1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 1
2	
3	
4	CITY COUNCIL CITY OF NEW YORK
5	X
6	TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES
7	Of the
8	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES
9	X
10	August 3, 2021
11	Start: 10:21 a.m. Recess: 12:25 p.m.
12	1100000 12020 pv
13	HELD AT: HYBRID HEARING-CHAMBERS/VIRTUAL ROOM 1 (Overflow Room for
14	additional public viewing at 250 Broadway)
15	B E F O R E: Barry S. Grodenchik,
16	Acting Chairperson
17	
18	COUNCIL MEMBERS:
19	Diana Ayala Joseph C. Borelli
20	Selvena N. Brooks-Powers Laurie A. Cumbo
21	Barry S. Grodenchik Stephen T. Levin
22	Antonio Reynoso Carlina Rivera
23	
24	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 1 2 APPEARANCES 3 Richard Lobel Sheldon Lobel PC 4 Ericka Keller 5 Brisa Brian Dobrolsky 6 THINK Architecture and Design 7 Amanda Iannotti Sheldon Lobel PC 8 Reverend Al Cockfield 9 Kevin Williams 10 Equity Environmental 11 Max Meltzer 12 Meltzer Equity 13 Elyse Foladare Eric Palatnik P.C. 14 Ben Stark 15 Hirschen Singer & Epstein 16 Tom Lee 17 William Thomas Representative and the Executive Director of Open New York 18 19 Austin Selestan MYU Student 20 Jamel Gaines 21 Artistic Executive Director of Creative Outlet Kate Griffler 2.2 Associate Producer as well as a Dancer for 2.3 Creative Outlet Marrissa Williams 24

Representative of 32BJ

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 3
2	APPEARANCES (CONT.)
3	Deja Miller
4	Dancing with Creative Outlet since seven-years- old
5	Cynthia McKnight
6	Community Education Council 13
7	Daniel Rogoff Lifetime Brooklyn Resident
8	Douglas Hanau Resident of Brooklyn
9	William Mean
10	Prospect Heights resident
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

RECORDING IN PROGRESS

SERGEANT PEREZ: Computer recording is started.

4 SERGEANT AT ARMS: Chambers is started.

the following address,

2.2

2.3

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Cloud recording is underway.

Good morning and welcome to today's Hybrid New York

City Council Hearing of the Subcommittee on Zoning

and Franchises. At this time, would all panelists

please turn on their video. To minimize disruption,

please silence your electronic devices and if you

wish to submit testimony, you may do so via email at

<u>landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov</u>. Thank you for your cooperation, we are ready to begin.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Good morning. I am Council Member Barry Grodenchik and I am going to gavel in right now. [GAVEL]

I will be Chairing today's meeting of the Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises. We are joined this morning by Council Members Laurie Cumbo, whose also our Majority Leader and Diana Ayala, Joe Borelli and Selvena Brooks-Powers.

Today, we will be holding public hearings on Beach 67th Street Rezoning, the 133rd Beach 116th Street Rezoning, both relating to property located in

the Borough of Queens and the 840 Atlantic Avenue
Rezoning relating to property located in the Borough
of Brooklyn.

Before we begin, let me recognize that today's Subcommittee is conducting its business in person for the first time since March of 2020. This is a result of the governor recently lifting the COVID state of emergency and restoring the normal operation of the New York State Open Meetings Law. As we work our way back to our prepandemic operations and customs, we will continue to accommodate public testimony via Zoom and we will also take testimony from members of the public who wish to testify in person.

Whether you are participating in person or via
Zoom, anyone who is here wishing to testify will be
given the opportunity to do so. To all of you, we
say welcome. If you are here with us in person and
you wish to testify, please be sure to fill out a
speaker slip with the Sergeant's at Arms indicating
your full name, the project name or Land Use Number
and whether you are in favor or against the proposal.

For those of you wishing to testify remotely, you must also sign up by registering online. You may do that now by using the Land Use division registration

link available on the Council's website at www.council.nyc.gov.

For each of the hearings held today, applicant teams will be called first to testify followed by members of the public. Public testimony will be limited to two minutes per witness. If you have additional testimony you would like the Subcommittee to consider or if you have written testimony you would like to submit instead of appearing here before the Subcommittee, you may email it to landusetestimony, that's all one word @council.nyc.gov. Please indicate the Land Use Number or the project name or both in the subject line of your email.

Anyone wishing to obtain an accessible version of any of the presentations shown today, please send an email request to landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov.

Finally, please note that just as with virtual hearings, the logistics of conducting what is a hybrid hearing today, may require breaks or pauses as we coordinate everyone's participation. We ask that you please be patient as we work through any issues that may occur.

Today's first hearing will be on Beach 67th Street in the Borough of Queens in Council Member Selvena
Brooks-Powers district. With that, I am pleased now to open the public hearing on related Preconsidered Land Use Items for the Beach 67th Street rezoning proposal. Seeking a Zoning Map Amendment under ULURP number C200230 ZMQ and a related Zoning Text
Amendment on the ULURP Number N200231 ZRQ and relating to property in Council Member Brooks-Powers district in Queens.

I remind the viewing public for anyone wishing to testify remotely on this item, if you have not already done so, you must preregister online and you may do that now by visiting the Council's website.

If you are here today in person and wish to testify, please see the Sergeant at Arms to fill out and submit a speaker card.

At this time, I would be happy to hear from Councilwoman Brooks-Powers if she has anything that she would like to say.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Thank you and good morning everyone. First thank you Acting Chair Grodenchik and my fellow Council Members, as well as the representative of the Beach 67th Street project

for being here today and for the opportunity to talk about this upcoming project in my district.

Over the course of the application timeline, I have met with my constituents and the projects developers and public meetings including community board meetings. I've heard from my constituents loud and clear. First and foremost, I recognize the pressing need to create affordable housing across the city. I particularly approve that this project will provide affordable housing for our seniors. Older adults are the keystone of our community. People who have worked their entire lives to find a place to live that is affordable and comfortable. They deserve our continued support.

I also value the inclusion of the school boosting our districts access to education. My constituents have spoken in favor in public meeting and both for the senior housing and school specifically and we are confident that these two developments will benefit our community.

We also know that the nursing home component of the project as well. The nursing home has been part of our community for quite some time and we look forward to continuing to work with them to provide

_ .

vital care for our seniors. However, we wish to have the nursing home removed from the application. It's is important that the content of development projects be clear to the public when those projects are considered for public vote.

My constituents have not been provided that clarity and with that in mind, I look forward to hearing from the developers today and from the members of the public. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you Council

Member. The first panel for this item includes

Richard Lobel Land Use Council for the Applicant.

Eric Keller as the Applicant and Brian Dobrolsky, the

Project Architect. We also have Amanda Iannotti,

Alfred Cockfield, Kevin Williams, Max Meltzer and

Michael Monteleone. If I mispronounced your name, I

ask your forgiveness. As supporting members of the

Applicant team but who are on hand to answer

questions only as needed.

This applicant team will be testifying remotely, so I will now ask that they be promoted and unmuted and Counsel, if you would please administer the affirmation.

Thank you.

ALL PANELISTS: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL:

24

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you Counsel. We have received your slideshow for this presentation for your proposal and when you are ready to present, please say so and it will be displayed on screen by our staff and slides will be advanced when you say next.

As a reminder for the viewing public, if you need an accessible version of this presentation, please send an email request to

landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. And now Mr. Lobel
you and your team may begin. Thank you.

RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you Acting Chair

Grodenchik. Good morning. Richard Lobel from

Sheldon Lobel PC for the applicant. As introductions have already been made, we would launch into the presentation. If someone could post that on the screen, we'd be happy to run through.

So, with regards to the Beach 67th Street

Rezoning, the project summary contains what is sought
by this application, the first of the rezoning of
seven lots on our block, one lot across the block and
the reason it would be from an R4A to an R6 District.

This is involving a 31,000 square foot continuous
lot, seven properties owned or controlled by the

church and this would permit for the development of

two main buildings. The first is a group two nine

2.2

2.3

story airs building on three of the lots with roughly 58,000 square feet and 84 dwelling units. The second being a used complete three 11 story school building for a Charter school or an association of charter schools with roughly 72,000 square feet.

Of course, as with any rezoning, pursuant to

Of course, as with any rezoning, pursuant to mandatory inclusionary housing of this size, there would be the imposition of a mandatory inclusionary housing area over the sites mapping both options one and two. Next slide.

So, here you can see the zoning map and it should be coming up on the screen. This is an area which is zoned, currently zoned R4A, which we zone our 4A in the rockaway neighborhoods rezoning in 2008. So, what can we see from the zoning map here? We can see that there is a good deal of R6 zoning south of East Channel Drive to the south, roughly 84 blocks.

So, this is an area where R6 zoning is well known and is established as far as the context of the area. In the immediate vicinity of the building, we actually have some more buildings. Next slide.

So, you can see the tax map which demonstrates

the R6 and the extended R6 district both on the east portion of east 67th as well as the western portion encompassing currently the [INAUDIBLE 12:04]. We know that the East 67th Street here is not merely a wide street at over 75 feet but a wide street at 85 feet. Wider than other properties and streets within the area, making this an ideal location for the proposed zoning change. Next slide.

So, the land use map demonstrates the building types in the area, including both the eight story nursing home to the west of the site. The five story and with larger floor to ceiling heights, closer to a six story school building to the east of the site, as well as numerous religious institutions and community facilities such as other nursing homes to the South of Beach Channel Drive. So, this is an area where when you look at the context of the area, buildings as they are proposed here are 9 and 11 stories, definitely would fit within the area and we are so thrilled that the community board and the Queens Borough President Office have both expressed their interest and support the proposal. Next slide.

So, I think what we would do with the remainder of the presentation again, we will be brief and have the entire panelist team as well as others available for questions is just to run through some photos of the immediate area. You want to page through the next three pages, you can see both pictures of the site as well as building types in the area.

After looking at these photos, some of which demonstrate the larger buildings in the area, there will be a page showing the highlighted area in red and after that, I would defer to Brian Dobrolsky who can run through the architecture of the project.

After which, I know that Ericka Keller is available and can answer some — give some discussion regarding the program and affordability at this site, as well as Reverend Al Cockfield who can discuss a little bit about the program upon questions from the Council Members.

So, with that, I would hand this over to Brian who can briefly run through the proposal with regards to the buildings, Brian.

BRIAN DOBROLSKY: Hi, here you will see photo which is showing the location of the two new buildings as discussed. Next slide. Uhm, the yellow

1	
_	

on the left is the existing church building which is going to remain on the property. All of the existing vacant lots are going to be merged to one zoning lot and where you see the orange, is where there is going to be the new airs residential building and then to the right of that there will be the community facility which will be a school, charter school.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

Next slide. Again, these are, these are — this is a zoning analysis of the site. Everything is as per code and as of zoning. Next slide. You will see here the school — the existing church on the left is two stories. The residential building is nine stories and the school is 12 stories. Next slide.

And just another view showing that. Next slide.

Next slide. So, here is the site plan of the development. At the front of the building, there will be entry to residential where you see the yellow. To the right of that there will be entry to parking and then at the rear of the building, there will be a rear garden for the seniors to use and as well as uhm, a permit of construction at the school building, which will be a gymnasium inside that building. Next slide.

2.2

2.3

Here is a rendering of the airs residential building. It's nine stories. The building is block and plank. You know we're using light materials that we think will be positively suited to the area. You know fiber some and clouding on the outside and then a bright entry for the seniors that acts as a marker in the community.

Again, the building is nine stories total. Eight of those having residential on the ground level which is in the flood zone is having — is just building entry storage and is wet flood proofed as well as parking underneath the entry on the right. Next slide. Here is the floor plan of the ground level. So, you will see the lobby which provides access all the way through the site to the rear garden. To the right of that there is currently six parking spaces which is as per code. To the left of that is building storage, bike storage, trash and any program that is allowed to be within the flood zone, which these all are. This level will be wet flood proofed. Next slide.

Because we're in a flood zone, the mechanical spaces need to move up to the next level, so on the left you will see where we have our mechanical spaces

2.3

and then there is community rooms, program offices for administrative and then residential, which you see in the orange and red. Next slide.

Again, more residential at the back behind the elevator, we're providing a small community room that provides views for the seniors, which also becomes outdoor spaces staggered through the levels. Next slide. At the setback, we're also providing a community room right next to the laundry room which has access to the setback at the roof. This allows for the seniors to have social interaction and meet different people in the building, creating a greater community in the building. Next slide. And then above that, there is another residential level. Next slide.

The roof wall house, normal mechanical spaces as per code. Next slide. This is a drawing showing where all the flood vents will be, which we need to provide in order to be within the flood zone. Again, all is code. Next slide.

And then here is a rendering of the school building to the right. This is very preliminary right now because the plan for the development is that the residential building will be complete before

the school building starts construction currently. So, this is very preliminary, we still need to work it out. The ground level has parking and building entry again, which is all per code and then above

that there will be levels with classrooms and

gymnasiums etc.. Next slide.

RICHARD LOBEL: With that, I think we may want — given the lustered nature of the school, we may want to just go to the last slide in the presentation.

BRIAN DOBROLSKY: Sure, that's fine.

RICHARD LOBEL: Then we could Ericka talk. We're happy to answer specific questions but maybe Ericka can just talk briefly about the program for the entirety of the affordable and then again, happy to answer any questions from the Councilman.

and thank you for the opportunity to present this project to you this morning. We have partnered with HPD and are proposing a SARA program, so Senior Affordability where the project will offer 83 units of 100 percent affordable housing for seniors age 62 and above using federally funded project-based vouchers. There is a cap where seniors must be at 50 percent and their families must be at 50 percent AMI

2.2

and below. We are offering both studio and one bedroom apartments. There will be one, two bedroom apartment which would be designated as a non-income generating unit or 100 percent full-time superintendent for the building.

There is a 30 percent set aside currently for formally homeless seniors and because we are working with project-based vouchers, there is a preference for New York City. So, applicants will come from across the city. However, we know that there is a tremendous need for affordable housing for seniors across the boroughs.

We are ensuring that we meeting requirement. Ask for the SARA program where we have four percent of the building envelope is set aside for social service. So, there will be a full-time social service provider to the building. We have partnered with HANAC who is known across Queens County for their service of seniors. There will be a full-time social worker available to the residents as well as a part-time case worker. On the second floor, we will have a communal space where there will be opportunity for classes as well as independent social service for the seniors and we will have additional communal

2.2

spaces throughout the building to support the seniors in the building.

We are also ensuring that we have other amenities for the seniors inclusive of recreational spaces on the rear of the building. We have an open plan as designed by the lobby to again support communal as well as sort of porched area for seniors who will be using city amenities such as Access A Ride.

I think that pretty much describes the affordable program. We are seeking subsidy from HPD and tax credits through HCR and are currently applying for their summer round for construction and permanent loan financing. Which is a competitive round for nine percent tax credits.

In reference to the Charter school, that program is less defined but we are having conversations with currently upgrading charter schools as well as new charter schools and are looking to propose an elementary school and servicing approximately 500 students. That would be inclusive of a PreK program as well.

RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you Ericka and with that we would conclude our presentation with two brief notes.

The first is that the last slide demonstrated that

a

2.2

Reverend Cockfield received more than 30 petitions from residents in the surrounding area. This has really been a true collaborative process with the community and second, we would also thank Council Member Brooks-Powers who facilitated these conversations and has produced what we think is going to be just a fantastic, proposed development for this area, which is going to you know bring needed affordable housing and also high quality educational facilities to the local area.

So, with that, we're happy to answer any Council Member questions.

and your team for your presentation. Before we proceed further, we just have a technical clarification and I would like to note that the signup link for the remote witness registration is in fact www.council.nyc.gov/land-use. So, uhm, that is the actual registration this morning and I thank you, all those who take advantage of that.

We're now going to hear questions from the Council Member who represents this district. I'm happy to introduce Council Member Selvena Brooks-Powers.

RICHARD LOBEL: Ericka?

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Thank you so much. So, my first question is just point of clarification. I just wanted to confirm if as a part of the developer team today, is there anyone that is representing the nursing home?

RICHARD LOBEL: So, Council Member, the answer to that question is no. The rezoning's in a city generally include lots that are not owned by the applicants. So, typically, while the applicant owns for example this development site, the nursing home would not need to be part of the application and indeed in most cases applicants include parties around the site.

So, the answer is no. Uhm, you know we represent the church and we're here with the church and with Brisa but there is no representative from the nursing home.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Thank you so much.

Uhm, and I just have a few brief questions. So, one,

I'd like to know if the school planned to be open at

this site, would they be amenable to opening up the

school after hours to provide afterschool programming

for the community?

2.

2.2

ERICKA KELLER: Yes. So, definitely the conversations that we have had and continue to have are all inclusive of a robust afterschool program, as well as possibly weekends, as well as a low work grade to looking at the younger grades as well. As previously mentioned, we're looking at you know the three year old's and four year old's as well as a robust afterschool and social services and amenities we'd use on the weekends.

and I just wanted to underscore how important this is, especially with the rise in gun violence taking place and across the city but especially in the local community. We are looking to create spaces where our kids can really be kids and you know having access to the schools after hours is critically important from the local community, whether they attend the school or not.

So, I am happy to hear that that is something that you plan to do. Uhm, the next question I have is, how are the developers engaging with local — the local workforce as well as MWBE members as well, as it pertains to the build out of this project?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

ERICKA KELLER: So, we are currently engaged with [INAUDIBLE 26:33] Construction and we are working with them through the Pre-Con of the preconstruction Services. And we've spoken very strongly about our expectations regarding MWBE per the patient. We have to meet certain city goals, as well as state mandates since we are being financed through HPD. However, we intend to exceed those and have a plan to do so. do point out that this is a prevailing wage project and that the federal voucher program does trigger prevailing wages. And so, we are you know robustly talking to the uhm, contractor about that fact because we want to ensure that that mandate does not preclude participation of minority and woman business enterprises as it often does because of the requirements regarding certified payroll are very robust and expensive.

And so, we're working and we're thinking strategically about how to ensure that we have an equality and exceed the minimum expectations. We've also been introduced to a local CDC at Ocean Bay that has been successful in working with developers through the NYCHA developments and we intend to work with not only that one but also other CDC's to ensure

that we have local participation in reference to laborers and the direct hires from the general contractor. And we've been in communication with them in reference to that as well to ensure what our expectations are as the developer in reference to exceeding minimum requirements for local hiring.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Thank you so much for that and I definitely encourage the developer team to work with my office. However, we can you know be supportive in promoting the opportunity that you have to the greater community. We're here to do that too. So, thank you so much for responding to my questions.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you Council

Member. Do any of the other Council Members who are
here have questions? Okay, uhm, I have a few
questions for the development team and my first one
is, we saw the staging for the proposed development
and my first question is what is the rational for
approving higher density zoning districts in the
middle of the block and leaving the corners at a
lower density? It's kind of odd. Odd looking
certainly and I have been around awhile. I don't

a

2.2

remember seeing that before. Maybe I just wanted to know why that was done.

RICHARD LOBEL: Sure Grodenchik. So, the rational here was that first of all they looked at the — I want to say the City Planning looked at the local area and what zoning districts would provide additional square footage for the school and a religious institution.

So, the R6 zoning district, despite the fact that it's non contextual and typically is not the subject of a rezoning. Here, the prevalence of R6 throughout the area and again, we mentioned that 84 blocks of the South of Beach Channel permit R6. City planning really felt that that was a strong rational for around in this particular zoning district and in our, in our discussions with the department it was clear that this is something which is familiar to the area.

The fact that this block exists along an 85 foot wide street and has such good access. The fact that the A-train runs on Beach Channel within blocks of this property as well as bus lines which run along Beach Channel. All of these things led to the imposition of an R6 here in that selection.

While it is true that often time rezoning will for purposes of contacts go to the end of a block. Here are the existing R5D particularly to the south of the site which already permits a 2FAR. We seen as being of sufficient contacts to allow for redevelopment should it occur for residential in that area.

It was more that typically if you see an island of R6 among other zoning districts, it might raise concerns specifically with regards to spot zoning but here, given the lane of the development site, particularly the lot area at 31,000 square feet, City Planning felt and we could defend a land use rational which said that this large area merited — it's basically this zoning district. So, there wasn't this same concern that you were saying well, its ruined the context. You know contrary to that, the existing context of area and the existing R5D allow this to kind of work. So, that was the decision not to rezone.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you for that answer. Uhm, did the EAS analyze a reasonable worse case development scenario showing the nursing home as a projected development site and resulting in the

2.2

future displacement of the existing facility and its residents?

RICHARD LOBEL: So, I'm going to defer to Max
Meltzer from Equity on the technical aspects of the
EAS. What I would say and Max can you know, can
support this or provide additional information is
that given the context of the existing nursing home,
the existing nursing home is very overbuilt, so it's
at I think roughly a 1.4 FAR or greater. Maybe even
up to a 1.7 maybe Max can correct me.

The proposed rezoning would result in a potential floor area for that nursing home of roughly 2.43. So, when City Planning looked at the potential redevelopment they said, okay, given the given the fact that you got an existing spot here which is overbuilt with regards to floor area, which is not permitted at this — under the R4A, uhm, we're going to essentially assume that even with the action here it would be rezoned to remain. Again, the property that's included in this, the nursing home is a parking lot to the south of the site. That was not included. They specifically rezoned this nursing home as they do to other properties in order to allow for the nursing home to be complying. This rezoning

takes that nursing home from being way under compliant to being complying and so, I think that was part of the rational for inclusion in the rezoning but also importantly not penciling out a scenario which involved redevelopment. Max is there any — if I may defer to Max, is there any additional commentary you give?

MAX MELTZER: No, so Richard, everything you said is 100 percent correct and uhm, just to reiterate the reasonable worse case developments to analyzes the nursing home site as a projected development site. In this case it's a projected development site and number two, purely for purposes of showing a more conservative analysis. You will also note, the EAS points out that it is unlikely that the nursing home would be redeveloped or displaced but again, it is analyzed solely for purposes of showing a more conservative analysis.

And again, I want to reiterate that the EAS — that the EAS points this out. Their text is in the EAS but states that it is unlikely to be redeveloped and Richard, you're correct. It is — the nursing home would be compliant under the proposed rezoning

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

which is why - which is part of the rational for including it in the land use actions.

RICHARD LOBEL: And just to clarify that nursing home is at an FAR closer to 1.4 instead of 1.3.

MAX MELTZER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Okay, thank you for your The applicant and environmental review mentioned that the nursing home is not currently in compliance with the existing zoning. Could you explain exactly what about the nursing home building is not compliant with the current zoning?

RICHARD LOBEL: So, I would just start and again, Max can supplement my answer with a discussion of four area ratio. The existing nursing home being at a 1.37 is well over the permitted community facility floor area and that would be for a modern nursing home.

So, it's far over on both as far as square footage is concerned, as well as height the RF4A offers an absolute height cap I think maybe of 50 feet. The nursing home right now exists at eight stories. Max, is that your understanding as well?

MAX MELTZER: That's correct yes.

2.2

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Okay, thank you. The property as you stated in the testimony today is in a flood zone. My question now is the flood emergency response plan outlined in the EAS a requirement for the applicant?

RICHARD LOBEL: Max I would just defer that conversation to you.

MAX MELTZER: Sure. So, uhm, you're correct

Council Member. The project is in a flood zone and

you'll note that the EAS outlines several — the

project triggered several policies that we analyzed

and the EAS provides recommendations for flood damage

reduction, elements and controls etc.

And again, the projects in the flood plain and the project was found to not have — to not show any severe impacts and again, it's all stated in the EAS, the ways in which the recommendations that are recommended, that the applicant plans show better in the appendix for proposed flood protections.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Alright, uhm, I do want to make a point of saying we have been joined at this hearing now by Council Member Carlina Rivera and also by Council Member Stephen Levin.

2.3

You mentioned in the testimony — somebody did that the mechanicals for the building of course have been raised. Could you identify some of the other specific components of that plan that you are working with and other resiliency measures that might be optional but that the applicant is pursuing in this plan?

RICHARD LOBEL: Brian?

BRIAN DOBROLSKY: Yes.

RICHARD LOBEL: Yeah.

BRIAN DOBROLSKY: So, our base flood elevation is plus one — our BFE plus one is ten feet. So, our building is actually raised two feet and eight inches above that.

So, level two for us is 12 foot, eight inches above our base plain, so that is one measure. We're required by — because we're in a flood zone to have mechanical spaces have to be above the flood plain so that's why you know our electrical room and a few other ancillary mechanical rooms are located on the second floor and not on the ground level.

On the ground level, we're allowed to have building entry per code in storage and parking. So, those three are the only elements that we have on

that ground level. And we're also required to provide some flood proofing. So, there is wet flood proofing and dry flood proofing. We're providing wet flood proofing. We showed a diagram that has all of the vents in all the locations. So, we have to have a certain amount of vents in every room, so that if water got in, it had the ability to get out, as well as use resilient materials which we are using in those areas in case water does get in.

Uhm, all of the habitable space is above the flood plain by you know a higher height than is required as well.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you for that response. I have no further questions. Council Member Brooks-Powers, anything else?

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: No, thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Okay, thank you. Uhm, seeing no other questions from the panel, the applicant panel is excused. We have nobody currently registered to testify, so if there are any member of the public who wish to testify on the Beach 67th rezoning panel, please press the raise hand button now. For those who are here in the Chambers, please

see the Sergeants now to prepare a speaker card and the meeting will briefly stand at ease for about 30 second. [40:04-40:34].

Alright, there being no members of the public who wish to testify on the Beach 67th Street Rezoning

Proposal under ULURP number C 200230 ZMQ and N 200231

ZRQ, the public hearing on these Preconsidered Land

Use items is now closed and they are laid over.

I will now open the public hearing on the

Preconsidered Land Use item for the 133 Beach 116th

Street Rezoning Proposal seeking a zoning map

amendment on the ULURP number C 210148 ZMQ and

relating to property in Council Member Ulrich's

District in Queens.

Once again, for anyone wishing to testify remotely on this item, if you have not already done so, you must preregister online and you may do that now by visiting the Council's website. If you are here today in person and wish to testify, please see the Sergeant at Arms to fill out and submit a speaker card.

The first panel for this item includes Elyse

Foladare. I hope I pronounced that right. Land Use

Council for the applicant. She will be testifying

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

remotely so I will now ask that she be promoted and unmuted and Counsel if you would please administer

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Ms. Foladare please raise your right hand state your name for the record.

ELYSE FOLADARE: Elyse Foladare.

1

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

the affirmation.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this Subcommittee and in answer to all Council Member questions?

ELYSE FOLADARE: I do. Thank you very much.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you.

ELYSE FOLADARE: Elyse Foladare from Eric

Palatnik P.C. on behalf of the applicant. If you

would like to pull up —

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: One second. We just — I want to thank you for being here today. We have received your slide show presentation for this proposal and it appears you're ready. So, is that a yes?

ELYSE FOLADARE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: That's a yes. Alright and it's going to be displayed on the screen now by staff and slides will be advanced when you say next.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

As a reminder to the viewing public, if you need an accessible version of this presentation, please send an email request to land use testimony - I think we've actually changed that. Okay, no. Okay, landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. And now, please begin.

ELYSE FOLADARE: Thank you so much. Elyse Foladare again. Thank you for having us this morning. Next slide please. We seek a Proposed Zoning Map Amendment that would rezone the area on Tax Block 16226, Lots 25, part of 12, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 from R7A C1-3 to R7A C2-4. located between Rockaway Beach Boulevard and Ocean Promenade. The original intent was to allow the Proposed Zoning Map Amendment to enable the applicant to seek a special permit pursuant to ZR 7336 with the Board of Standards and Appeals to operate a PC, a physical cultural establishment.

While we understand everyone is working on this tax change now, there is a land use rational to move forward with this rezoning. Next slide and thank you. As you can see in the slide, the development site is located on Lots 25 and 23, which is

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

25

constructed with an as of right building. Next slide.

The Proposed action would facilitate two new buildings. Where there are two new buildings, you can see what's around them right now on that slide. That will rise to eight and four stories respectively amongst 23 and 25 and would include 127,799 square feet, 3.99 FAR with 110,707 square feet of residential space and 17,092 square feet of ground floor commercial space, including 20,947 square feet of parking for residential accessory uses with 108 accessory off street parking spaces. The proposed action would facilitate a new mixed use development in the project area to contain residential use and commercial retail space and would enable the applicant to pursue a special permit with the BSA for zoned to the Intersection 7336, to provide a PCE use. Orangetheory Fitness will be occupying that space.

The addition use if permitted by the C24 District would promote the vibrancy of this commercial corridor with increased pedestrian activity. As additional commercial uses such as theaters, art studios and repair shops would be permitted, which are currently lacking given the restrictive nature of

the C 13 District. The C 24 District would allow more types of tenants to occupy the ground floor spaces. In addition, the C 24 District enables the possibility to apply for a discretionary special permit, a demonstrating need given the lack of such facilities present. Therefore, given a similar bulk requirements and enhanced use opportunities, the proposed mixed use district would be consistent with the preexisting mixed use character of Beach 116th Street. Next slide please.

Uhm, as you can see the area that I just described between Ocean Promenade and Rockaway Beach Boulevard where the rezoning would be. Next slide please. Here are some photographs of the as of right building that is currently constructed on Beach 116th Street. Next slide.

And these are the plans, you can go through those quickly. Thank you very much. There are 86 total units in both buildings A and B. It has 78 - 78 and B has eight all units and contracts are in building A and the owner is speaking to commercial tenants for the spaces that are not yet occupied. Thank you so much and I understand that a lot is happening with the PCE special permit and things are changing but we

2.3

still think that the C 24 commercial overlay would be great for this area of Rockaway Beach. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you very much for your presentation. Uhm, is the development occupied currently?

ELYSE FOLADARE: Yeah, there contracting units, so a bunch are selling and some of the commercial spaces have been occupied and Orangetheory will go in very, very soon. This was the whole purpose of this rezoning.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Uhm, if the physical cultural establishment text amendment were approved, would you still need this proposed zoning change to facilitate your project?

ELYSE FOLADARE: Not to facilitate the PCE but to have a lot of these others uses I described. So, the C 24 would allow for more types of uses to go in that ground floor space.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: And does the proposed new commercial overlay reduce required commercial parking at the site?

ELYSE FOLADARE: It does but we are not — we already built the buildings as of right, so there are

100 named accessory all student parking spaces pursuant to the old current zoning.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Okay, I have no further questions for the applicant. Uhm, and once again, I want to note — well, there is there anybody set to testify? Any of the Committee Members have questions? Alright, seeing none, I am going to dismiss the applicant. I want to thank you for being here this morning and wish you good luck as you go forward.

If there are any remaining members of the public who wish to testify on the 133 Beach 116th Street Rezoning, please press the raise hand button now or for anybody who might be in the Chamber, please see the Sergeant at Arms now to prepare a speaker card and the meeting will briefly stand at ease. [49:05-49:20]

There being no other members of the public who wish to testify on the Beach - 133 Beach $116^{\rm th}$ Street Rezoning Proposal under ULURP Number C 210148 ZMQ. The public hearing on this Preconsidered Land Use item is now closed and the item is laid over.

I am now going to open the hearing, public hearing on related Preconsidered Land Use items for

2.3

the 840 Atlantic Avenue Rezoning Proposal, seeking a Zoning Map Amendment under ULURP Number C 210249 ZMK and a related Zoning Text Amendment under ULURP Number N 210250 ZRK and relating to property in Majority Leader Cumbo's district in Brooklyn.

Once again, for anyone following online and wishing to testify remotely today on this item, you must preregister and you may do that now by visiting the Council's website. If you are here today in person and wish to testify, please see the Sergeant at Arms to fill out and submit a speaker card.

It's now my pleasure to introduce your comments.

Majority Leader Ms. Laurie Cumbo.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you Council Member Grodenchik. I appreciate your leadership at this time and I just want to begin by thanking all of my colleagues for being here today. The 840 Atlantic Avenue application before this Committee for public hearing today would facilitate the significant new mixed use development at the corner of Atlantic and Vanderbilt Avenues. Also known to many people as the McDonalds Block.

This development site on the south side of Atlantic Avenue from Vanderbilt all the way to

Nostrand Avenue is within the M-Crown study area where for over five years Community Board 8 has been working together with my office, the Brooklyn Borough President Eric Adams and the Department of City Planning on a proposal to create a dynamic new mixed use neighborhood.

This is particularly of interest because we wanted through this particular process to empower the community and to allow the community to create the framework in which development happens within the community. It was also an opportunity to empower community boards to be able to shape the future of their community, understanding the needs of that same community by the individuals who actually live there.

And from the very beginning of this project along with Borough President Eric Adams, we have spoken enthusiastically about the M-Crown being a catalyst for how Community Boards could work with local elected officials as well as developers to shape what their community should look like and recognizing their needs.

This application will help set the precedent for the wider area and I strongly support community board 8 as I have always said from the very beginning and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

the Brooklyn Borough President and seeking to ensure that this proposal is consistent with the M-Crown plan. Our offices in the Community Board has spent countless hours in community meetings, building local support and consensus for this vision.

I look forward to hearing from the applicant on how they believe their proposal will meet the goals and parameters of the M-Crown plan, which was established long before this application came to the Council and to plan for my constituents and the public on this important development for the future of Community Board 8 and just want to just close by saying, it's so important that Community Boards are empowered to shape their community. They are the ones that live there. They are the ones that have built their communities and it's so important that their voice be heard and that their vision and plan be articulated and it is my hope and belief that the M-Crown will actually become a designated district within the 35th Council District and will set a precedent for how responsible development can happen all across the city. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you Majority

Leader. We're going to now proceed with the first

2.2

panel for this item, which includes Stefani Marazzi and Ben Stark Land Use Council for the applicant and Tom Lee for the applicant.

This panel will testify remotely, so I will now ask that they be promoted and unmuted and Counsel if you would please administer the affirmation.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Panelists, please raise your right hands and state your name for the record.

BEN STARK: Ben Stark Hirschen Singer & Epstein.

TOM LEE: Tom Lee for the applicant.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do we not have Ms. Marazzi?

BEN STARK: Ms. Marazzi will not be joining us.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Panelists, do you affirm to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before this Subcommittee and answer all the Council Member questions?

BEN STARK: Yes.

TOM LEE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Okay, I thank you

Counsel. When you — now I am addressing the panel.

When you are ready to present your slide show for the proposal, please say so and it will be displayed on the screen by our staff. Slides will be advanced when you say next.

Once again, for the viewing public, anyone

wishing to obtain an accessible version of this

landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. And now, Ms.

Marazzi, Mr. Stark and Mr. Lee, you may begin.

presentation, please send an email request to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

BEN STARK:

Thank you for the introduction. Hello again, I am Ben Stark for Hirschen Singer & Epstein for the

Thank you Council Member Grodenchik.

applicant Vanderbilt Atlantic Holdings and whenever your staff is ready, please bring the presentation

forward. Thank you. Thank you.

BEN STARK:

As the introduction went over, this is an application by Vanderbilt Atlantic Holdings to rezone M1-1 Zone property on the southeast corner of Atlantic Avenue and Vanderbilt Avenue in the Prospect Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn. M1-1 Zone Plan to a C6-3X zoning district as is required. Under the Zoning Resolution, the application has -

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Mr. Stark, I'm sorry to interrupt you. The members of the panel, some of us are having trouble hearing you. I don't know if you can get closer to your mic or speak a little more slowly.

Is that better sir?

- 2
- 3
- 4
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 19
- 20
- 2.2
- 2.3

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: A tad maybe.

- BEN STARK: You know what, one moment sir.
- CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Take your time.
- BEN STARK: Is that better sir?
- CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Yeah, I think that's a
- little better. Give us one second. Give us just one
 - second. This is the brave new age we're in. Okay.
 - Alright, Mr. Stark, if you could continue.
 - BEN STARK: My apologies. Is this better?
 - CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Yes.
 - BEN STARK: I will try to speak clearer and
- louder. Thank you.
 - CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you.
 - BEN STARK: As I said, this is an application as
- formerly introduced by Majority Leader to rezone M1-1
- zone land in the Prospect Heights neighborhood of
- 18 Brooklyn on the corner of Vanderbilt Avenue Atlantic
 - Avenue.
 - The application would also establish an MIH area.
- 21 It's a part of the zoning resolution. And the
- application would also amend the text of the Zoning
 - Resolution in order to facilitate a wider more
- pedestrian friendly sidewalks along Atlantic Avenue 24

and Vanderbilt Avenue. Next slide please. Thank you.

The application if accrued would facilitate a new 18 story building that would yield approximately 316 dwelling units. Of which, 95 would be affordable under MIH option two, as the application was filed into ULURP. Although, as we'll discuss later, our applicant team is open to MIH Option one, which would yield 79 affordable, approximately 79 affordable apartments. Next slide please.

Here, we have a rendering of the building. As you can see in this image, the building has proposed if it is contextually with its immediate surroundings, including constructed buildings to the north. On the left hand side of the image at 809 Atlantic and an existing building to the South on the right hand side of the image at Vanderbilt. Next slide please.

The application at 840 Atlantic Avenue on the southern side of Atlantic Avenue, this position in close proximity to Atlantic Center, about a ten minute walk to the west and is positioned just kind of onto the southeast of downtown Brooklyn. And offers an opportunity to make a significant

contribution to the boroughs affordable housing shortage. Next slide please.

The application would zone — a rezone what we consider to be like a legacy M1-1 District mapped in the early 1960's and which has already started to be rezoned via private applications including a recent rezoning directly across the street to the north, that made its way through this particular Subcommittee about a year and a half ago at 809 Atlantic. That's the R9 just to the north of our site you can see in the right hand image. Next slide.

This site includes a number of differ parcels but as Majority Leader introduced, this site is dominated by the drive thru McDonalds that any many people know and are familiar with. Next slide. And you can see it here in this overhead image and you can see that the drive thru McDonalds have entrances on specific exits on both Atlantic and Vanderbilt. Next slide please.

This site on the southside of Atlantic is ideally suited for events from a mixed use building and is contextual with surrounding structures. Next slide.

2.3

Flipping around to the other side on Vanderbilt, this is looking north on the 809 Atlantic site. It was just in the background. Next slide. Bring it around the other side, we're looking south towards the sight and the back is the Vanderbilt building on the right hand side. Next slide.

And you can see as you step forward towards the median that this is the typical condition of area as many might be familiar with. It's a lot of traffic both vehicular and pedestrian. Next slide. What makes this application appropriate for this particular site, well, this is as I said a second ago, it's an exceptionally busy area. Both from a vehicular and pedestrian standpoint. The site positioned between two very wide streets, Atlantic Avenue and 120 feet wide is as many people won't point out to me is wider in Broadway. Vanderbilt at 100 feet wide bounds the other site of the site.

The wide street characteristics give this site
the potential to provide adequate light and air at
the street and pedestrian rail while remaining
contextual with the buildings that surround. The
proximity of transit multimodal both subways within a
short walk, regional rail and express bus lines also

support a dense development at this location. Next slide.

You can see Atlantic Center as provided to us by Google is a mere ten minute walk to the west. Next slide. Clinton Washington Subway Station just about a three minute walk to the north. Next slide. The surrounding context. We feel strongly that the proposal at C6-3X which revealed 195 foot tall building is contextually appropriate given what is both the existing surrounding context and the future context of the area. 809 Atlantic, which we had discussed a second ago, has recently topped out over 300 feet tall. 550 Vanderbilt directly to the west at 205 and our structure will mark a notable step down at 195 feet. Next slide please.

And this is 809 Atlantic. Next slide. Both the structures in one image here, 840 Atlantic in the middle. Next slide please. So, the Majority Leader in introducing this project had asked us, how does this application fit within the M-Crown framework? We believe that it does. We believe the M-Crown framework which was a partnership between both the Community Board and the Department of City Planning. Identify the number of goals for the wider area.

2.

These goals for both housing related and more nonresidential related. Atlantic Avenue, for its part is treated in a number of different ways. For one is treated in a number of different ways by this — during this process. Certain parts of Atlantic Avenue are identified as being most appropriate for nonresidential development. Those areas of Atlantic Avenue were mostly to the east over a half a mile from our site. Whereas housing development was seen as more appropriate on the western edge of the M-Crown.

This site is on the far, far western age of the M-Crown area and has since the beginning of the M-Crown study, always been identified as the location appropriate for the most density. The reasons for this are the reasons we've already discussed in this presentation. It's a double wide street location. It's the proximity of Atlantic center and it's the proximity of other buildings of a tall context.

Our application would facilitate a building that would fit within that context and would meet that vision, that M-Crown had laid out for this particular site. Which as I said a second ago, is appropriate

for a little bit more density than some of the sites on Atlantic to the east.

This dynamic of 840 being appropriate for a touch more, was discussed during the City Planning commission hearings just a few weeks ago. In fact, during the commission's vote on the application, members of the commission took the opportunity to remind stakeholders that whatever zoning is adopted here at 840 does not serve as precedent for the applications that would follow. That as Council Member Grodenchik had pointed out in commenting on the 67th Street Rezoning, corner sites are — there are land use principles that support corner sites being treated differently, the midblock sites.

So, we should not feel as though whatever exact zoning is established at 840 has to be the zoning that moves east of here and in fact, that's not what is called for impound. Impound does not identify specific zoning districts but it does suggest a general contracts. Next slide.

Yes and as I said, the corner of Atlantic Avenue op, okay, op. As I had said, the corner of Atlantic and Vanderbilt is the only area in the M-Crown having received uhm, this particular designation. What it

3

4

5

_

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is calling for here is more housing. Next slide please.

And as I had said, although the M-Crown does not identify specifics, only districts with densities, it proposes a change in density at the corner of Clinton Avenue. This is consistent with the existing context on the northside of Atlantic that yielded the 809 Atlantic project over 300 feet tall. And is appropriate given - next slide. Given the positioning of the AC train having stations, subway entrances on the corner of Clinton and Forman. anticipate that as North Prospect Heights continues to fill out, with as more development occurs in the southside of Atlantic, that foot traffic will likely cross Atlantic right at the corner of Clinton and move north to that station, which supports the proposed context at the corner of Vanderbilt and And these principles, as I sit here, they Atlantic. guide the zoning that was chosen and supported by the City Planning Commission at this location. slide.

The M-Crown framework as I had said, calls for this kind of reduction in density moving east. This stepping down towards the east and these are the

J

principles that guided how we designed this building. We designed the building to put as much of the density on the corner and then step down as we move south and step down as we move east. Next slide.

Thinking about the context moving east on specific, we even established with this rezoning or maintained with this rezoning the existing R6B District on the Pacific. You can see that the building actually steps down notably to only 50 feet in height along Pacific Street. That would be contextual with the townhouse character of that, that particular block. Next slide.

Uhm, as I had said at the beginning, this application was filed under MIH Option 2 but the applicant is comfortable with MIH Option 1 as well. I just wanted to be able to provide her for a quick response what the anticipated rents would be under MIH Option two through the approximately 95 affordable housing units that this building would provide under that particular option. Next slide.

This project has a series of other commitments and these commitments in our view are supportive of the relationship between this development and the community that it will share. This application will

also include — this building will also include two floors of nonresidential, totaling 50,000-55,000 square feet inclusive of an approximately 8,000 square foot non-for-profit dance studio. The dance studio, we proposed to earmark for nonprofit in perpetuity.

So, although we are negotiating a long term well below market lease to give the community comfort that that particular space will remain affordable for a non-for-profit or an arts oriented use. In perpetuity, we are willing to execute and record a restrictive declaration to that affect.

We have a series of other commitments that we have worked through in the last few months, including and back and forth with the Borough Presidents office, the project will be built with a more family friendly unit mix. Including above average mix of two and three bedroom apartments. We will be agreeing to hiring 32BJ building service workers. We commit to hiring — given preference to LBE's and MWBE's during the construction process. We are also going to be partnering with the locally based affordable housing nonprofit service to buildings with administering agent and help us with the

2.3

marketing and the promotion of affordable housing units, especially to the local senior population.

And also coming out at the Borough President hearing process, we refined our commitment to make us part of the building super structure. Certain resiliency and sustainability measures we're exploring doing both the solar array as well as working with the UP on rain gardens at the street level as well as incorporating certain public realm improvements within these wider, more pedestrian friendly sidewalks that the application will facilitate.

I am going to leave this slide up given that I'm sure it will come up perhaps during our question and answer period. But by and large that concludes this introductory presentation and of course we're here to answer and respond to any questions. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you Mr. Stark for your presentation to the Committee. At this time, we are going to hear questions from Majority Leader Cumbo. Are you ready Majority Leader?

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Good afternoon. I just wanted to go right into the height and the density.

In 2008, I wrote a letter to the Department of City Planning alongside Brooklyn Borough President Eric Adams and the Chair of CB8 supporting a commercial zone along Atlantic Avenue with six FAR residential and additional bonus to seven FAR for commercial space as part of the M-Crown framework. Did you consider this letter when crafting your application?

BEN STARK: Yes, we did. Thank you Majority

Leader. Yes, we did. We in thinking about the total

floor area that would be appropriate at this

location, we ran with the idea that seven was a

baseline for Atlantic Avenue as a whole but that in

keeping with the land use principles of a corner

site, being able to accommodate a slightly more

density, we added just about an FAR and a half on the

corner. That we feel is a way to balance both what

is an appropriate context of this location while also

achieving or unlocking the potential here to build

more housing basically. To really meet the

opportunity.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: So, you had the letter,
you reviewed the letter and then you took it upon
yourself and your team to make assumptions about what
you thought could be essentially a better letter by

proposing the extra density. Because when we look at the M-Crown, that particular location fits within the M-Crown. There are no variances based off of whether it's in the corner or the middle or — this is what we saw for the entirety of that particular zone.

So, I just want to be clear because it's very important to understand because in terms of how I like to function as a Council Member. And I understand that value of peoples time, energy and resources that we put forward a framework that we wanted the development team to fit within that framework but you spent time, energy and resources and calculations on a larger framework and so now, here we are at this particular point.

The Proposed C6-3X Zoning is significantly denser than this at over nine FAR and up to 20 stories. The block immediately south of this site east of Vanderbilt is low rise part of the historic district. Does your design consider any transition to this lower density context? And I saw that you did some step downs in terms of your design and architecture but can you further address this question?

BEN STARK: Yes, yes I may. The District immediately to the south of our site can at least

2.2

along Vanderbilt Avenue, buildings upwards of 95 feet tall. Thinking of that, we began or we design our building to make steps to kind of within or four or two of that context. I don't have the massing of the building up in front of me but I believe that with along the Pacific and Vanderbilt corner, the building steps down to about 110 feet tall, which is about 20 feet taller than the district to the south of us is permitted. So, we're kind of making further steps as you cross Pacific, it will make a further step to about 95 and then continue from there.

So, yes, we did try to bring those steps within a four or two of what that would be committed across the street.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Going to the affordable housing, which MIH option do you propose for the development and why? CB8 and the Borough President recommended the deep affordability option be used at this site. 20 percent at an average of 40 AMI, which reduces the percentage of affordable housing from 25 to 20 percent but would require more deeply affordable apartments. Have you considered this request at this time?

BEN STARK: Uhm, I know the applicant has. I think is a great opportunity to interface with my client Vanderbilt Atlantic Holdings. Tom, do you want to answer this question about affordability?

TOM LEE: Sure and thanks for the question

Council Member. Our initial proposal was for Option

Two, which would maximize the number of affordable

units. For us, it was important to include as many

units as possible. And we have heard feedback

previously that in Option One, it's something that we

should consider which we looked at very seriously and

certainly open to. With Option One, there is

actually a portion that is also deeply affordable and

also, we get the benefit of having a larger number of

units.

Going down to Option Three, I think we lose another 20 units or so of affordable units and to us, having around 40 percent AMI to 60 percent AMI to 80 percent AMI is a better choice in a building like this.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I appreciate your opinion. However, what we're talking about really here and because of the bedroom mix can change these numbers in many ways, we're talking about a

2.3

significantly larger density for the ability to acquire potentially 15 or 20 units of affordable housing. So, it's really that question between, do we sacrifice the character of this historical community with greater density for potentially 15 or so additional apartments? And while apartments are certainly important at this time, we also don't want to further erode the character of that community.

The buildings that you showed or highlighted in your presentation are not a part of the M-Crown District. So, to continue to encroach upon the M-Crown District continues to allow other developers to come in and say, well, look at what happened here on this project. We should be able to do something larger, a block away because of what happened at the end point of the M-Crown project.

So, I also wanted to ask if you're proposing to partner with a local not-for-profit organization to be the administering agent for the affordable housing?

BEN STARK: Yes.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: And have you identified what that local not-for-profit organization would be?

2.2

2.3

BEN STARK: We have a few that we're considering.
We have not made a selection yet at this stage.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: It's really important for you to understand the local community and what organizations are most qualified to do that work within the community. The M-Crown space also calls for a planning vision for a mixed use development with housing, jobs and a diversity of community enhancing uses. Does your proposal meet those goals and how so?

BEN STARK: We believe that it does quite strongly. Our project is proposed to have to full floors of nonresidential uses totaling upwards of 55 plus thousand square feet, which is a significant chunk of this building, given that the first two floors are, are, are more full. Whereas the residential floors don't occupy the entirety of this site.

Uhm, of that 55,000 plus square feet, we intend to develop both space for like we had talked about, a non-for-profit community facility space. 8,000 plus square feet and also space for retailers, including local retailers. We think, at least in relation to M-Crown, we think that this mixed use framework, a

on the sidewalk.

mix of commercial community facility residential uses is what is appropriate inside of the M-Crown for this particular location. As the M-Crown study discusses or the framework discusses and shows, the land cabinet was not a monolith and neither the M-Crown is either. There are parts of the M-Crown are more appropriate for industrial uses and there are other parts of the M-Crown that are more appropriate for all transformational community facility space and a lot of that is very site specific. Industrial uses for example, really are not great when located on very wide streets at intersections because of the interaction between deliveries, pedestrian movements

And so, when we start to hammer down what the exact best uses are for this particular site, it was clear to us that a transformational community facility space would be what is appropriate here.

Can you imagine the population of Prospect Heights is growing. People are walking more on Vanderbilt and right up on the street along these widened sidewalks we have. This great space for a non-for-profit band studio beckening, holding people into the building.

That's kind of our vision in how it lines up with you know Crown's call for notable nonresidential spaces.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: But haven't you seen on Atlantic Avenue for as long as I can remember, it has been an avenue that's been full of industrial manufacturing uses, so on and so forth. So, that has really been a space within Brooklyn New York where manufacturing, all types of industrial spaces where there is deliveries, there is pick up. There are all these sorts of spaces that Atlantic Avenue seems like it was almost designed to be.

The idea of the residential is in many ways a new concept, more so than the industrial and the retail.

Outside of the not-for-profit space, what other uses are you considering for the remainder of the 40,000 plus square feet.

BEN STARK: Tom.

TOM LEE: Sorry, we're losing the signal I see.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Excuse me?

TOM LEE: The City Council, we're seeing cutting in and out for a few seconds there. Uhm, we have — we're considering ground floor retail with other commercial uses on the second floor. Essentially having office space on the second floor.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Are you willing to enter into a binding agreement to memorialize a commitment

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Have you been in discussions with any particular companies, organization or have you even thought about what the mix should even be in terms of are you looking at a supermarket. You may not know the supermarket but are you looking at a supermarket? Are you looking at a doctors office? Are you looking at a gym or a daycare or what are some of the uses that you are looking at? Are you looking at a craft studio or those sorts of uses?

Uhm, we have had a preliminary TOM LEE: conversation with a grocery store to potentially take a portion of the space. Uhm, we would like to think we have a variety of tenants, not just one or two for the ground floor space as part of it's size. would like to have some local restaurants, food and beverage options, maybe a pharmacy but I think the key point is to have a mix. Since as part of our mission, we're also widening the sidewalk. We want to make sure this whole corner becomes more pedestrian friendly. The building interacts with the public, it's not just any use commercial space.

2.2

2.3

to low cost art space? As you have proposed today in

3 | this hearing.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: This is the — at this time, this is the low cost art space that you have discussed in terms of your partnership with Creative Outlet Dance Company.

TOM LEE: Yes, we would be willing to enter into binding agreements.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Now, let's say Creative

Outlet stays there for ten years and they outgrow the space and they decide they want to move into another space somewhere else. What will then happen to that space?

TOM LEE: It will remain permanently affordable.

We will have it open for the next growing local nonprofit to take the space and I think we'd be very
happy to see that for them to outgrow the space. It
means they have a very good organization that at some
point in the near future, move into a bigger space.

But this will stay permanently affordable for the
community.

2.2

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: How do you incrementally decide what the increase in space rental costs will be? So, in other words is it going to be let's say a 1.3 percent every year and even after a change from one space to the next space, wanting to ensure that there is not some dramatic jump in terms of what the increase for the space rental would be between one tenant to the other tenant?

TOM LEE: I think we will follow some kind of increase based on a CPI, so that it attracts inflation. It's really to recover basic costs for having that space. In fact, I think we're losing a significant amount of money to build a space. It's a good space to have.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Do you have a plan in place to ensure local hiring and M/WBE participation during construction?

TOM LEE: Yes, we are — we want to meet the city and state requirements. We want to see that. In the past, we've seen those numbers exceeded and in terms of building services, we're working with 32 BJ to identify local members to staff the building once the building is complete.

2.

_

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: How many local hires would typically be involved in a project like this?

TOM LEE: The signal is cutting out, so I didn't hear the question.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Excuse me, I didn't hear you.

TOM LEE: The signal cut out for a few seconds again. Could you repeat the question?

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: My question was how many local hires would typically be involved in a project like this? How many people do you plan to hire from the local community as it pertains to construction on this site?

TOM LEE: I think there's a percentage that's - sorry, the signal keeps on cutting out.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Are you not able to hear my question?

TOM LEE: No, your — the City Council screen \mbox{keeps} on going to no signal in and out constantly.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: So, can you hear me at this point?

TOM LEE: Yes, I think it would be you know between 30 plus percentage from a LBE and WMBE.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: How can we ensure follow up and progress reports on these commitments?

TOM LEE: I'm sure we can work out a system to track that and to ensure that happens. I don't - I think HPD and other city programs have monitoring programs pertaining to these requirements.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: So, I just want to ensure with this that the ability to hire locally is going to be really of foremost concern. As we've seen with a lot of the issues that are happening in our communities, a lot of the violence that we're seeing is happening in our communities is traced most back fundamentally to a lack of jobs and opportunities within our communities.

So, the ability to hire local supersedes almost all aspects of any project that we do at this point because we want to ensure that the local community is benefiting from the growth and the development that they are seeing in their own communities.

So, a real plan on local hiring with real partners and we can help you identify who those partners should be, is going to be critical in moving forward and also achieving my support as well as the support of this Council.

And just finally going into sustainability and resiliency, what sustainability and resiliency measures are incorporated into the buildings design and construction? Such as incorporating blue, green, white roof treatment, passive house, rain garden, solar panels or wind turbines?

TOM LEE: I think the easy question is all the above. All items you just stated. I think we are incorporating all those into the design of the building. I think it makes perfect sense to have a white roof, solar panels, we considering a vertical wind turbine as part of the design and you know, rain garden is very important to have to make sure there is not access run off of water, rain water.

So, the short answer is all of those items are being considered as part of the building rezoning.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I don't have any further questions. I just want to reiterate as I have stated earlier, my position stands with the Borough President in the letter that we wrote in 2018. We were clear then. We are clear today and we're hoping to turn the tide as far as the empowerment of our community boards to shape the communities that they actually live in versus where the developers actually

live. It's important that we empower the neighborhoods where this development is happening so that people understand and know that they have power to shape their community and its surrounding environment. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you Majority

Leader Cumbo for your questions this day. I have a

few questions for the panel and uhm, the first

question I have, could you confirm that in the

portion of the site that fronts on Atlantic and at or

near the rear lot line where there appears to be a

one story building portion. Could you just confirm

that you are subject to in compliance with the

transition rule. If you are having difficulty with

that question, I would request that you answer the

Committee staff in writing.

BEN STARK: We're happy to follow up with

Committee staff on that question but yeah, the short

answer I can give is that if adopted, if the C6-3X

zoning is adopted, we of course have to comply with

the transition rule, the maximum height transition

rule on the portion of the building in the R6B

District and a portion of the building in the C6-3X

adjacent to the R6B District. And in compliance with

2.2

Z 4

of course be enforced by Department of Buildings during a zoning review and we have to comply with,

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Okay, alright, so staff will be waiting for that answer. Uhm, you showed the unit mix for Option Two, can you share with us the breakdown for Option One with regard to studio onebedroom, two-bedroom etc.

BEN STARK: We presented Option Two. We're happy to follow up with Council staff on what the breakdown would be for Option One. We — as we had said that we intend with this particular development to have a higher proportion of two and three bedroom apartments and of course that will influence what the proportions of two and three bedroom apartments would be for the affordable units.

Which as we all know, under HPD ranks it kinds of runs — we have to mirror one another. So, we can put together a kind of mock up of what the breakdowns would be for a unit mix and then what the associated rights would be.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Okay, thank you. Uhm, with regard to parking, how much will be required and I understand it's 40 percent of market unit rates but

2.2

2.3

about 95 spaces. Will this parking be built below grade and did you consider applying for a special permit to wave parking requirements?

BEN STARK: I mean I can answer the second question, which is no. There is no special permit here to wave parking. As you noted, the parking requirements for the market rate units is 40 percent. The parking requirement for the affordable units is notably less given the projects positioning within the transit zone. The amount of parking that overall will actually be required as a function of the number of market rating, you know it's the number of affordable units and also the size and typology of the nonresidential uses.

So, we can in say sharing with Council staff, a proposed unit mix under MIH Option One, we can also make an estimation on what the associated partner requirements would be using the MIH Option One Affordable Housing figures.

TOM LEE: And to answer the first part of the question, we're currently contemplating as the building is designed 90 parking spaces below grade and when we were speaking with people from the community, people who live in adjacent buildings, we

_ _

2.2

as developers, we would be happy to not build parking. We've met with people in the community that express interest that there is a shortage of parking spaces in the neighborhood and they were wanting to see this building with a few parking spaces that would be used by tenants who were not living in this building. So, other people can use these parking spaces.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Alright, thank you for answering those questions and for answering the Majority Leader's questions. At this time, uhm, we have no further questions of this panel and the panel is excused.

BEN STARK: Thank you very much.

TOM LEE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you. Alright, the first public panel on this item will include and will be Ethel Tais[SP?] and then the following panel will be William Thomas and Austin Selestan[SP?]. So, and again I want to — well, we're going to promote those —

Okay, Ms. Tais is unavailable at this time. So, we're going to go to the second panel, which I believe is here with us in the Chamber today.

2.3

William Thomas and Austin Selestan. Please step forward.

WILLIAM THOMAS: Hello everyone, my name is
William Thomas, I am here to support the project as a
representative and the Executive Director of Open New
York. We're an independent grassroots pro-housing
organization. We support 840 Atlantic because
allowing more home here would help both to alleviate
New York's housing shortage and help to fight high
ranks in displacement. I believe everyone knows on
some level that New York has a terrible housing
shortage but let me throw out some numbers to remind
everyone how bad it is.

Between 2010 and 2017, median ranks increased by more than double median wages. Homelessness has reached the highest level since the great depression. Pre-COVID, one out of every ten elementary school students in New York City public schools attended from homeless shelters. In this environment, we need every bit of affordable housing we can muster and the 95 below mark units that this rezoning offers is a great place to start.

With that said, allowing more market rate homes in Prospect Heights injectively wealthy enclave in

2.2

2.3

the city will also help by preventing displacement in other neighborhoods. The census track for the rezoning area has a median household income of over six figures. Prospect Heights is a very desirable neighborhood and although the likely many families first choice, if they can't find a place to live here, they will simply move to a more affordable neighborhood.

As that displaced demand increases, up goes the rent forcing current tenants to allocate ever larger shares of their incomes to stay in their homes and knocking those who can't pay to the street. If we don't let young professionals live here, they are not going to disappear, they are going to continue to gentrify neighborhoods in Brooklyn by Crown Heights, Bed-Stuey and Brownsville. By contrast every new home here will spare a family that pressure.

To put it bluntly, we live in a city where there aren't enough homes for the people who want to live here. It is horrifying human consequences. I know this is a little denser than what the M-Crown study called for but the scale of the housing crisis, I think really demands we think bigger.

2.2

2.3

envisioned.

In addition, Borough President Adams just won the democratic primary on a housing platform specifically calling for up zoning wealthier neighborhoods for affordable housing. I hope this election can give us the confidence to move forward on that platform even if it is not exactly what the Community Board

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you for your testimony this morning and for being with us today at City Hall. Mr. Selestan?

AUSTIN SELESTAN: Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Yes.

Thank you.

AUSTIN SELESTAN: Okay, good afternoon. Three minutes into it, I was like good morning. My name is Austin Selestan, I am a MYU student studying a redesign. When hearing conversations about projects like this and other projects throughout the city, I also hear precedent zoning.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Can you speak a little closer to the mic?

AUSTIN SELESTAN: Yeah, sorry. Uhm, but I just wanted to ask, we need to defend character and context in zoning but at what cost? The past five decades not one of the past five decades, we have

3

built more housing than we did during the great depression. If we were cobble together the total

number of units built in the last 50 years, we built 4

less housing in the past 50 years than we did in just

the 1920's. This has resulted in once middle class 6

7 neighborhoods turning into exclusive [INAUDIBLE

1:43:31] out of reach for pretty much anyone not 8

making six figures. It has also resulted in the

gentrification of a myriad of neighborhoods across 10

11 the city.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

Maybe it is a little bit taller than the surrounding area but every little bit of housing is going to contribute to tackling the housing crisis that I am sure all of you can acknowledge that we're undergoing right now. Prospect Heights has a six figure median income and is disproportionately White, no matter how you spin it. In the city, in the borough, on Long Island, 55 percent White is much higher than the city's average.

95 affordable units will go a long way or at least a short way to contributing to solving this housing crisis. It's also worth mentioning that those 95 units of affordable housing would be in walking distance from the C-train, the D-train and a

Part of our artistic and cultural mission

25

2.2

through the arts is about education, getting young people and professionals to Broadway television and film. Also, cultivating people to entrepreneurs, using the arts as a vehicle to get the community involved in many different activities as well.

We are for the project. We are looking forward to having a home in downtown Brooklyn. We've been in Brooklyn before all the development has happened the last 15 or so years. So, we're excited about the project and we want to stay here in Brooklyn and grow with the Brooklyn community.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you Mr. Gaines for your testimony. Ms. Griffler?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Your time will begin.

KATE GRIFFLER: Good afternoon, my name is Kate
Griffler, I am an Associate Producer as well as a
Dancer for Creative Outlet. I am in favor of this
project. We've been working with Tom Lee on getting
a space, a home base for Brooklyn for our dance
artists and the community. And we're very, very
looking forward to this home. Creative Outlet is an
organization that is deeply rooted in the Brooklyn
community, especially works with communities of color
and our institution would not only help the

2.2

2.3

testimony Ms. Griffler. Ms. Williams.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK:

professional dance artists but students, adults, young artists. We offer scholarship programs and we offer under market value costs for our classes.

As Jamel said, many of our artists go on to Broadway Theatre film, TV and as far as creating jobs, we would probably bring in 25 to 30 teaching artists, ten administrators. We would bring in probably 50-100 summer youth employment students as well. And we are really looking forward to creating a community here in Brooklyn. As a dancer myself, I have to train in Manhattan because there are not classes available for me to train as a professional dancer in Brooklyn. Although Mark Morris is very close, they don't offer the types of classes I need to be a dancer and make it in New York City.

Also, Brooklyn doesn't have a Black led dance organization and our community is mostly made up of people of color and they need a home base and they need an art center that would appropriately cater to their needs. So, we hope that we will get our space. Thank you so much.

Thank you for your

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Your time will begin.

MARRISSA WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, my name is

Marrissa Williams and I am a Representative of 32BJ.

I am here today on behalf of my union to express our support for the proposed project at 840 Atlantic Avenue.

32BJ supports responsible developers who invest in the communities where they build. 32BJ has more than 3,000 members who live or work in Community Board 8 and we believe that the best way to make sure that developments like the one proposed have a positive impact on building service workers and the community is for developers to make a formal commitment to pay the prevailing wage.

In light of this, we are pleased to let you know that the developer affiliated with this project Vanderbilt Atlantic Holdings, LLC, has made an early commitment to creating prevailing wage building service jobs at this site. The developer has a long time partnership with 32BJ and a track record of creating good jobs throughout their portfolio.

We estimate that this will be to the creation of five new building service jobs and we are fully in support of this project. We have full confidence that at the Atlantic buildings will be a responsible

employer and present in the community. We know that this development will continue to uphold the industry standard and provide opportunities for working families to thrive in Crown Heights.

On behalf of 32BJ and CIU, I respectfully urge you to approve this project. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you for your testimony and Deja Miller now.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Your time will begin.

DEJA MILLER: Hi, my name is Deja Miller, I have been dancing with Creative Outlet since I was seven-years-old. I am 18-years-old now, so I thought it was really important that I come here and let everyone know that Creative Outlet getting their own building and space to flourish will be really, really good for the community and I know firsthand because of what they have done for me.

Like I said, I've been dancing with them since I was seven-years-old and my personal story is that my family isn't the most perfect but whenever I am able to speak to Jamel or some of the other professional artists, I always feel like I have a safe space and I feel like it is really important that the entire community is able to have access to that. Because

not only am I now going onto theatre in college but I know teachers that have now started their own dance programs and their acts and their singing and now, they are professionals at what they do on Broadway and it's really important that we open our arms and minds to help people that might not be as fortunate as everyone else, so that they also have that outlet. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you for your testimony. This panel is now dismissed. I am going to introduce the next panel. Cynthia McKnight, Dove Fetter, Daniel Rogoff and Douglas Hanau(SP?). And when we're ready to begin, Cynthia McKnight will be first.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Your time will begin.

CYNTHIA MCKNIGHT: Good morning everyone. Well, actually it's good afternoon now. My name is Cynthia McKnight and I am here on behalf of Community Education Council 13. I am a parent leader and also the former PTA President at PS 11 in Dock Street School. I am also a resident of District 35. I am here on behalf of the parents, the teachers and the community members who could not attend this meeting.

15

16

25

2 I am also a union leader for AFGE local 913, a 3 HUD housing, an urban development and I can say that 4 our community desperately needs affordable housing. There is a lot of families who can not afford to stay in District 35. I help a lot of families look for 6 7 affordable units and it's very dear dire need for 8 this. So, I am pleading for the approval of this plan in order for our families to take advantage of great schools in District 13. And also, with HUD, we 10 11 are releasing a lot of vouchers through President 12 Biden's plan and it would be a shame that people 13 would have to stay and high poverty areas.

So, please approve this plan. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Majority Leader Cumbo?

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: I just want to say hello

17 to Cynthia McKnight. Always an honor to have the

18 | hardest working woman in District 35 here with us

19 today and your testimony of course is a very

20 | important one and will be waited heavily. Always an

21 honor to work with you and to have you here today.

22 | Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you Majority

24 Leader and thank you Ms. McKnight. Dove Fetter?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Your time will begin.

_

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Alright, let's see if we can get Mr. Fetter back. In the meantime, Daniel Rogoff.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Your time will begin.

DANIEL ROGOFF: Hi, thank you for your time. I'm a lifetime Brooklynite. My parents immigrated here from Lebanon. I was born in Brooklyn. I grew up in Brooklyn. I've lived my life here pretty much exclusively outside of college. Right now, I live in Fort Greene. My name works at Maimonides and my entire family, including my three-year-old son love it here.

And my vision for my life since day one, was to settle down and grow up, raise a family here in Brooklyn the same way I did and in close proximity to my parents, my siblings, my wife's siblings. But I am reaching the bitter realization that I don't know how feasible that is. I know there is a very simple reason. Housing is outrageously expensive. I'd have to earn on the order of \$1 million a year to afford a home for a family of four in Fort Greene. It's not feasible and projects like this one would alleviate that burden in a major way. I'm eagerly awaiting the day when our elected officials start prioritizing

2.2

2.3

people and families over the historical character of neighborhoods and don't roll their eyes at the prospect of an additional 15 or 20 affordable apartments that could help families like mine settle down and live in this city.

The same way I am eagerly awaiting the day when my own elected Council Members start representing the thousands of people like me in their choices for community board members and when those community boards actually start representing the needs of the people in their communities and not their own personal ones. Thank you very much for your time.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you Daniel. Have you ever actually been outside of Brooklyn? That's a joke, I'm teasing you.

DANIEL ROGOFF: In college. It was nice, they people build houses there.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Well, welcome. Your thoughts will be your desires will certainly be waited and we thank you so much for your testimony and for being on this Zoom for over two hours, awaiting your time to speak and we'll certainly take into consideration your testimony here today. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: Thank you and thank you Majority Leader and now Doug Hanau - Douglas Hanau.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Your time will begin.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Yes.

DOUGLAS HANAU: Yes, hi, hi, can you hear me?

DOUGLAS HANAU: My name is Douglas Hanau; I have lived in Brooklyn only 25 years but I have lived in New York City my whole life. I used to live in Oueens.

I love a good meeting where we talk about material and we talk about transitioning to the historic district and how the building look but this is about people. This is about human beings and the ability of human beings to live in New York City, the most wonderful city that's given me everything. I'm raising two amazing children here. I am lucky enough to have bought a house 25 years ago in Brooklyn. I didn't do anything special. I didn't build this community. I bought a house, the neighborhood turned fancy and I am benefiting from that. It really wasn't anything I did. But I want my kids and I want my kids friends and their future colleagues and the people they work with and people who do not live in New York City but come here for a million reasons.

2.2

2.3

To work, to get away from small towns, to enjoy the
arts and the culture. They won't get a chance if we
don't build projects. This project and projects like
this all over the city. I want this. This has to
happen. We can't stop this because it doesn't

transition properly to the neighborhood across the

8 street.

This is about people and people cannot come to

New York to live anymore because it's too expensive.

So, we need more housing. We need more affordable

housing. We need more housing close to

transportation to address climate change, to address

the car culture that we live in. We have to move

away from cars, move to public transportation, move

to housing, a lot of it affordable. Much of it not,

that's fine too.

So, please, please, please, pass this and you know no project is perfect. No project is going to meet everybody's needs and wants but this is a great project and it's a great starting point for Brooklyn and for New York City. Thank you.

MAJORITY LEADER CUMBO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: For the record, I have never lived in Brooklyn but I was born in the Bronx

and I've lived my entire life in Queens. I thank you all for testifying this morning. We have one more panel that we're going to hear from at least and that consists of David Ratner, William Mean and Joe Garzone(SP?). So, if we could have David Ratner.

Mr. Mean if you would like to start?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL:

WILLIAM MEAN: Sure, hi, my name is William Mean.

Your time will begin.

I am a Prospect Heights resident and I would like to voice my support for 840 Atlantic. I think this project is exactly the kind of new building that the neighborhood needs. We're a wealthy neighborhood, tons of resources, like ten or so subway lines and those below market rate apartments will help welcome lower income families who are currently priced out.

I would like to request that the developer consider MIH Option One, so that these homes will be available to people who really need that subsidy and produce class segregation in the neighborhood but to maintain that higher number of affordable units, I'd like for them to apply for a parking waiver.

Some people claim this building is too big and dense for the local community but at the end of the day, the density is what makes New York City the best

_

city in the country and you know possibly the world some people think. And the people who live at 840 Atlantic, will help make Vanderbilt Avenue, Atlantic Avenue and the open street even more lively and enjoyable.

Not to mention the existing use of this site, if we don't approve, it is a huge parking lot. It's terrible to walk past. It's really hot now with the asphalt in the summer and you are in constant risk of getting run over by someone their McNuggets.

So, the building with the wider sidewalks would be a massive improvement. And my request about the parking, is that the developer completely eliminate the parking spots.

While some members who might have a car themselves, might want more parking so there is less competition for those spaces, studies show that when you provide parking, just the residents will buy it up and there will be more car spewing CO2 and PM2.5 particles. The zoning should be you know, garages are expensive to build and we're weighing car storage against homes for people and I want them to prioritize people over cars. Especially when there is like ten subway's right next door.

2.3

So, besides the parking, I think this is a good project. Just really try and maximize you know affordability here but I look forward to having these residents as my neighbors.

CHAIRPERSON GRODENCHIK: I thank you for your testimony Mr. Mean and thank you for your patience today and waiting to testify. I don't believe — is Mr. Garzone here? I don't think he is with us. I don't see him. Okay, if there are any remaining members of the public who wish to testify on the 840 Atlantic Avenue rezoning proposal, please press the raise hand button now or for those who might be here in the Chambers, please see the Sergeants now to prepare a speaker card and the meeting will briefly stand at ease. [2:03:23-2:03:59]

There being no other members of the public who wish to testify on the 840 Atlantic Avenue rezoning proposal under ULURP Numbers C210249 ZMK and N210250 ZRK, the public hearing on these preconsidered land use items is now closed and the items are laid over.

I want to remind New Yorkers that you may submit written testimony to the Council by email at landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. I want to thank my

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date August 10, 2021