JAMES WALSH: Chair Avella and

Council Members, thank you for your time. I'm Jim Walsh, President of the Civic Association, the Association of Old Forest Hills. And, I want to thank our Councilperson and the City Planning for listening to our complaints.

We've seen this type of large construction start about ten years ago. And, in

the beginning, it didn't look too bad. But, the houses have gotten bigger over the years. And, some of the houses are very nice. Some, nice shading of gray, sand-colored, nice window designs, nice rooftops. But, many of them are not appropriate for our area. Our largest lots are 100 by 100 feet. And, most of our lots are 50 by 100. A large house may look very nice on one or two acres. But, put it into a 50-acre lot in the middle of the street, it looks outlandish. On the corners, not too bad, because you have 100 by 100 lots. But, in the middle of the street, they're out of scale.

And so, we've been fighting to get something done on the zoning because, as you know, the last zoning change was 50 years ago, more than 50 years ago. So, we're glad that this has been done. We are glad that the yards text amendment was passed last year because not only were the houses too large in many instances, but the fences were too high; 6-foot fences on the street, particularly on a corner, if you had a fence on a corner, very high fence, you couldn't see traffic coming down the next street. And, some people are

paving over their front, not too many, but some paved over their front yards. And, it took away some of the aesthetic view-ability of the area.

So, we're glad that that has been changed. Now, I see the new houses being built are putting in lawns and the fences will be shorter, smaller. So, this is definitely needed. This has been needed for years and we're glad that our representatives listened to us. And, I hope that this brings about more uniformity.

Although, we're not completely happy with this, as Mr. Young said. We would have preferred to have the attic count for the floor area ratio, which is what R2A did. But, it's the best we could do. And, we are living with it. And, we're happy for it. And, thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

Now, we have a panel-- oh, I'm sorry. Council

Member Jackson.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Thank you.

And, thank you for the opportunity to listen to
you. And, I reviewed some of the pictures. But,
I guess, sir, you had opened up by saying that

2.0

2.3

some of the new neighbors, they're Russians and
they're coming into the neighborhood and making
changes and what have you and so forth. Are there
only Russians that are coming in? Or, are there
other people, Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, are they
coming in also? Because I mean, you gave the
impression there's only Russians that are coming
in and I'm just asking a question.

HENRY SEALINE: I would say that they were 99% Russians.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.

HENRY SEALINE: Because it takes a certain amount of affluency to come into the neighborhood and spend the money that they are spending. We're talking about \$2 million houses.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.

HENRY SEALINE: And, I don't mean to be disrespectful to any other nationality.

But, that happens to be the case.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON:

Now, I was reading, someone had, as part of your position, brought in this article from the New York Times last year. And, I think that it opens up by saying that these are individuals that are

buying these homes are part of a group that have come from a certain part of— Jews from Central Asia. I'm just reading from the paper. And, that a big house is an essential tradition. A place to shelter multiple generations, to hold large parties, memorials and holiday dinners to reaffirm a community's unity. This is the opening paragraph. Is there a problem with that? As far as, you know, to preserve community unity and to have large parties and memorials for families and friends.

JAMES WALSH: Actually, we've heard this argument. And, we understand their position. They like high ceilinged houses. And, they have multi-generational people living in the home. However, our position is that the houses as now are allowed are quite large for our area. You're talking about a 35-foot house. Most houses in Queens are not close to 35 feet. And, you're talking about a pretty good size floor area ratio, not counting the attic. So, I think the houses that are allowed now under the zoning are fine for what most people would like to see happen. But, we can't allow out of scale. We can't just allow

looked very tall? And, they told us that they

only had one for the whole Department.

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.

JAMES WALSH: And, I said this really should be checked. So, we actually went out, our organization, and bought one of these tools. And, it's difficult to do it correctly because the fence is in the way. But, we thought that, in some cases, the buildings were a little bit too high.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.

JAMES WALSH: But, that's tough to enforce, that rule.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Right.

But, I assume that the houses are built. They have commenced. They've built within the zoning regulations. And, if not, it's up to the Department of Buildings in order to communicate to someone that it's too big and you have to take a certain footage down. I mean, they've done that in Manhattan on the upper west side where, upper east side, rather, where a developer had built some tall skyscraper and it was too high. And, they had them remove a couple of stories of the building.

JAMES WALSH: That's a good point.

Τ.	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 3.
2	A couple of houses we did complain about. We got
3	calls from our neighbors saying that house looks
4	too big. And, we notified the Community Board.
5	They notified the Buildings Department. And, in
6	certain cases, we got houses stopped.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.
8	JAMES WALSH: The construction
9	stopped. And, they had to do something on the
10	roof. But, sometimes, to be honest with you, to
11	do this job correctly, I could use three helpers
12	fulltime.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: But, it
14	JAMES WALSH: [Interposing] You
15	know, to be honest with you, it's very difficult
16	to watch every little violation. So, we try to
17	pick the worst, we think is the worse cases.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Right.
19	JAMES WALSH: We get calls. And,
20	we did stop several houses where they had to
21	delay, they delayed them for several months. And,
22	they had to bring it down. But, once the house is
23	built, I don't know if they're going to make a

25 COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: What it

24

house smaller.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 and the Tutors.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Right.

23 JAMES WALSH: They're different.

24 They have balconies. They have large windows.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: They have

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 34
2	walls and they paved, some of them paved
3	JAMES WALSH: Yeah.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: their
5	drive
6	JAMES WALSH: [Interposing] Right.
7	They're very pretty. Some of them are very quite
8	pretty. Our objection is that they have to be
9	within scale because we don't have most of our
10	lots are 50 x 100. So, they can't take a big
11	house.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay. So,
13	okay, so, all right. I get it. So, thank you
14	very much. I appreciate it.
15	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.
16	The next panel is a panel in opposition, Albert
17	Dayan [phonetic], and Varder [phonetic], and
18	forgive me for mispronouncing it, Mishari
19	[phonetic], Mizari [phonetic], Mizari. [Pause]
20	Only see one person up. Is the other person here?
21	No? Okay.
22	[Pause]
23	ALBERT DAYAN: Thank you. My name
24	is Albert Dayan. I am a general counsel for the
25	Bukharan Jewish Congress, the majority of the new

home purchases in Forest Hills Cord Myer area. I am also a homeowner. In fact, I own two lots in Cord Myer area.

The basis of this rezoning, the basis of this rezoning has no issue in increase of value. It does not propose any development. As has been outlined, it's just purely character. The issue of the Old Forest Hills Association is that these new immigrants, who are not Russian, I just want to correct. We are Jews from the from former Soviet Union, country Uzbekistan, that was occupied by Russia, part of the former Soviet Union.

So, what we bring is change. But, character of this great country of ours has always been change. With every generation, new immigrants come in and they always bring change.

And, this change makes our economy prosper. You go to Flushing, for example, you have these stores that are opening up every day with the Koreans, with the Chinese immigrants. You go to Forest Hills, Rego Park, our people have brought in so much productivity and so much prosperity to the neighborhood. And, we really do appreciate what

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Association of the Old Forest Hills has done and kept our neighborhood clean and the way it has.

But, we are looking for a compromise. See, there are present regulations in zoning. And, if anybody builds outside those zoning regulations, they should be prevented from continuing to build further. The new proposed change is one, restriction of height of 35 feet. We do not oppose that. But, we do not want to be limited to a 25-foot outer wall because from there on, they're forcing us, indirectly, to build in Cape Cod and Tutor style. We don't want to do that. If we want to, if they want to let us build at 35 feet, we want to take a straight wall up to 35 feet. If we want to work hard and make tremendous sacrifices in this country to ourselves and to our families and we want to invest into real property and we want to live large, as is the American Dream, no one should be able to tell us that we can only have eight-foot ceilings or ninefoot ceilings, when we want to have ceilings as high as this hall, especially if we're purchasing property that's a million dollars for property.

2 An additional million and change to build 3 beautiful homes. That is the American Dream.

You see, what's happening here is a reoccurring theme from history. It's always the old established ways that don't want any change. They want to prevent change. But, change is what made America great in the last 200 years. We have grown faster economically than any other European country in the last 200 years because we prosper because of change.

We're not asking for something extraordinary. They don't want us to cement our front lawns, fine. They want us to not to cut down trees, fine. They want to cap the homes at 35 feet, fine. We're willing to compromise with all of that. But, do not tell us to build in Cape Cod if we want to build in Jerusalem style. That is what we want to do. And, that is what America allows us to do. I mean, I have so much to say. But, three minutes is... And, my three minutes are up?

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Your three minutes are up. You can always submit something in writing.

that property values have gone down.

25

VARDA MIZRAKI: I mean, [off-mic]--

ALBERT DAYAN: [Interposing] Before

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

you decide today--

2.0

2.3

as the lack of greenery that prevails. And,	I
believe the new proposed zoning is moderate,	yet
substantial and would be fair for everybody.	
Thank you.	

ALAN BROWNSCHWEIGER: Good morning,
Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. My
name is Alan Brownschweiger. And, I live in Cord
Myer. I'm a Vice President of the Association of
Old Forest Hills. I've lived in the neighborhood
for 42 years and brought my children up.

To answer the gentleman that was opposed, when I moved into my house, well, after I moved into my house, I had three children and my mother-in-law in a small Cape Cod, three-bedroom house with one complete bath and one half bath.

We survived. We had family gatherings and very large dinners at times.

I'd like to remind the panel also that the chopping down of trees and the elimination of grass, we are a three or four or five blocks away from the wetlands in Flushing Meadow Park, which is a bird sanctuary. And, they do have many different kinds of birds, which thrive and fly in the neighborhood and feed.

[Pause]

Oh, okay. The neighborhood

characteristics have changed by the building of

these very large structures. The sunshine, as has

been stated, has been eliminated in many areas.

And, I would like the compromise, although I would

have liked to go a little bit further, but can

live with the compromise. And, I believe that the

other side could also live with the compromise,

because it does meet their needs.

Thank you very much for your time and attention. And, I'd like to thank Melinda
Katz for all the work she has put in on this very much.

STEVEN CASHUB: Good morning, everybody. My name is Steven Cashub. And, I'm a neighborhood resident, who's here to testify in favor of the proposed rezoning plan for Cord Myer.

Although I think that it is unfortunately too little and too late to save the neighborhood from the very noticeable transformation and significant damage to its physical environments that has already occurred. I think that we should have been where we are now

at least ten years ago. Instead, there were years of inaction and lack of organized action that were dismaying, heartbreaking and frustrating to me.

Nevertheless, I think that the City of New York should do something instead of nothing to attempt to protect the neighborhood from the damage that even as I speak here this morning continues unabated all over the neighborhood.

I have lived in Forest Hills and its Cord Myer neighborhood for exactly 25 years, since the early summer of 1984. After that, I always enjoyed showing the neighborhood in my car to family members and friends, including ones living in Manhattan, when they would be visiting me. And, they all took delight in seeing a large lush and leafy suburban-looking gem of a neighborhood within New York City, just seven miles from midtown Manhattan.

Then, in the early 1990s, I noticed the first house that was drastically different.

Being an American-born person with a suburban

American upbringing, I did not understand or know what to make of this house, except that I thought that it was, the house and the property were

2 fortress-looking.

In the mid-1990s, including on a property directly across the street from me, and certainly by the late 1990s, it became very clear what was happening, as house after house, lovely old homes, including English Tutors, a housing style for which Forest Hills is renowned, and Dutch Colonials and Georgian Colonials were being torn down or gutted with the trees on the properties going down with the houses to simply be replaced by a large, boxy, aesthetically confusing and questionable, to be kind, modern showplace houses out of character and proportion to the houses around them.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: [Off mic] You can sum up.

STEVEN CASHUB: Okay. I just want to add that, in addition to these houses, making the situation worse is that many of these homes have had their properties surrounded, as has already been mentioned, by tall, brick and concrete and sometimes metal, too, fences, blocking any views of lawns, shrubs or other greenery, if any have remained on the property.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

everyone. My name is Susan Peppertone. I'm a resident of Forest Hills for the last I believe 15 years. And, I'm also a member of the Forest Hills Homeowners Association.

neighborhood, and specifically what's going on right around me is that these huge houses are going up. They're so huge for the plot of land that they interfere with my personal quiet and enjoyment in my home. They build so far out in

the back that I can now look into my neighbor's kitchen and wave hello and really just, I have lost my privacy.

My other neighbor enjoys playing the drums. And, he is so close to me that I hear his drum playing every day. When I ask my neighbors to please stop doing this, they tell me sorry, they can't. That's why they built this big huge house so that they could enjoy themselves in it. So, there's little regard for their neighbors as from what I can see.

My next point is that these homes are so huge that they require impinging upon other people's property to build them. And, if that is, in fact, the case, if I have to run to Court to get a TRO to stop this building, so that they can stop using my land so that they can build their house, that's an imposition on me. And, that's absolutely not fair.

My third point is that this new proposal allows for larger homes. And, this is really large enough. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

Council Member Jackson has a question.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Thank you.

Sir, didn't catch your name. But, my question is addressed to you. I'm an American-born citizen also. But, my wife is an immigrant. She immigrated from Tanzania in East Africa. But, she's an American citizen also. I was just, what is the damage to the physical environment that you allege in your testimony? And, there was insinuations in your testimony because maybe these individuals are not American-born citizens, I sense some sort of either objection to the fact that they may be recent immigrants that are building what many people may deem to be the American Dream.

And so, I'm trying to listen and understand. But, in listening to some of the testimony, I'm getting pretty annoyed. Let me just be quite frank with you, because it hints of racism and discrimination, in my opinion. I may be wrong. I may be wrong. But, that's the feeling that I'm getting. So, I want to know from you, was there anything hidden in the fact that you said that you're an American born here in the United States versus someone that has immigrated

until a few years ago. I had no idea who these

25

District Manager of Community Board 6, which

covers Rego Park and Forest Hills, Queens, which

is one of the most diverse counties in New York

City. We have one of the largest senior

populations, also, in New York City at Community

Board 6.

With regard to a statement that was made a little while ago that we did not reach out to the community, this particular zoning issue was reported in every media outlet you could possibly think of. We had meetings for about a year and a half, maybe more, with the Council Member and the community. So, it was an ongoing issue. There was nothing secretive about this at all. The date of the Community Board 6 public meeting was on March 11th, '09. We did have a quorum present. And, when the Chair did call for a vote, the vote was in favor, 29; against, two. So, it was approved and sent on its merry way on March 11th, 2009 in favor of. Thank you.

PATRICIA DOLAN: Good morning. I am Patricia Dolan. I'm the Executive Vice

President of the Queens Civic Congress, an umbrella organization of more than 110 community

and neighborhood associations representing

tenants, business owners, co-op and condo owners

and homeowners living in every part of Queens.

I'm also the President of the Kew Gardens Hills

Civic Association. And, I want to thank you for

the opportunity to be here this morning and

discuss the application for the rezoning of Cord

Myer.

Since its founding, the Queens
Civic Congress has made neighborhood preservation
and contextual zoning a key part of our civic
advocacy. So, we are especially pleased to be
here in support of the Association of Old Forest
Hills and the residents of Forest Hills who have
strived for so long for more accurate contextual
zoning for their neighborhood. Forest Hills
waited almost ten years for the action the
Council's considering today.

The long-awaited R1-2A zone, which the Congress supported for the last five years, adds another critically needed element to the planning and zoning toolbox that the City's lower density neighborhoods need if they're to preserve their unique and irreplaceable character. The

Forest Hills rezoning utilizing this new zone presented challenges which City planners and community leaders overcame. They have created a zoning plan that serves residents and allows for orderly growth. And, I emphasize orderly because that's what this is all about.

Every step of the way, planners and civic advocates consulted their neighbors and the larger community. The new zoning allows existing building, even those painfully out of context, to remain in place while preserving the generous traditional FAR that has long marked local development in this extraordinary neighborhood.

I would just like to insert in my testimony the following. I have sat through the review of more than 40 rezonings in the Borough of Queens that went through the Borough President's Zoning Task Force, which is a unique group, which no other borough has. Never, in those 40 rezonings, have I seen any kind of discussion about the ethnic makeup of the neighborhoods under rezoning plans. And, I'm including neighborhoods in Queens that have the same makeup that the Cord Myer area in Forest Hills does, specifically the

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 57
2	to thank Councilman Katz for her steadforth help
3	in this issue. Thank you very much.
4	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Council Member
5	Jackson.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Thank you.
7	Frank, good afternoon. Good morning, Frank. How
8	you doing? Frank
9	FRANK GULLUSCIO: Okay.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: the
11	Community Board, my understanding, I had asked the
12	question whether or not there was unanimous vote
13	and there was not. My understanding that two
14	members of the Board, I think, voted against the
15	proposal.
16	FRANK GULLUSCIO: That is correct.
17	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: What was
18	their objections to the proposal?
19	FRANK GULLUSCIO: I don't recall
20	their objections at this point in time. But, I
21	could certainly have it researched and sent to you
22	if you like.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Yeah. You
24	could just e-mail me if you don't mind.
25	FRANK GULLUSCIO: Oh, okay. I will

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 58
2	do that. I don't want to say on the record 'cause
3	I'm not totally sure.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.
5	Okay. And, I have a question for you, Miss. You
6	had mentioned that there was other rezonings that
7	we did and the neighborhood was just as
8	PATRICIA DOLAN: Diverse.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON:
10	ethnically, I guess, the same or
11	PATRICIA DOLAN: Much the same.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.
13	And, can you tell me the ethnic diversity of the
14	neighborhood, if you don't mind? And, compare
15	that to
16	PATRICIA DOLAN: [Interposing] In
17	the Fresh
18	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Let me
19	finish. Let me finish, please. And then, give me
20	the one that you cited in your example. What's
21	the
22	PATRICIA DOLAN: I
23	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: ethnic
24	diversity of this neighborhood?
25	PATRICIA DOLAN: They are well

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 61
2	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Yes.
3	PATRICIA DOLAN: They did not try
4	to build sod houses to replicate what they were
5	living in in the old country.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: But, if
7	they did, it would be okay, wouldn't it?
8	PATRICIA DOLAN: I don't believe
9	so.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Why not?
11	PATRICIA DOLAN: We have zoning
12	rules here in the City of New York that we should
13	be proud of. They have preserved our
14	neighborhoods. They have stabilized our
15	neighborhoods.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.
17	PATRICIA DOLAN: And, that's what
18	this discussion should be all about.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: And, I
20	agree with you. But, currently, all of those
21	homes are within the zone, though. So, for people
22	that indicate that they're
23	PATRICIA DOLAN: [Interposing]
24	Given
25	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: I'm sorry.

Excuse me. Let me--

PATRICIA DOLAN: -- the sorry--

4 COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Can I

finish, if you don't mind? And, I'm not going to talk over you. I wish you don't talk over me, if you don't mind. I mean, you said your parents came from Ireland and, you know. My mother was born of slaves. And, my grandparents were from Athens, Georgia. And, going back several generations, the slave owners down there owned most of the blacks down there. And, I'm saying to you that I don't know what it was. United States has always been my home. But, if the culture of individuals want their homes to be big and some people may think that the bigness is gaudiness and with statues, so be it. As long as within the zone.

Now, you have a proposal that the Community Board wants, that the Borough President agreed to, that the City Planning agrees to and, my understanding, Melinda Katz, the Council Member also agrees with it and it is in front of us.

And, maybe no one asked these questions like I'm asking them. But, you know one thing, it is my

2.0

right and duty to ask these questions of you and
everyone else in order to ensure that my vote,
whatever way I vote, is the way I feel based on
all of the information that I have.

So, I'm just asking for clarification, because you are the one that raised the ethnic diversity of this zoned area is similar to the one, an area that was zoned before. And, I just asked for clarification on that. I didn't know what you meant by that when you made that statement. But, you clarified that. And, I appreciate your response. Thank you very much.

Other person who is signed up to speak in the interim, Aaron, and I can't pronounce your last name. Aaron, you want to come up, in opposition.

[Pause] And, following the last testimony, Council Member Katz would like to make a statement and actually, so would I.

AARON BOROGOFF: Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Go ahead, sir.

AARON BOROGOFF: The last name is Borogoff [phonetic]. My name is Aaron Borogoff.

And, I'm a member of a Bukharan Jewish community

that was mentioned several times today. And, by
way of a background, our community numerates close
to 50,000 members, mostly living in Rego Park, Kew
Gardens and Forest Hills. As a matter of fact,
Cord Myer area, which the zoning in question
intends to affect, mostly occupied by Bukharan
Jews.

Now, it is important because the officials of City Planning office and Councilwoman Melinda Katz' office mentioned that this proposed rezoning is being issued to address concerns of the community. Now, if Bukharan Jewish community is most of the community, then whose concerns are we addressing here? We have also heard several times today and in the past meetings, hearings, that notices of hearings were sent to people in the community so they could raise their voices and opinions, or positions with respect to zoning in the past.

Personally, I live in Forest Hills for 15 years. And, I have a lot of clients and compatriots in that area, as I said earlier. None of them receive the meeting. We all learn about the meetings post fact. So, we didn't have a

2 chance to raise or voice our concerns timely, at least.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In addition, I am a real estate I practice real estate law in the area. attorney. The value in today's economy where prices are going down, where people losing their properties to foreclosure, we have to be concerned about keeping the home values in the area. This particular rezoning will affect the values. have a lot of homeowners that bought properties in the area, demolished properties and have plans approved. Now, this rezoning, this particular act, you know, will affect them detrimentally, you They invested millions of dollars in know. properties and now, what do they do with those properties?

Now, we also been told, and I guess Miss Katz should be, this question should be addressed to Miss Katz, if you are to keep the character in the neighborhood the same everywhere, then it should really be such, you know. And, I think, Councilwoman Katz, you were, so to speak, the frontrunner of the condominium building built on Austin Street, known as Windsor Tower. And,

this building is 22-plus stories high. It is completely out of character. Completely out of character. Notwithstanding the fact you assisted the developer in putting that building together.

So, you know, even if the law doesn't have underlying affect to the Bukharan Jewish community, it affects only Bukharan Jewish community. I personally don't know any other community member that builds in that area. Okay. The law will affect only Bukharan Jewish community. There's no other development going on.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Please sum up, sir.

AARON BOROGOFF: The current zoning that we have on the property is complied with by the current residents. The current zoning is not violated by the current residents. It should stand. It should stand because there's no need to change it as it is right now. If the property, as it is erected, impedes on other person's property, then this property has to be changed to make sure it doesn't. Please consider this, all of these facts at the face value. And, please do the right thing. Thank you.

37, 38 feet, which is clearly, clearly out of

25

2 context with the rest of the community.

The other thing that my colleagues should know is that with this rezoning, it is still 98% in conformity, 98% in conformity. And, the large buildings that were put up, only 10% of those will actually be out of conformity for the new zoning. So, it definitely gives a lot of leeway to everyone and anyone who may want to build a larger home.

The other clarification I'd like to make is much to the dismay of most of my constituents, or some of my constituents, who may want this rezoning, it will not affect the aesthetics. It will not affect statues. And, it will not affect the color. And, it will not affect the stone that's used. This will simply affect the height, the rear yards and the amount of percentage that can be filled when there is a building to be built.

The other issue I guess, I don't know the last speaker spoke about a building that went up that was 220 feet. I don't know which building that is. The last building we had was a BSA variance application. It was 190 feet. And,

that went through the BSA. So, and, that was in a different part of the area. So, I'm not really sure what that was about. But, I thank you for your testimony.

I made the biggest mistake that a Chair can make; the hugest mistake that a Chair can make. When I was actually working this out with all aspects of the community, what I did is I reached what I thought was a good compromise and then, had City-- asked City Planning to work on it. Instead, what I should have done is actually created an application that I could have negotiated for a larger amount so that both sides of the community would feel like there was negotiations. But, when this went into City Planning, since it was still going to be 90% of the buildings would still be okay, I thought it was a good compromise from the beginning.

So, I look forward to this application moving forward. This has been a very, very, very long and detailed negotiations over the last few years. I look for the support of my colleagues. I really do thank all the communities, all parts of the community for coming

out and testifying today. I thank you.

thank Chair Katz for her comments. You know, I was going to say some of the similar things that you just mentioned. I'll just make one quick comments in that, you know, in this country, everybody enjoys a lot of freedom, more so than any other country. But, that freedom ends when you start to interfere with other people's freedoms. And, I think that's what comes down to some of the larger buildings that have been built in this City and it comes down to interfering with people's privacy, air and light.

And, what we've been trying to do
through this Committee and the rezonings we've
done through the City Council, with the
Administration, is to make sure that building goes
on in contextual situations so that the character
and charm of neighborhoods are protected. If you
move into a neighborhood-- I've never understood
why somebody moves into a neighborhood,
personally, that has a particular character and
does everything they can to change that character.
The City of New York is made up of neighborhoods.

JOHN YOUNG: Good morning, again,
Chair Avella, Chair Katz, City Council Members and
ladies and gentlemen. I'm John Young, Director of
the Queens Office of the Department of City
Planning. And, once again, on behalf of City
Planning Director, Amanda Burden, I'm very pleased
to be here this morning to present the
Department's zoning text changes to support and
guide development within the Special Long Island
City mixed use district in Western Queens.

I'm joined by Penny Lee, who'll present our proposed zoning amendment to you. As Penny will explain in detail, six specific revisions to zoning requirements within the Special Long Island City mixed use district are

proposed to ensure new buildings will more closely
line up with existing buildings, provide

pedestrian scale building bases at the street
line, create mandatory or optional sidewalk

widenings in two locations and change the location
of a required new subway entrance to better serve
the community's needs.

Overall, the proposed zoning text changes will refine current Special District controls in order to accommodate planned streetscape and infrastructure improvements and ensure that new buildings will reinforce existing block fronts and support the appeal of one of the Borough's prime regional hubs and transit centers.

The proposed zoning text changes have benefited from the input of area stakeholders and we're pleased with the support the zoning amendment has received from Community Board 2, as well as from Borough President Helen Marshall. We thank Council Member Gioia for his focus on making positive changes in Long Island City and his interest in the proposal.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Can everybody take those conversations outside, please? It's

2 getting difficult to hear.

JOHN YOUNG: Thank you very much.

And, simply to wrap up, we hope that this proposal will enjoy your support to help guide development within Long Island City. And now, Penny will review the proposal.

PENNY LEE: Good morning. The proposals are pictured, illustrated, in the handout that was just distributed to you. The proposed changes affect three of the four subdistricts of the Special Long Island City mixed used district. And, the first graphic is a map showing the boundaries of the Special District and the sub-districts. The sub-districts we'll be talking about are those indicated by QP, which is Queens Plaza; CS, which is in the middle, which is Court Square and HP, down at the bottom, which is Hunters Point.

If you turn to page 2 of your handout, what you'll see is a photograph of a new multi-tenant building that was constructed after 1995. You can see that it lines up with its neighbors; the neighboring buildings, which were there before the building was built. That was a

consequence of a lineup requirement that the

Department of City Planning applied to the Hunters

Point sub-district, back in 1995, as well as a

number of other text changes.

In 2004, when the Special mixed use district provisions were applied to that part of the neighborhood, the lineup requirement was inadvertently eliminated. So, what we've been getting instead is a new building, as shown on page 3 of your handout, which is a building that's set back from its neighbors. And then, as you're walking along the street, you get kind of an unsightly blank wall that's the result of the setback. And, also, you know, in the corners where the building is set back, there's a tendency for garbage to collect. And, it's just kind of an unsightly pedestrian environment.

So, we are proposing to restore the lineup requirement so, once again, the block fronts in Hunters Point will look like the block front on page 2, not the one on page 3.

The next change affects the Queens

Plaza sub-district. And, it affects only one

block of the Queens Plaza sub-district; the block

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that had been occupied by the 1,150-space Queens Plaza municipal garage until February of this The block is situated at the corner of Jackson Avenue and Queens Plaza South. And, the City of New York is currently doing streetscape improvements to the Jackson Avenue and Queens Plaza South frontages of that block. I'm sorry, Jackson Avenue and Queens Plaza South, except on the frontage of that block because, in Jackson Avenue, there is a subway tunnel running underneath it and in the sidewalk, there's a number of subsurface infrastructure problems, as There's a sewer line. There's an entrance well. to the subway station. So, we weren't able to do any landscaping at all on that particular street frontage. And, because of the traffic volumes and the elevated subway line, it's a particularly harsh block.

Right now, to develop on the

Jackson Avenue frontage of that block, you have to
put your building at the street line. And, that
precludes any sidewalk landscaping because there
just wouldn't be room for pedestrian circulation.

What we're proposing to do instead is to allow for

the street wall of the building to be set back five feet. And, that would allow for planting beds and still allow for adequate pedestrian circulation around the beds and the subway vents and everything else that's in the sidewalk. It's not a mandatory sidewalk widening. It's an optional sidewalk widening.

Tishman Speyer is the designated developer by the City of New York for this block. We have talked to Tishman Speyer and their land use attorneys. And, they believe this is the best compromise to achieve that allows them flexibility when they design their building and still can yield some landscaping on the block.

And then, the next three amendments affect the three-block Court Square sub-district. The boundaries and the various locations of the amendments are shown on page 5 of your handout. The first one I'll go over is 'A,' which is illustrating, it's a circle, which is located at the intersection of 23rd Street and 45th Avenue. That currently is where the developer of that block where the little 'a' is indicated, would have to locate a new entrance to the Number 7

train to develop their property. The Court Square sub-district is predicated on a subway improvement requirement that says to develop to 15 FAR, which is the maximum FAR, you have to do a subway improvement that's specified in the text. The improvement for this block is a new entrance to the Number 7 train that would be enclosed within the building that's being developed.

The first developer of that block doesn't even control the property where the new entrance would have to be located. So, they couldn't do it. And, the location of the new entrance is also just not one that best serves the neighborhood. So, what we're proposing instead is a new entrance to the Number 7 train at the north end of the 23rd Street Courthouse Square Station. It would be located at 23rd Street and 44th Drive.

each of the four corners, illustrated by the little rectangles on each of those corners. The street stair would go up to the platform level of the Number 7 train. That way the Number 7 would have an entrance at the north end and the south end of the station. And, the loft buildings that

are to the northwest of the 'B' and the new office and residential buildings to the right of the 'B' would have closer and better access to the Number 7 line.

The next change is down at 'C,' which is down at the bottom, which is a mandatory five-foot sidewalk widening, unlike the optional five-foot sidewalk widening in the Queens Plaza sub-district. This would be a mandatory five-foot sidewalk widening for any development that fronts on that street frontage.

There's a subway improvement underway right now in that stretch of 45th Road, that is requiring the relocation of a sewer line from the middle of the roadbed to underneath the sidewalk. And, DEP was concerned that the resulting ten-foot sidewalk would not give them sufficient room to do any sewer maintenance should there be a problem. So, they asked us to change the text to require the additional five feet in sidewalk width when the property is developed.

And then, the last change is the establishment of height and setback, different height and setback regulations for the Court

2.0

Square sub-district, illustrated on the last page,
page 6, of your handout. This illustration shows
the existing Citibank building, which is
approximately 658 feet. The building is pulled
back from all of the street frontages of its
zoning lot. And, it just goes straight up.

That's what the underlying C5-3 district allows.

There is a proposal to develop the south block, which is illustrated by the shorter building. They initially were proposing to set their building back a pretty far distance from the street line, which would be inconsistent with the height and setback regulations in effect on every other block in the area, but for the Citibank building.

So, we talked to the developer and their architect about a more pedestrian-scale building base, similar to what's in effect on the adjacent blocks. They were comfortable with that. So, the new text amendment will establish a 60 to 85-foot base and then, a setback for the tower.

And, those are the five amendments.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: This

restaurant. Whether it will be open to the

public, I'm not sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 COUNCIL MEMBER GIOIA: Got it.

now, you feel that you should go back to the

PENNY LEE: Well, yeah.

I think

uniformity. Is that correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

All

And, the Community Board and everyone else agreed with that. Was there any opposition to that?

24

applications commonly referred to as the Lower Concourse rezoning in Council Member Arroyo's district. Call up City Planning to give the presentation.

23

24

2.0

[Pause]

CAROL SAMEL: Good morning, Council
Members. We have a presentation that we're
passing out a hard copy of. Good morning, Council
Members. My name is Carol Samel [phonetic] and
I'm the Director of the Bronx Borough Office of
the Department of City Planning. And, I'm joined
here today by Ryan Singer [phonetic], the Deputy
Director and Paul Phillips [phonetic], City
Planning Project Manager for the Lower Concourse
rezoning proposal. And, we are most pleased to be
able to present the Lower Concourse rezoning
proposal to you today.

This proposal is the product of many years of outreach and research. And, the proposal is designed to invigorate a key corridor in the Bronx, the Lower Grand Concourse, the quintessential Bronx street, and to provide opportunities for much needed affordable housing, new waterfront open space, new retail, offices, restaurants, grocery stores, a hotel, all the uses that go into a healthy, attractive neighborhood. It strikes a critical balance between the need for housing opportunities and the protection of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

industrial businesses and jobs was we plan for the future of the South Bronx.

The plan is expected to result in more than 3,100 new units of housing and more than 3,400 new jobs in the South Bronx. The proposal has a strong support from the community, including a unanimous unconditional approval from Community Board 1, approval from acting Bronx Borough President Earl Brown and the City Planning Commission. And, the City Planning Commission made important modifications to the proposal based on the comments received during the public review process and based on the recommendation of the Bronx Borough President. And, we will review those changes as we-- toward the end of the presentation. And, Paul Phillips will now provide a more detailed presentation.

PAUL PHILLIPS: Good morning. I'm going to walk you through the rezoning proposal for the Lower Concourse. And, I think you all have a handout that you can follow along.

The first slide is really just to locate you to the area. It's a 30-block area located in the South Bronx, Community District 1.

2	If you turn to the next slide, this
3	sort of zooms into the area. The rezoning area is
4	bounded by 149 th Street to the north, 135 th Street
5	to the south, the Harlem River to the west and
6	Lincoln and Morris Avenues to the east. This area
7	is extremely well served by mass transit. The new
8	Metro North station is just north of the area.
9	There's also been significant investment in this
10	area and the surrounding neighborhoods. You got
11	the new Yankee Stadium, the Metro North station,
12	as well as the new Gateway Center, which some
13	stores have already opened and will be completely
14	open in the fall of this year. The Hub is located
15	nearby, as well as the neighborhoods of Mott Haven
16	and Port Morris. This area also benefits from
17	industrial business incentives, both at the
18	federal, City and the state level.
19	The next slide illustrates land use
20	in the area.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: [Off mic]
22	PAUL PHILLIPS: Page 4. Okay.
23	Sorry, okay.
24	COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: If you can.
25	PAUL PHILLIPS: Okay, sure. Page 4

is land uses in the area, predominantly industrial and manufacturing, with some larger community facilities in the area, including Lincoln Hospital and Hostos Community College. But, this doesn't tell the entire story of what's going on in this area.

If you turn to page 5, the existing zoning is predominantly M1-2 and M2-1. These are light industrial and commercial zones. I'll point out that residential is not allowed in either of these zones. Both are governed by the height exposure plane, the sky exposure plane, so there are no height limits in these areas. And, also, which is an important point, grocery stores greater than 10,000 square feet require a special permit. And, it's important to point out in this neighborhood, there is one existing grocery store in this 30-block rezoning area.

Turning to page 6, just going over some facts and trends in the area. Fifty-seven percent of the building area in this area is either vacant, used for personal storage, dead storage or for non-industrial uses. And, this is an important point as we look to redevelop it and

reuse some of these underutilized sites. Since
1980, three buildings have been built in this
rezoning area; one includes self-storage, which is
along our waterfront area, a gas station and also
a car wash and a warehouse. This area has also
seen significant job loss; 30% of job losses since
1992. And, in the manufacturing sector, they have
seen a 66% loss of their jobs.

Turning to slide 7, we divided the rezoning area into four distinct areas. The first is the Grand Concourse. The second are loft areas, both in the east and in the west. We also identified areas where there are active industrial uses. And then, also, our waterfront area is our fourth sub-area.

Turning to slide 8, this is just giving you some context of the existing context along the Grand Concourse. Typically characterized by low-scale uses including car washes and gas stations. And, this gas station that's over on the right is actually one of the new buildings that has been built in this area since 1980.

Turning to slide 9, this just gives

you an idea of where the loft areas that we've identified, both in the east and the west, are located in the rezoning area.

And, turning to slide 10. In the west, we have the Major Deegan Gateway building, which is a major building in the area. And, you can see this photograph to the right shows the inside of the building, which is predominantly vacant. There's some underutilized sites in this area. And, there's several multi-story loft buildings, which would definitely be used for redevelopment.

Turning to slide 11, we have a similar condition in the east in terms of loft areas. Again, we have several multi-story loft buildings. You can see the photograph on the left. It's vacant on the upper stories and so, we really want our proposal to actually allow people to fully utilize these buildings. And, many of these buildings, again, as I pointed out, are underutilized, are used for dead storage.

Turning to page 12, we've identified, as I mentioned earlier, active industrial areas within the rezoning area.

And, on slide 13, you can see where these areas are located. There's a active industry here. And, one of the important things to note here is that there's a large concentration of jobs. There are more than 750 jobs in these industrial areas that we've identified.

Turning to slide 14, just gives you an idea of where the waterfront area is located within the rezoning area.

On slide 15, the waterfront area in terms of the context, some of the current uses that exists along our waterfront area are car auction. We also have a race recycling station and self-storage, which is also one of the three new buildings that have been built in this area since 1980.

Going to slide 16, the waterfront area has several constraints that exist in terms of development here. The Oakpoint Rail line runs right along the water two times a day. We also have the Major Deegan, which is a constraint here that we needed to consider in developing this proposal, both at grade and there's also limited access at certain points underneath the Major

2 Deegan Expressway.

Turning to side 17, so, in terms of our proposal and our objectives, first and foremost, we want to create a new neighborhood in the South Bronx, a vibrant, mixed use, mixed income neighborhood to really revitalize this area in the South Bronx. A major component of the proposal is creating opportunities for new housing. As I mentioned earlier, the existing zoning predominantly does not allow residential development. So, this is an important component of the proposal.

We also want to incentivize new permanently affordable housing in this area. I want to point out that the application of inclusionary housing is the first application of inclusionary housing in the Borough of the Bronx. We also want to retain viable light manufacturing. As I mentioned, there are many active industries, industrial industries and jobs that we want to encourage these businesses to retain and expand in many instances.

We also want to create new waterfront open space. The waterfront is an

important component of this proposal. So, we want to reinvigorate this waterfront area, create new open space and access to a community that's currently underserved by open space.

We also want to connect to adjacent communities. As I mentioned, this area is adjacent to both the Port Morris neighborhoods, as well as Morrisania and significant development has taken place around the area. So, we want to create connections to these significant developments and investments in the South Bronx. And, as I mentioned earlier, there are several vacant loft and underutilized sites. So, we want to redevelop these vacant properties, as well as the vacant loft buildings.

So, just reviewing the proposed actions. First, we want to rezone this area to allow residential, commercial and light industrial. We also are mapping a park along the waterfront, which I will talk a little bit about later in the proposal. Additionally, we are creating a waterfront access plan, as well as a Special District, which are both going to be along the waterfront. And, as I mentioned before, we

are applying inclusionary housing, which is the first instance here in the Borough of the Bronx.

And, we're also going to encourage grocery stores through a zoning text change. As I mentioned earlier, there's only one grocery store that

exists in the rezoning area currently.

an overview of the inclusionary housing program.

All the areas that are outlined in yellow are areas where the program would be applicable. And, the chart on the right gives you the base FARs, which would be allowed in each of the proposed zones. And then, to the far right is the maximum FAR which would be allowed if they take advantage of the inclusionary housing bonus.

Slide 20, our first proposed zone is a C6-2A, which we're mapping along the Grand Concourse. And, our concept here is really to transform this area that is currently typically low-scale with auto-related uses and some vacant and underutilized sites into a vibrant mixed use gateway, which is really the centerpiece of the South Bronx. And so, the base height here is a very strong 60 to 85 feet and then, a maximum

height of 120 feet. And, this was really done to really mimic the historic Grand Concourse, which is mapped to the north of this area.

Turning to slide 21, this just gives you a vision of potentially what the Grand Concourse would actually look like. We're envisioning very active retail on the ground floor with some residential uses, obviously, some more greenery and street trees. So, really transforming this area from low industrial to...

We are also mapping MX districts throughout this rezoning area. It's important to note that we have mapped MX districts in the Bronx in both Port Morris and Morrisania. And, all of these MX zones have actually created business expansion, as well as several new residential developments. And, here you can see the building in yellow is a residential conversion and the blue is an existing building. Okay.

R6A, a strong street wall, 40 to 60 feet, maximum height of 70 feet, again, inclusionary housing would be provided here, as well. We're also mapping an R7A, 40 to 65 feet, maximum height of 80 feet. We're also mapping an

R7X, as well, as part of the MX districts.

In terms of the C4-4, Lincoln

Hospital is being rezoned to allow to bring it

into conformity and also to increase the community

facility FAR from the existing 4.8 to a 6.5, which

would allow them to expand if they chose to in the

future.

We're also proposing an M1-4. And, this is really in an effort to protect existing industrial businesses. We have strong concentrations of jobs that are less desirable for residential.

We're also going to retain existing M1-2 zoning in the area. Again, this is in an effort to protect existing industrial businesses where there are concentration of jobs and less opportunities for residential development.

We are also mapping, along the waterfront area, a Special District, really to create a new lively neighborhood with public access to the waterfront. The northern portion of the area is proposed to be rezoned to C4-4, which is a commercial zone. Inclusionary housing would be applicable here. We envision a mix of regional

commercial uses, including regional office as well as hotel. And, again, the Special District would actually control the bulk for these properties as well as the properties to the south.

For the lots to the south, we're proposing an R7-2, with a C2-4. These lots are a little more narrow, so we're envisioning smaller commercial uses here in terms of dry cleaners, beauty salons. And, again, residential would be allowed here. And, the Special District would control the bulk.

The next slide just gives you an idea of the components of the waterfront access plan, which includes a 40-foot required short public walkway, supplemental public access, as well as visual corridors and upland connections.

As I mentioned, we are mapping a park along the waterfront. The park is about 2.26 acres. It's strategically located where we actually have access underneath the Major Deegan. Currently, the property's privately owned now. And, the property will be developed once the Major Deegan expansion has completed and the properties both to the north and south of the proposed park

2 are developed.

Along the waterfront Special

District, just to give you an overview of the

area, maximum tower heights are dependent on the

size of the lot. We're requiring active ground

floor uses, 20%, for all the buildings. And,

we're also incentivizing - - to create connections

to all of the waterfront properties.

The next slide just gives you a vision of the waterfront. We're envisioning varied skylines for all the buildings and a strong base for all the properties along the waterfront area.

And, the next slide just gives you a vision of what we see along the waterfront area in the future.

As I mentioned earlier, we are encouraging grocery stores. Currently, anything greater than 10,000 square feet requires a special permit. Our proposal was to allow grocery stores as of right any size within the areas outlined in blue within the M1-4 districts.

As Carol mentioned, we did make modifications at the City Planning Commission to

address some concerns and issues that were brought up during the public review process. The first is the modification to grocery stores. We're changing our proposal to allow grocery stores up to 30,000 square feet within the areas outlined in blue. And, this modification is consistent with the Citywide text amendment, which is currently out for review as part of the Fresh Program, which was referred on May 18th of this year.

Our second modification was to retain M1-2 zoning in an area that you can see that's outlined in red. This actually allows for smaller firms with a larger concentration of jobs to remain zoned M1-2. But, it also allows the properties that are going to be rezoned in yellow some vacant properties as well as some residential uses, bringing them into conformity.

And, our last modification is along the waterfront. It affects two properties. The first was adjustments that were made to allow for--account for a sewer easement that traverses a property to the north. And, the last change was to allow commercial or public utility vehicle storage for Con-Edison, who is the owner of this

site. They would be allowed to develop a limited building at 10,000 square feet. But, they would be required to provide waterfront public access on this site.

So, just to review, this proposal has the capacity to provide a significant number of housing units, over 3,100. Of those units, more than 500 would be permanently affordable, either through rental or also through home ownership. We would also be developing local and regional retail. There's an opportunity for a conference-level hotel, both in the C6-2A, as well as the C4-4, along the waterfront area. We're also expanding community facilities, for example, for Lincoln Hospital, retaining light industrial, as well as the creation of potential of over 3,400 new jobs.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

Any questions from Council Members at this point?

Seeing none, I'd like to go to the-- Council

Member Jackson.

COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: First of all, let me thank you for the detailed proposal.

I mean, you went through this. It seems as though

CAROL SAMEL: I'll just address

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 101
2	that a little bit. My understanding that the
3	Friends of Brook Park is concerned about an area
4	at the end of the Park Avenue street end. Could
5	you point that out to them
6	PAUL PHILLIPS: Yes. It's
7	actually
8	CAROL SAMEL: the location.
9	PAUL PHILLIPS: Yeah.
10	CAROL SAMEL: Just outside of the
11	rezoning area.
12	PAUL PHILLIPS: [Off mic] rezoning
13	area.
14	CAROL SAMEL: The park that we're
15	proposing to map
16	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON:
17	[Interposing] I'm sorry. Where is it located at
18	on that map?
19	PAUL PHILLIPS: It's actually
20	outside
21	CAROL SAMEL: No, no. It's
22	PAUL PHILLIPS: Yeah, it's actually
23	right down here. So, it's just outside of the
24	rezoning area.
25	CAROL SAMEL: Yeah.

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 102
2	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay. A
3	little bit move your
4	PAUL PHILLIPS: Yeah.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: finger
6	again.
7	PAUL PHILLIPS: Yeah, it's just
8	south of the rezoning area.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: That
10	little yellow space outside of the
11	PAUL PHILLIPS: [Interposing] Yes,
12	just out
13	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: black
14	dot.
15	PAUL PHILLIPS: Yeah. It's
16	actually, this area's actually already been
17	rezoned.
18	CAROL SAMEL: And, we're proposing
19	to map a park further north along the waterfront.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: That green
21	spot?
22	CAROL SAMEL: Yes.
23	PAUL PHILLIPS: Yes, right [off
24	mic]
25	CAROL SAMEL: That's 2.2-acre park.

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 103
2	That is privately owned, correct.
3	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: That's
4	the one that's privately owned.
5	PAUL PHILLIPS: Yes.
6	CAROL SAMEL: Correct.
7	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: And, what
8	about I guess the people who wanted access to the
9	water as far as boats and what have you, is that
LO	part of the plan down the road? And, if so,
11	where?
L2	CAROL SAMEL: Well, I would say
L3	this that one of the challenges of this
L4	waterfront
15	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Just push
L6	it away from you a little bit.
L7	CAROL SAMEL: One of the
18	challenges
L9	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: [Off mic]
20	CAROL SAMEL: Okay.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Oh, is
22	that what it is?
23	CAROL SAMEL: Can you turn One
24	of the challenges is that the Oakpoint Rail link
25	runs along the water outside the it's just

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 105
2	the one that's
3	CAROL SAMEL: [Interposing] The
4	one yeah.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: down
6	there?
7	CAROL SAMEL: Yeah.
8	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Where, at
9	the proposed site, you're looking at which is
10	owned by private owners right now that would not
11	have direct access?
12	CAROL SAMEL: That's correct.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Because of
14	the rail situation.
15	CAROL SAMEL: Correct.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: And, you
17	said it's in private hands. Do you anticipate
18	purchasing that property from private owner?
19	CAROL SAMEL: Yeah. What we're
20	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: I mean,
21	the City of New York
22	CAROL SAMEL: Ultimately,
23	ultimately. I would say there's a complication in
24	the area in that the state is expanding the, or
25	doing work on the Major Deegan. And, we expect

CAROL SAMEL: Sixteen. You can see

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 107
2	there's actually really good clearance under the
3	Deegan at that point. You have a nice view
4	corridor actually from the Grand Concourse down to
5	the waterfront, all along $144^{ m th}$ Street. $144^{ m th}$
6	Street is kind of unique in that it traverses the
7	entire rezoning area from the Patterson houses to
8	the east, all the way to the waterfront. Whereas,
9	elsewhere we have the Deegan at grade, which you
10	see also on page 16.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Right.
12	CAROL SAMEL: You know, we have
13	street ends that are blocked. So, we chose that
14	site because of its easy access under the Deegan
15	and its central location.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: But, that,
17	currently, that little piece of land that is
18	accessible to the water, who owns that little
19	piece of land?
20	CAROL SAMEL: My understanding is
21	that it's state owned.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: State-
23	owned land.
24	CAROL SAMEL: Yeah.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Do you

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 108
2	know what the current use of that land is?
3	CAROL SAMEL: It's not used for
4	anything. There's a combined sewer outfall there.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Combined
6	sewer what?
7	CAROL SAMEL: And, I think the
8	sewer outfall
9	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.
10	CAROL SAMEL: in the water.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: You mean
12	that goes into the water. Okay.
13	CAROL SAMEL: So, there's some
14	infrastructure. And then, the state uses it, my
15	understanding is, uses it for access to the
16	Oakpoint Rail link. But, there's nothing there
17	now.
18	COUNCIL MEMBER JACKSON: Okay.
19	Thank you.
20	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you. We
21	will proceed with the public hearing. I believe
22	we have a representative from Senator Serrano. Is
23	he still here? She, okay. Come on up.
24	[Pause]
25	Push the button.

DEMARIS OLEVILLE: My name is

Demaris Oleville [phonetic]. And, I'm here to

read testimony on behalf of Senator Jose M.

Serrano.

"I would like the thank Chair

Avella and the members of the Committee for the opportunity to present testimony today. Since last June, when I submitted comment as part of the public scoping meeting, New York City has witnessed great change. The downturn in the financial sector has underscored the need to diversify our economy. I applaud the focus on mixed use development and light manufacturing in the rezoning plan. City Hall must do everything it can to ensure such proposals are implemented successfully, with comprehensive job access for local residents.

The economic decline has further intensified the need for income-oriented housing in the South Bronx, while residents are making less money than one year ago and their rents have not dropped in a corresponding fashion. At the state level, I will continue to fight for stronger rent laws, in particular, through repeal of

foster a greater understanding of the River's

2 unique ecology; the important role it plays in the 3 overall environmental health of the Bronx.

Grassroots organizations have been at the forefront of this campaign for decades. And, the City would do well to work in concert with them and build upon their leadership.

As such, the City should consider designating the land just north of the Third

Avenue bridge at the terminus of Park Avenue as a priority public access area. This parcel has long served as a launch point for canoes and kayaks enabling local organizations to introduce countless Bronx residents to the river. Turning this into a more formal and well-funded park will leverage tremendous amounts of community support and sweat equity behind governmental mitigation efforts. It's important to note that the proposed 9-acre park to the north does not include a single launch point due to a rail line along the river park.

I wish to express sincere gratitude for your consideration on these remarks and recommendations. Moreover, please consider me an ally at the state level in your efforts to rezone

only true recreational waterway in New York City
whereby the only commercial traffic on the Harlem
River is the Circle Line, where everything else
that is happening there are recreational. We
should consider these factors when introducing
such massive developments along such a wonderful
resource.

The Harlem River itself, like our neighboring Brooklyn, is also home of the greatest concentration of what I call water people. Most of us, considering 90% of the population, are from the English, French, Spanish-speaking Caribbean and growingly a large continental African coastal people. These factors also should be considered when we are creating and considering amenities along the waterfront.

Public access to the water and waterfront vistas and other amenities that come with that, such as the recreational and educational components that we bring to the river is also essential in considering that, as well.

Most of these amenities are offered throughout New York Harbor, yet the Harlem River, with all the scenic vistas and also the history that it

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

possesses, with a great population of people, those amenities are extremely minimal on the Harlem River.

Increasing public access at every opportunity site along the Harlem River will also contribute to increasing safety for the current public use of the water and also the contemplated future uses of the water. And, what do I mean by that? I think in this development we should consider at every site there is an opportunity to have an open access, we should use it. If you're on the Harlem River, it's not just to get people in the water. It also helps to get people out of the water. If you haven't - - Harlem River and you get tired and you want to take a rest, the more points you have to exit the water, the safer that journey becomes. So, that's something most people do not think about. And, being the water folks that we are, we wanted to bring that to the table and want you to consider that in these developments.

We are recommending that there be no exceptions. Considering all these factors, that we are recommending that there be no

Bronx, very densely populated peninsula, makes up

And, children can also gain educational values from being on the water. I know, particularly, from my experience, that I've learned about water currents and PH levels and it's helped me in school. And, there's also a good chance that kids can get college credits for a crew if they choose and I know that's a very big scholarship factor in colleges.

environmental stewards.

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

And, I also had fun. And, it's important for kids to have fun in the City, and also adults. And, I think that it will improve their physical wellbeing and their mental state.

HARRY BOBBINS: Great. Thanks a lot. And, I'm Harry Bobbins with Friends of Brook Park, based in Mott Haven, Melrose, Port Morris neighborhoods. And, thanks for Council Member Arroyo for championing these issues and for Mr. Jackson asking a good question about what is the game plan for acquiring private land in the future, which I didn't quite hear, but maybe I'll hear later.

So, we want to acknowledge that in the course of the public hearing process that City Planning has responded in some way to our concerns. But, instead of mapping and providing resources to a actual park, they extended the Special District zone to include the Park Avenue site. And, while that's a step in the recognition of the importance and value of that underutilized public land, we want to use this process to leverage an actual amenity for the existing community. The park land they identify, as you

heard, will come when the zoning is built out,
which is totally inappropriate, towers along the
river, and also when the Major Deegan is redone.
That could be decades down the line. So, the park
there is not for the existing community. It's
part of a gentrification plan.

So, we need a resource now at Park Avenue with money. We understand other zoning plans, 125th Street, for example, got resources for the local parks in the vicinity. So, we hope that we can leverage this process to achieve that. And, we're confident in your local leadership to help us do that.

The second troubling thing that you heard about, which I included in your packet, the last two pages, is that Consolidated Edison is asking for special privileges not to be required to provide the waterfront access. I don't know if you got the last two pages of this. But, unfortunately, the Community Board didn't have an opportunity to weigh in on that, nor did the Borough President because Con-Ed wrote a letter in April to the Chair and, unfortunately, City Planning pretty much allowed the special

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

privileges and exemptions for Con-Ed along our waterfront, which would totally thwart our common goals along the river for a continuous greenway. So, as you move forward in this plan, that definitely needs to be removed.

So, in conclusion, Park Avenue as a park with resources and no special treatment for Consolidated Edison. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I'd like to call upon Council Member Arroyo.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARROYO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And, I will be brief. I am requesting There is a that we delay the vote on this item. minor detail of public access to the waterfront that my community needs to deal with with regards to this application. It is not part of the application. But, it is absolutely a conversation that has to happen and commitments made with regards to how the access to that waterfront at the tail-end of that broken dotted line in that map, with a commitment for timeframes and a point at which the community that, Council Member Melissa Mark-Viverito and I share at that point of our districts, can leverage open public space with

the safe amenities to launch canoes, boats or rowboats; something that if you go out there this Saturday, you'll probably see happening at this site.

My respect to you for your consistency and your advocacy around this issue. And, we will continue this conversation. I hope that certainly by Thursday, we will be able to have come to a place where we're confident the City's commitment will be there to turn this little place in the South Bronx into a place people from all over the City would want to come to. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you.

Thank you for your testimony. Seeing no one else signed up to speak on this item, I will close the public hearing. And, move on to one of our-- we still have two more items to go. We'll go on to the C090313ZMK, commonly referred to as the Canarsie rezoning. And, I'll call Brooklyn City Planning up to give the presentation. Application lies within Council Member Lew Fidler's district.

[Pause] And, if you're here for the Landmark subcommittee hearing, it is actually going to be

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 122
2	taking place next door. [Pause]
3	WINSTON VON ENGEL: Good afternoon,
4	Councilman Avella, Chair Avella, Councilman Fidler
5	and other Council Members. I should just add also
6	that the Canarsie rezoning is also partly
7	represented by Councilman Barron, who was briefed
8	on this proposal. My name is Winston Von Engel
9	[phonetic]. I'm the Deputy Director of the
10	Department of City Planning's Brooklyn Office.
11	I'm here speaking on behalf of Kapur
12	[phonetic], the Director of the Office, as well as
13	Amanda Burden, Chair of the City Planning
14	Commission.
15	And, we are very proud, very happy
16	to present to you the Canarsie rezoning, a
17	contextual down-zoning of 300 blocks, the largest
18	such down-zoning and rezoning in Brooklyn. I
19	apologize. Is that better? Okay.
20	MALE VOICE: Somebody else [off
21	mic]
22	WINSTON VON ENGEL: Okay. All
23	right. This rezoning is the result of a
24	longstanding request by numerous civic
25	associations in Canarsie, strongly supported by

Community Board 18 and championed by Council

Member Fidler. It received unanimous approval,
recommendation for approval, from Community Board

18 during the ULURP process, from Borough
President Marty Markowitz, as well as from the
City Planning Commission.

It addresses zoning that has been in place, unchanged, since 1961. And, that zoning that has resulted in out-of-character and out-of-context development. This rezoning is the product of many, many public community meetings, often organized by Council Member Fidler, that were all inclusive, where the number of civic associations active in Canarsie, as well as the public, were able to participate.

We presented our study area. We listened to the community. We made adjustments. We presented our recommendations and listened to the community, again, and made changes based on their recommendations and comments. We came up with a proposal that was unanimously endorsed by the civic associations, many of the civic associations and the Community Board.

The proposal maps lower density

proposing lower density and contextual zoning map

changes for 250 blocks in the Brooklyn
neighborhood of Canarsie, Community District 18.

The rezoning area is generally bounded by Foster
Avenue to the north, East 108th Street to the east,
the Belt Parkway and Seaview Avenue to the south
and Paerdegat Avenue North to the west. The
result of a larger 300-block study, the rezoning
would protect existing uses, building types and
neighborhood context, while allowing limited
opportunities for mixed use development on
existing commercial and transit corridors.

Canarsie, a predominantly low rise and low density residential neighborhood, has an existing mix of housing types, with some blocks defined by one and two-family detached and semidetached homes and others by attached row houses. However, the existing R4 and R5 residential zoning, while low density, currently permits all housing types. Often new development has been inconsistent with prevailing scale, density and built character. Specifically, the community's concerned with one and two-family homes being torn down and replaced with multi-family developments eroding the character of certain blocks.

We've worked, again, very closely with Council Member Fidler and his working group of various stakeholders to build a consensus for the proposal. The proposed zoning districts include detached districts, R3X and R4A; the semidetached districts, R3-1 and R4-1; the attached row house districts, R4, R5, R5B and R5D. We've modified commercial overlays to C2, C1-3 and C2-3. And, we've mapped new C2-3 overlays where there's an existing retail presence.

These fine-grain zoning changes, together with the mapping and maintaining of existing R4 and R5 districts, where appropriate, would protect the neighborhood character of Canarsie. And, again, just to reiterate, Community Board 18 vote unanimously in favor of the application. Again, the Borough President recommended approval without any modifications. And, the City Planning Commission voted unanimously in favor.

I'll be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: First, I'd like to call on Council Member Lew Fidler, whose

I do want to, Mr. Chairman, just

submit for the record packages of letters, if the

Sergeant at Arms could distribute that to my

23

24

Т	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 12
2	to reach the conclusion where everybody is on
3	board, I think is pretty astounding. So, you all
4	to be congratulated.
5	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: If you can
6	hang around, of course, I'm sure you will. First,
7	I'd like to call on what? You're shaking your
8	head.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: [Off mic]
10	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Simcha, we're
11	trying to move this ahead.
12	COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: [Off mic]
13	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I understand
14	we have a representative from Senator Karl
15	Krueger. I'd like to call him up first.
16	[Pause]
17	MALE VOICE: I will speak slowly,
18	Councilman Felder. Good morning. Senator
19	Krueger's in Albany and sends his regrets that he
20	cannot be here in person today. But, he feels
21	strongly about the plan to rezone Canarsie and is
22	submitting the following testimony, which I will
23	read now.
24	"I applaud the rezoning of Canarsie
25	and believe that implementing this plan is not

2.0

only the best way, but the only way to save the neighborhood from out-of-scale, unscrupulous development.

For the last 30 years, I have seen this issue process from a slow simmer to a full-blown boil. I was deeply involved as the plan began to germinate and gain steam, first as a civic activist in Canarsie and then, as Chair of Community Board 18 for ten years. For the last 15 years, I have served as Senator of the community that sits directly adjacent to Canarsie.

The problem began when many one and two-family homes in Canarsie gradually became three-family homes to accommodate all of the new residents who moved into the neighborhood. Then, many of the old farmhouses started to go and replaced by multi-family condominiums, an ugly sight on streets accustomed to low rise architecture. The farmhouses that fell victim to the wrecking ball were part of Canarsie's charm and an integral part of its history, as well. The history of Canarsie dates way back to the time of the Canarsie Indians and Dutch settlers and the farmhouses existed when the neighborhood

2 represented the Hinterlands of the City of 3 Brooklyn.

Now, unfortunately, time is marching on in Canarsie, but most definitely not in a way that was beneficial for the community. So, our response was to fight back against this out-of-scale development; me, Canarsie's elected officials, including Councilman Lew Fidler, the other activists, Community Board 18, everybody with a stake in Carnarsie's past, present and future. Together we achieved a number of successes.

There was one project on East 92nd

Street, near Farragut Road that was battled. It
ended with the developer having to pour cement
into the basement to decommission illegal
apartments. We were also successful in preventing
the development of an old Indian cemetery next
Grace Church.

Our goal all along for Canarsie was to make the important distinction between good development and bad development. Good development requires planning and forethought and occurs as a natural course of community growth. That is not

Chairperson Avella, our distinguished Council

Member Lewis Fidler, and Honorable members of the

24

Council of the City of New York Land Use

Committee. My name is Dorothy Turano. I'm the

District Manager of Community Board 18.

I want to reiterate, at the outset, that Community Board 18 did, in fact, vote unanimously to support this ULURP application for lower density and contextual zoning map changes for the Canarsie neighborhood. We commend the City Planning Commission and the Department of City Planning for their thoroughness and speed. It's a job well done. It's a finally crafted neighborhood preservation plan. I'm here today to ask for your support in approving this plan. We anxiously await its implementation.

The scope of this proposal was an enormous undertaking. The planning process is a difficult and daunting task. Planning cannot be done in a vacuum. It cannot be whimsical or succumb to the financial goals of developers. It must be done in the context of an overall plan with a vision and a direction for future development with an end in sight to out-of-scale development. This plan meets that criteria.

Would we have wanted to be more

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

creative with each block? Absolutely. Would we have wanted to see more regionalized approach toward our infrastructure, be it shopping, schools, religious institutions or transportation? Without a doubt. However, we have what we have; a lengthy, in-depth and well-thought through plan to rezone this community consistent with its existing This plan observes and protects our character. community's rich heritage which dates back, as Senator Krueger stated, to the Canarsie Indians and is home to the historic Canarsie Cemetery and prominent Canarsie Pier, which is part of Gateway It embraces our neighborhood and National Park. connects our homes to the community.

Before I close, there are people I want to acknowledge and thank for their commitment, expertise, guidance, overwhelming support, cooperation, patience and, above all, teamwork. This was a project with teamwork. Will we ever forget the phone calls, the lengthy studies, the countless meetings, the ceaseless debates and the unrelenting letters? I don't think so. Thanks to all the Canarsie stakeholders for bringing together this diverse community and

for recognizing its historic and geographical boundaries while, at the same time, developing a theory for a long term redevelopment of residential maintenance and commercial competitiveness.

I really wish that there were a better word than thanks to express our sincere appreciation to Councilman Lewis Fidler, who fostered and closely monitored its advancement.

And, he worked in cooperation with Council Member Barron. Thanks to the City Planning Commission and Department of City Planning, our Borough President, Marty Markowitz, Community Board members and community leaders, in particular Mary Anne Sallustro, President of the South Canarsie Civic Association.

Thanks to all of you here today and to all the members of the City Council for your continued support and commitment. Continue to use your authority and expertise to examine, and revise when necessary, current zoning laws for the protection of generations to come. We must continue to fight to maintain and preserve our natural resources and the unique character of the

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 136
2	diverse neighborhoods of our City. Let's keep New
3	York a place to live in and not to be from. Thank
4	you all very much and enjoy the rest of the day.
5	GARDY BRAZELA: Good afternoon,
6	ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for
7	allowing me to speak on behalf of Canarsie
8	rezoning. My name is Gardy Brazela. I'm the
9	President of Friends United Block Association,
LO	which is a larger civic organization in Canarsie.
11	I'm here to testify in favor of Canarsie zoning.
12	First, I would like to thank my
13	Councilman, Lew Fidler, and the City Planning for
L4	a job well done. That's all I have to say.
L5	FEMALE VOICE: That's enough.
L6	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: That's the
L7	best statement of the day.
L8	FEMALE VOICE: Should have given -
L9	_
20	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Yeah, right.
21	I always say the politician who speaks the least
22	gets the most applause. So, you actually, you
23	know, you actually did it.
24	WANDA IHRIG: Thank you also for
25	allowing me to speak. My name is Wanda Ihrig. I

have been a long time resident of Canarsie, 49

plus years. And, I am the President of Informed

Voices Civic Association. We also have an

extensive membership in Canarsie, as well as

members from all areas of Canarsie. So, it's not

geographic to just one segment.

I don't know how I can follow up these two very eloquent speakers without boring you to death. So, let me first say I totally agree with everything both the Planning Commission and they have said so far. I just want to stress that this has been a totally transparent, totally inclusive process with countless hours, both of discussion, sometimes lively discussion, as well as collaboration. This down-zoning was a block by block effort. The only objections could perhaps be a structure by a structure, which you know you can't do in a down-zoning.

This was something that was a labor of love for all of Canarsie. Our organization totally agrees with it and hopes that you will consider it. Since the mind cannot endure more than the seat can endure, I think we are going to end there. Thank you very much.

[Pause]

DEBBIE TAMAFOLK: I don't know how
I'm going to follow the predecessors. My name is
Debbie Tamafolk. And, I am a resident of Canarsie
for almost 35 years and Board member of Friends
United Block Association.

I'd like to say thank you, thank
you, thank you to our Councilman, Lew Fidler, and
for pushing this forward and community
stakeholders and everyone involved in the process.
And, oftentimes, it was like a root canal without
Novocain. But, we got through it. There was a
lot of teamwork. There was lively discussion,
constantly. Lots of thanks go to Mary Anne
Sallustro and members here and many of them who
are not here, who were present at the meetings.
It was complete transparency and an opportunity
for all members of the community to voice an
opinion, sometimes ad nauseam, but we're managed
to get through it.

And, I'm asking the Chairman, this Committee, to move forward on the Canarsie down-zoning plan. Oftentimes, these plans are not done with the amount of care that was done here.

I do want to mention, because he's not here, that Councilman Barron, who represents about a third of Canarsie, also fully supports this project in one of those great moments when Charles Barron and I are absolutely of the same mind. So, I just wanted to say thank you for all

21

22

23

24

2	And, we appreciate everything that
3	was done. But, we find some flaws in the zoning.
4	We're very frightened about the R5D. We're very
5	frightened about it being given in literature from
6	our elected official that that kind of housing
7	will never happen again. And, I have some
8	pictures if I can get up and show you some photos.
9	I'll talk first. But, the R5D is not compatible
10	with the Canarsie zoning. And, in the R5 and the
11	R4 that we have now, that's were all the infill
12	has occurred and all of the outer developments. I
13	would rather show you a map that I made.
14	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Mary Anne, you
15	have to speak into the microphone. What you could
16	do is have somebody else point to the map while
17	you speak.
18	MARY ANNE SALLUSTRO: We're going
19	to see the first one is
20	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Mary Anne,
21	you've got to speak
22	MARY ANNE SALLUSTRO: Okay. I'm
23	sorry.
24	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: into the
25	microphone.

24

25

2	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: The first one
3	has to deal with the area where United Canarsie
4	South Civic would like to add a room, which is
5	wonderful. But, it still has the R5 zoning
6	district. And, we went block by block and we
7	found all one-family detached and all one-family
8	semi-detached predominantly. So, if you want to
9	protect and preserve, you can do it very easily
10	with an R4.
11	And, the next one is
12	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: [Interposing]
13	I'm not clear as to what area you're talking
14	about. What section are you speak Mary Anne,
15	you've got to talk into
16	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: We're speaking
17	about
18	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: the mic.
19	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Seaview, I
20	know you only have three minutes, Seaview Avenue
21	to Skidmore Avenue, that's behind Canarsie Beach
22	Park to Skank [phonetic] Street, which is like the

Belk Parkway. And, you have Skank Street on the

left and then, you have East 91, East 92 and East

93. Those are predominantly one and two-family

Τ	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 14
2	homes, detached, semi-detached. On Canarsie Road,
3	on the west side of the block, those are two-
4	family and one-family detached, semi-detached
5	homes. Across the street, they're connected or
6	they're also detached.
7	And, it qualifies as an R4-1. It
8	allows people to do an expansion, an addition
9	because with the R5, they could tear down these
10	houses. Some of them are older bungalows. And,
11	that's it. Now, we have other maps. I'm leaving
12	them for you. Yeah. [Pause] All right.
13	This is Flatlands Avenue. This is
14	where I grew up. Flatlands Avenue between East 88
15	and Avenue J. It happens to be we thank Dorothy
16	Turano. At one time, she preserved our block,
17	East 88 Street on the east side.
18	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: If I can
19	interrupt because it's very confusing for anybody
20	on the Committee to understand what you're
21	referring to.
22	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: [Interposing]
23	These houses
24	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: What
25	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: on East

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 144
2	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Mary Anne
3	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO:88.
4	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Mary Anne,
5	listen to what I'm saying.
6	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: The previous
8	map you had up had referred to the R5 section.
9	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Yes.
10	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: What section
11	are you referring to now?
12	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: We're
13	referring to Avenue J, where they did it R5B. You
14	see Avenue J to Church Lane, they made that R5B.
15	Do you see, there is one, two houses and then, the
16	condos and on next block you have one house on the
17	corner of East 88 Street. You have one-family
18	house. Then, you have another one. That's on the
19	whole block. So, we want you to take the
20	bungalows, which are on East 88 to J, Flatlands to
21	J, and 89 to J and 87, and take it all the way
22	down and make it R4-1. Why did you make it R5B,
23	when it's on a lane where the Canarsie Cemetery's
24	for sale, where the water table? So, we don't
25	think R5B is appropriate. We have an architect

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 14
2	that, when Danny speaks, he'll talk about it.
3	Then, we have another one.
4	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Mary Anne,
5	you've gone over your three minutes. Can we have
6	somebody else
7	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Okay.
8	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: talk about
9	these issues significantly?
LO	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Okay. That's
11	basically it. We're afraid
12	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Okay.
L3	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: of that
L4	the 40 feet limit, the bonus, 'cause on Avenue K,
15	8413 Avenue K, we have an overbuilding. And, they
L6	can still do that in Canarsie, the overbuilding,
L7	out of character with the bonus height. Forty
L8	feet is inappropriate. We are one and two-story
L9	predominantly. That's it. We're afraid of it.
20	We're afraid of the R5s. And, our architect here
21	has a map. Thank you very much.
22	ELIAS WEIR: Yes, thank you for
23	giving me the opportunity to speak. My name is
24	Elias J. Weir. I'm also with South Canarsie Civic
25	Association and a resident of Canarsie.

zone.

One of the things that I'd like to speak about, basically, is the fact that they did say down-zoning. One of the things that is notices that the commercial strip oppose to saying that is being capped on the norm. It has been up-

That's one of our concerns.

And, as Mary Anne is pointing out, we are concerned with the R5B. And, that is the area of Avenue J and East 85th Street, as well as Farragut and East 82nd Street. Not only that, the point of fact is that we have the waterfront section, where we notice that there is no actual labeling as a C3. And, the careful part that we want to make sure that it is labeled C3 oppose to in a area of R5.

We know very well that the rezoning was a very time-consuming factor. And, we're very thankful about it. These are just a few things that we basically want to see corrected. It's not to say that the whole matter has to be corrected. It's a time-consuming matter, as stated. We're very thankful. And, no one is actually pointing fingers that there's something wrong. Just basic fact. Here we have a minor issue. Can we correct

2 it?

And, basically there are other things I'd like to speak to, speak about, but, I suppose they're being laid out in that letter in documentation from Mary Anne. So, I'm not going to take much of the Committee's time. I thank you for having me. And, I'm going to turn over the mic. [Pause]

very much for letting me speak, Committee members.

My name is Leo Cukier. I'm President of one of the congregation in Canarsie. I'm also a member of the Bayview Housing Association in Canarsie.

And, since I don't drive, I've actually been walking through the whole of Canarsie, you know, all the years I've been there, which is over 35, 40 years.

I'd just like to say that, you know, I want to thank everybody that has worked very hard, as we know, from the meetings that we've had. They've been very turbulent and sometimes, almost in a violent state because people are concerned with what's going on in Canarsie. Canarsie's a very beautiful place,

which over 200 years the Canarsie Indians started over there. And, we have neighborhoods that basically is a place that anyone that can come, can enjoy.

Houses, brick homes that, you know, you can't get anywhere else, you know. You can pay a million dollars, \$2 million for some of these homes elsewhere. But, here in Canarsie, which is a very basic mix-- it's a mixed neighborhood. We have people from the Caribbean. We have, you know, from Haiti, from Jamaica and from Trinidad. And, we have Oriental, you know, people from China. They come and it's basically a community that's together. In other words, it's not one that we're at each other's back. Okay. It's a beautiful and we just want to keep it that way.

All the work that was done, as I said, it's been years and years and has not been easy, you know. I thank, you know, Lew Fidler for being in this process. It has not been easy to get our Committee members to join us in on what was going on. And, I want to thank everybody, Mary Luann, of course, and everybody that's been

2 involved with this.

I just want the reason that I'd like them to, you know, since it has been taking many, many years and, you know, and trying not to lose our neighborhoods, I want them to think of what Mary Anne and others have said as to what our concerns are. And, please make note. I mean, if you're going to finalize something, let's finalize it so that we don't leave anything that we're going to have to keep fighting over and over again, the same battles.

So, again, I'd like you to review everything. And, you know, and, get the feedback from the community and from the people that, you know, live there and basically, we all live there. And, we'd like you to please not to rush into something and not leave anything out that could be basically changed for the better. So, as we know, developers have a way of going around and using all kinds of ways of trying to get around regulations.

And, you know, so, as someone mentioned, you know, what's important is the privacy, air and, you know, and light. That's

very important to the Committee so that, you know,

I've seen, you know, where homes basically, there
is no light. So, I thank you again. And, thank

you very much, Committee members and Chairman.

DANIEL McCULLOUGH: Good morning.

My name is Daniel McCullough. I'm here to request a few amendments to the zoning proposal.

Basically, we're requesting most of the R5B sections be, if possible, changed to the R4.

We're looking to expand the R4s, which City Planning proposes. We find there's very similar floor area ratio per lot that's allowable for development. R4 just gives you a little more flexibility as far as building extensions.

We're also requesting that the proposed R5D remain the commercial districts, especially on the Rockaway Parkway area because it's already built, I mean, as far as traffic is concerned. The train line is already overflowing during rush hour. And, plus, we're looking to have the use groups that are commercial districts restricted from use groups one through four. If you get to use groups five through nine, that's just— it's a little too many. It just makes

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 151 traffic almost impossible. 2 3 We're also requesting to expand 4 City Planning's R3-1s because these are little 5 more in character of the neighborhood. 6 Our main request is if the Committee could ask the Brooklyn Borough office to 7 8 look at the area of Seaview, Skidmore over there if it's possible to attach it to another zoning 9 10 proposal in Brooklyn, something like Coney Island 11 or maybe even, what do you call it, Sunset Park. We're hoping that the district could be R4-1. 12 13 There's still a lot of houses left unprotected on 14 those blocks. 15 And, we hope to keep the area of 16 Paerdegat C3, item 17 says it's proposed R5. 17 thought there needed to be legislation if that's 18 park land. 19 So, basically our most important 20 request is if the Brooklyn Borough office can take 21 a look at the Seaview area that's outside of the 22 zoning proposal district, you know, just to get 23 the R4-1 in if it's possible for the Committee to attach it to another zoning district. But, we 24 25 would prefer to have the R4-1s extended more.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's only just a yard and 35 feet on the front wall, you know. It's R5B is a five front-- five-foot front yard. R4-1 is four, I think maximum ten yard, I mean, ten feet. So, that's in conclusion. That's the quickest things we needed.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Any questions?

Oh, Council Member Helen Sears. And then, I'd

like to call City Planning back to comment on the testimony.

COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You really spent considerable time on doing this. So, I'm not confused. But, I just really have a question because in spending the time and expressing and defining the areas that you really choose to have these changes, this process has been a very lengthy one. And, I know the process, the Committee goes through this and we've done extensively in every part of the City. So, what I don't understand is you must have expressed this to the Community Board. You must have expressed when there have been public hearings. City Planning had to hear your comments. So, what was the objection to your proposals? That's what I would like to know.

```
1
               SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 153
 2
                     ELIAS WEIR: I will answer that.
                                                        Ι
 3
      will answer that.
 4
                     COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: No, anyone
 5
            I mean, I'm just raising--
      can.
                     ELIAS WEIR:
                                   That's quite okay.
 6
                     COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: -- the
 7
 8
      issue.
 9
                     ELIAS WEIR: One of the things I
10
      failed to mention as I was speaking, 'cause I
11
      wanted to keep it at a limited time and I didn't
12
      want-- basically, I understand that the Community
13
      Board stated that everyone voted in favor.
                     COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: Well, it
14
15
      indicates that.
16
                     ELIAS WEIR: It indicates that.
17
      But, one of the things that, 'cause I was there.
18
      No careful consideration was given as far as
19
      studying the actual map as to what was going on.
20
      Now, as it stated, the points that are being
21
      brought about is the fact that we don't want
22
      Canarsie to be overcrowded. We know that
23
      developers are just waiting to sink their teeth to
24
      destroy the community. Now, I don't understand
25
      what does it take for the mind to look at an area
```

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 and say it's a tree-line block and so forth.

3 If it feels that it's an incumbent 4 part where you feel that we're troubling you, no 5 it's not. Canarsians are concerned. I know you've heard documentation that many individual 6 7 are for it. Well, I'm sorry to say we're playing 8 the bad guys. We know very well that some things do not fit within the medium of our community. 9 10 And, that's why we're addressing them. If careful 11 consideration and careful thought was given in reviewing the map, we will probably not having 12 this discussion. And, that's it. 13

COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: I'm not going to speak for City Planning and then, I'll just end my comment. But, that I know that City Planning Citywide extends very, very extensive thought process, the professional process and the very clinical process. And, in my experience with City Planning Citywide, is that a lot goes into-this is the most extensive that I've sat through. Three hundred blocks is extensive. There's no frivolity or thoughtlessness in 300 blocks.

Now, there seems to be a difference of opinion. But, the fact is the process for

COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS:

occasions. And, mostly, at the Community Board

ELIAS WEIR: We've testified on all

I have.

23

24

25

Τ	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 15
2	a planner. And, I'll end here. But, the fact is,
3	you don't change on block and ignore another. It
4	is a very complicated process. So, what you are
5	asking for, sir, is that we delay the voting, go
6	back to the drawing board
7	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: [Interposing]
8	Let me ask her. Let me answer her.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: and not
10	take a very simple selected process.
11	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: [Interposing]
12	Let me speak to her.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: You don't do
14	that. Rezoning isn't done where we take one block
15	and ignore everything else that was done. So,
16	that's why I'm wondering, and my question was
17	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: [Interposing]
18	I have to answer her.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: why did
20	it reach this point when an extensive process took
21	place
22	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: [Interposing]
23	Can I sort of
24	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: for a 300
25	hlock

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 158
2	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: frame an
3	argument here?
4	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: rezoning.
5	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Can I
6	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: And, I
7	okay, 'cause I made the point.
8	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: [crosstalk]
9	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: All right.
10	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Could I
11	please, as the President
12	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Can I sort of
13	frame the argument here because I hear what
14	everybody's saying. But, I think we're getting
15	just a little bit off the topic.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: Well, I
17	raised the
18	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I think your
19	question
20	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: question.
21	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I think your
22	question is, and I don't think they answered it.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: No, they
24	didn't.
25	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: But, I think

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 159
2	your question is
3	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS:
4	[Interposing] They didn't.
5	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: and if I
6	hear what you're saying is you're trying to fine
7	tune the application. Her question to you was the
8	fine tuning that you're suggesting, was it
9	submitted previously to the Community Board or
LO	City Planning prior to today?
11	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: Yes.
12	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: And then, her
13	question was what was the answer.
L4	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Yes. Every
15	week, every month, we wrote to Commissioner
L6	Burden. We CC'd it to Markowitz. We gave
L7	everything to Chairman Avella. And, we never got
18	a response. In other words we wanted originally
19	to rezone Canarsie because we were R4 and R5.
20	Four Borough, he's from Four Borough. He's not an
21	architect. Our architect, she came onboard now
22	recently. She's a Canarsian and she did this last
23	night at our meeting. We had a meet the
24	candidates meeting.
25	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Mary Anne

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 160
2	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: We had
3	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: we know
4	that. We're trying to get
5	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: March
6	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Mary Anne,
7	we're trying to get to
8	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Okay.
9	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: the basis
10	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: [Interposing]
11	The bottom line is
12	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: of the
13	issue here.
14	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: we
15	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: I'm going to
16	cut you off, Mary Anne.
17	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: We're trying
19	to get to the bottom of your fine tuning
20	suggestions. That's the basis of your testimony.
21	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: [crosstalk]
22	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: That's the
23	basis of the questions. What I would like to do,
24	at this point, unless there's any other questions
25	is call

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 161
2	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: Call up City
3	Planning.
4	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: City
5	Planning back and let them comment on the
6	suggestions that you've made.
7	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: We have
8	addresses that we went door, Steven and I, my Vice
9	President, we went on all these blocks. Now, I
10	don't know you had to make ten copies for all of
11	you. And, I had to this map was drawn last
12	night. I have photographs. I gave everything at
13	the City Planning when it was with Miss Burden at
14	that college. We have all the streets on Avenue
15	L, which is R5D. We have all of them. They're
16	one and two-stories. They're all residential
17	houses. We have all the addresses.
18	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Okay. Mary
19	Anne
20	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: So, I want to
21	submit this
22	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Mary Anne, I'm
23	cutting you off
24	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: [crosstalk]
25	testimony

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 162
2	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: because
3	let's get City Planning back
4	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: [Interposing]
5	I have photos
6	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: to go over
7	it.
8	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: I
9	submitted. I have so many photos.
10	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Okay. Mary
11	Anne
12	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Yes, thank
13	you.
14	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: what we
15	need to do is now hear from City Planning. So,
16	I'm dismissing this panel.
17	MARY ANN SALLUSTRO: Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: And, I'd like
19	City Planning to come back and comment. And, my
20	first question to City Planning would be have you
21	been aware of the fine tuning suggestions that
22	they have made? And, what's your comments?
23	WINSTON VON ENGEL: Let me say that
24	yes, we have been aware of the testimony, in
25	general, of the South Canarsie Civic Association

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that you heard today. And, I just want to mirror what Council Member Sears has said that all of these issues were discussed numerous times at the meetings that Councilman Fidler has referred, the Chair of the Community Board and the other representatives of the Civic Associations has referred to. We discussed those issues in great detail. We made adjustments based upon those comments and those questions to us.

I have Richard Jacobs here. can, if you would like, if you have specific questions, respond to specific, you know, questions about this. But, all of these issues were discussed. All of them were thoroughly gone Richard has gone over these numerous times. It is really, as you pointed out, block by block, block by block, very careful. And, we check with each civic. And, I'll just give one example. Seaview Avenue area, we checked specifically with the Civic Association that represents that area. And, they said leave the zoning as is. This is our area. Leave it as it is. We said fine. we left it as is. It's as it is right now in the proposal.

Any other questions from anybody? Thank you.

[Off mic] the public hearing on this matter is

closed. We will move on to the last item, [pause]

23

24

25

which is N090306ZRM, Battery Park City Site Three, an application for the Battery Park City Authority for an amendment of the Zoning Resolution. And, I know you've been waiting around a long morning to do this.

DANIEL BALDWIN: Thank you.

Chairman Avella and members of the Committee, my name is Daniel Baldwin. I'm the Senior Development Counsel of Battery Park City
Authority. And, we are proposing an amendment to the Zoning Resolution for our Special District to permit an increase from 40 to 50 feet in the permitted aggregate length of curb cuts for Site Three, which is the zoning lot east of Battery Place between Second Place and Third Place. And, all of these cuts will be on Second Place, which is on the south side of the Visionaire.

The Visionaire is a newly constructed LEED platinum certified residential building. In four floors within the base of the building will be the new headquarters and facility for the Battery Park City Parks Conservancy, which manages all of the parks and park programming Battery Park City. It's consolidating all of

their operations, which formerly had been spread in different locations throughout Battery Park City, in one place. Because now that Battery Park City is basically fully built out, there is no vacant lots that they can use for storage and other things.

So, this is actually a very ingeniously constructed— it's a vertical storage, maintenance and office facility, 43,000 square feet. So, the existing zoning permits 40 feet of curb cuts. We're asking for 50 feet of curb cuts. Here's how it lays out. The Visionaire, the residential portion of the building, has a 20-foot curb cut for the garage, for the residential garage. Then, we have a compactor room, which is part of our ongoing pilot program in Battery Park City to try to get to minimize on—street storage of garbage, which attracts rats, other things like that. So, this is part of that initiative. That has a ten-foot curb cut.

The Conservancy has, if you just kept it down to the 40 feet, they would have one ten-foot curb cut. They need two, because now they're having all of their operations in this one

facility. It's a 24-hour a day operation. I

mean, I'm sorry, 18 out of 24 hours. They have a

constant inflow and outflow of their personnel,

maintenance vehicles, deliveries. So, if there

were only to have one curb cut, that would

basically mean that any time that there was

deliveries going on, they'd have to shut down the

rest of their operations.

So, this proposal is simply in the interest of enabling this new facility, which is also going to be a LEED certified facility, to function efficiently in their mission of preserving and maintaining the Battery Park City Parks.

CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you. I have a statement. This lies within Council Member Alan Gerson's district. And, he has apparently a cold, like I do. So, he has submitted testimony. And, I'll just quickly read it into the record.

"I am writing in support for Land
Use Number 1114, Battery Park City Site Three, an
application submitted by the Battery Park City
Authority, pursuant to Section 201 of the New York
City Charter for an amendment of Section 84144(e)

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 171
2	testified publicly as to the use they want for
3	that waterfront. And, it seems to me they have
4	lost their ability to get the benefit of the
5	doubt. And, I'd ask that in the area, in the time
6	between this hearing and the vote, that Con-Edison
7	make more clear their use of that waterfront.
8	Thank you.
9	CAROL SHINE: Council Member Katz.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER KATZ: I vote aye on
11	all. And, I want to thank, once again, the Land
12	Use staff and folks from my community and also,
13	especially, City Planning for all the work that
14	they did on the Cord Myer. And, of course, for
15	the support of my colleagues, I thank you as well
16	on a project that truly has taken a lot of time
17	and effort and compromise over the last few years.
18	I vote aye on all.
19	CAROL SHINE: Council Member Sears.
20	COUNCIL MEMBER SEARS: Aye on all.
21	CAROL SHINE: Council Member Vann.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER VANN: Aye.
23	CAROL SHINE: Council Member
24	Felder.
25	COUNCIL MEMBER FELDER: May I be

at the end is whether the rezoning, for the most

25

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING & FRANCHISES 173
2	part, as Chair Katz said, that 98% I think you
3	used that ratio, 90 and whatever else, most of the
4	people, you know, it affects in a proper way. I'm
5	not going to say in a favorable way. And, with
6	having said that, that's what we should focus on,
7	not on the other stuff. And, with that, as I
8	said, I vote yes on all.
9	CAROL SHINE: Vote stands at six in
10	the affirmative, none in the negative and no
11	abstentions.
12	CHAIRPERSON AVELLA: Thank you,
13	everyone. This closes this meeting of the
14	Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises. Oh. No,
15	no, no, we are recessing. Right. Let me
16	recorrect that. We are recessing the meeting 'til
17	Thursday morning at 9:45.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

I, DeeDee E. Tataseo 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

Deeder E. Tatano

Date August 6, 2009