CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

----- X

August 18, 2014 Start: 10:00 a.m. Recess: 11:29 a.m.

HELD AT: 250 Broadway, Committee Room, 16<sup>th</sup>

Floor

B E F O R E: MARK WEPRIN

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Margaret Chin
Helen Rosenthal
Ritchie Torres
Daniel Garodnick
David Greenfield
Antonio Reynoso
Ritchie Torres
Donovan Richards
Jumanne Williams

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

Robert S. Bookman, Esq. Pesetsky and Bookman

Shlomo Steve Wygoda SWA Architecture, PLLC

Batya Lewton Coalition for a Livable West Side

Susan Cassidy President of the Board The Majestic

Kay Sheehan Resident of Oliver Cromwell

Jan Levy Resident of the Majestic

Marin Algaze

Susan Rutner

Richard Bloom

Nina Pinsky

Lewis Boxenbaum

Marion Conti

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

Funsho Owolabi Legislative Director for State Assembly Member Linda B. Rosenthal

Josh Cole

Edward Lyons
Douglas Elliman Property Management

Jerry Kahn

David Schwartz

Steven Sinacori Akerman LLP

2	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay we're going to
3	get started. Good morning everyone, my name is Mark
4	Weprin I am the Chair of the Zoning and Franchises
5	Subcommittee and I am joined this morning by the
6	following members of the subcommittee to start,
7	Council Member Ritchie Torres, who was the first one
8	here. Thank you Ritchie. Council Member Dan
9	Garodnick, Council Member Antonio Reynoso, the Chair
10	of the Land Use Committee, David Greenfield is here.
11	We are also joined by two members who have an item ir
12	their district on this agenda. Council Member
13	Margaret Chin and Council Member Helen Rosenthal.

We have three cafes and one land use application. One of the cafes has a lot of people here to testify and we're going to do that as the last of the cafes, out of the three cafes.

The land use item on Woodward Avenue will go on after the cafes. So it might be a little while. Those who are here for Woodward you may want to realize that it may take a little while.

So let's get started. We're going to start with Council Member Chin's district, Land Use #104. And that's Sant Ambroeus. Robert Bookman is here on behalf of this applicant, well with his

2 client. Mr. Bookman has been here before so I don't
3 have to tell him to make sure to state your name when

4 you speak and describe your application.

ROBERT BOOKMAN: Good morning Mr.

6 Chairman and members of the committee. My name is

7 Robert Bookman from the law firm of Pesetsky and

8 Bookman. I'm here on behalf of the sidewalk café

9 applicant, 265 Lafayette Ristorante LLC d/b/a Sant

10 Ambroeus. With me is Gherardo Guarducci one of the

11 principals of the applicant.

5

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Great. Could you please describe what it is you're asking for?

ROBERT BOOKMAN: We're asking for an approval of what's called a small café. It's one row of tables up against the wall. Six tables of two each. We worked closely with Council Member Chin's office to resolve certain issues which came up and with your Land Use staff. I want to thank the staff of both of their offices for working with us so that we were able to clarify there were some plans that needed to be clarified, which we did. As well as a letter of understanding that we have with Council Member Chin concerning a related or unrelated,

Member Chin concerning a related or unrelated,

depending on your position, other location.

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Understood. What

I'm going to do now then is to call on Council Member

Chin who I know has a statement to make. Council

Member Chin.

COUNCIL MEMBER CHIN: Thank you Chair I'm also going to read the letter into the Weprin. record later. Good morning, my name is Council Member Margaret Chin. While I understand that Sant Ambroeus is applying today for a sidewalk café permit for their 263 Lafayette Street location in my district. Our community has raised concerns about the operators other location at 259 West 4<sup>th</sup> Street, in part because of the lack of a sidewalk café license there. I'd like to thank the operator for agreeing to cease operation at the other location by the end of this month as a gesture of good faith. The operator has brought a letter, a copy of a letter for us, outlining this promise. And I would like to read it into the record.

Dear Council Member Chin. Pursuant to my telephone conversation with your staff, we have agreed to the following: At the collop [sic] of the sidewalk café application for 265 Lafayette
Ristorante LLC d/b/a Sant Ambroeus, at 263 Lafayette

Member Chin. Do any members of the panel have any

questions for these gentlemen? I see none so...

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

(Interpose)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

ROBERT BOOKMAN: I misspoke, its seven tables and fourteen seats. Not six and twelve.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: No problem. And we understand that revision. That number was submitted to us and to DCA so we thank you for that. So with that in mind I'm going to close this hearing. And thank you very much for coming.

ROBERT BOOKMAN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: We've also been joined by Council Member Donovan Richards from Queens. Is there anyone else here who is here to testify on this item? I don't see anyone. So we are going to close that hearing and move on. We're going to move onto 106 which is 755 Washington Trattoria. Sebastian Widmann and Mr. Wygoda, Shlomo Wygoda. Does he have a thing? He's here for two of them right. Steve Wygoda is here on behalf of this establishment. Mr. Wygoda you too have been here before so I expect you to know the rules. Just make sure to always state your name when you're speaking if more than one person is speaking, especially so the record can be clear. Um, so Mr. Wygoda whenever you're ready.

SIEVE WIGODA: IS IC OII: 165. GOOD
morning Chair Weprin. Thank you for your time. And
committee members. My name is Shlomo Steve Wygoda.
I'm an architect. I represented Sebastian Widmann
and his restaurant. This is a modification of an
existing restaurant sidewalk café that he's had for
many years. Um, what we've done is asked to add some
seating on Washington Street. He's had seating on
Bethune for quite some time. And what he did was
modify the storefront on Washington Street. It's a
landmark building so that's been completed.

So we've worked also with staff, with Peter. And this is Council Member Corey Johnson's district. So we've come to an agreement, um, with this location. And if I may I can read the letter into the record.

[Pause]

Can I read the letter into the record?

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Yes please. I apologize.

STEVE WYGODA: Dear Council Member

Johnson. This letter should serve as our agreement
with the Chair Council Member Mark Weprin and the
encompassing members of the Subcommittee on Zoning

statements. Unfortunately, we're going to have to limit people to about two minutes each. And we're going to put you on a clock. So if in your head, and I know a few of you, and two minutes I know is tough for some of you. No, two minutes, if you can try to put in your head to limit it to two minutes and we'll try to keep you to that. It will be disrespectful to let people go much more, any more than that. But we'll put you on a clock. So I just want you to know that ahead of time.

Alright, gentlemen, whenever you're ready, could you please describe the application for Reposo 72, Land Use #105.

STEVE WYGODA: Good morning again. My name is Shlomo Steve Wygoda. I am an architect. In this situation I am not the architect for the sidewalk café, I'm just assisting Carlo who is the architect for the sidewalk café. With me is Phil Alotta who is the owner. Um, this sidewalk café is located on 20, I'm sorry 50 West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street and the original application was made for a seating capacity... If I may, yeh, yeh.

[Pause]

The original application was made for a capacity of 16 tables and 30 seats.

[Background talk]

And yeh, okay. And we've been in discussions. Had community board meeting and have been in discussions with Council Members Helen Rosenthal's office and her staff. And we have come to an agreement as to what we would go forward with. And I also have a letter here that I can read into the record.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Yes please.

Reposo, regarding Reposo 72, sidewalk café 50 West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street. Dear Council Members Rosenthal, Weprin and Greenfield: Reposo 72 is applying for a city license to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café at 50 West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street. Proposed hours of operation for Reposo 72 sidewalk café are as follows: Monday to Thursday, 4:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m., Friday, 4:00 p.m. to 12:00 a.m., Saturday, 11:30 a.m. to 12:00 a.m., Sunday, 11:30 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.

We have reduced the original number of tables and seats from 16 tables and 30 seats to eight tables and 16 seats. And if I just may interject, we

agreement. I think what happened was you agreed to

make some changes to the application.

24

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 15
2	STEVE WYGODA: Should I respond?
3	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you.
4	(Background talk)
5	STEVE WYGODA: So noted.
6	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Thank you.
7	Anybody on the panel have a question for these… the
8	applicant and at the moment we have a number of
9	people from the community who want to testify in this
10	matter.
11	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Chairman Weprin I
12	have a question.
13	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Yes. Mr. Torres.
14	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: What is the
15	Community Board's position on the café? Because I
16	don't have it doesn't indicate it right here.
17	STEVE WYGODA: My understanding the
18	committee at committee level, approved the
19	application at full
20	[Crosstalk]
21	Well it's in the record, but the full
22	board I was told is that they ran out of time and
23	there was no vote taken at the full board meeting.
24	So but at committee level was approved 5 to 2.

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you. Alright.
So, I think I'm going to excuse gentlemen you for
now. We have a number of people here to testify and
we're going to hear from them and we're going to call
them up in groups of four, since we have four chairs.
It is in the order they handed to me. So, what I'd
like to do is call on the following people. Is it, I
can't read the first name, Batya Lewton, is that
right? Jan Levy is it? Susan Cassidy and Kay
Sheehan. Ladies, thank you.

Alright, I want to reiterate, before you speak to please state your name. Because we want the record to be clear who's talking. And if it's written down we can't tell people's voices. So...

[Background talk]

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Alright ladies, you can decide who wants to go first. We're going to put a clock remember. It has a really annoying tone at the end, I want to warn you. So whenever you're ready.

BAYTA LEWTON: Batya Lewton, Coalition for a Livable West Side formed in 1981 is a west side grass roots

### 1 | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

council to reject this application.

2.1

all volunteer community based environmental organization whose members care about our community and city. The Coalition also focuses on quality of life issues on the Upper West Side. We believe that sidewalk cafes are inappropriate on residential streets. Especially in our landmark districts. The Coalition supports the disapproval of Reposo application for the sidewalk café. We urge the

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you. We appreciate that. Next, where we started. But please make sure you state your name when you speak. Thank you.

SUSAN CASSIDY: Hi my name is Susan

Cassidy. I'm President of the Board of the Majestic.

Which is 115 Central Park West at 72<sup>nd</sup> Street. And I come here requesting that the council not vote today on the application for the sidewalk café being made by Reposo for the following reasons.

The application was not reviewed and voted on by the full community board. It was on the agenda but because of the location of the meeting, the meeting was adjourned without hearing this item. And more than 30 residents did not have an

community board on September 2<sup>nd</sup>.

2.1

opportunity to voice their concerns. My
understanding is that it is in the agenda for the

accurately indicate the presence of the lamppost and muni-meter in front of the wine bar. Nowhere do I see mentioned the fact that three afternoons a week all of the residential garbage from 50 West 72<sup>nd</sup> is put out on the sidewalk in front of Reposo where it stays until collected by the sanitation department the next day. And it's a substantial amount of trash. Sometimes as high as three or four feet. Reposo is not a good neighbor. They're in violation of their liquor license stipulation that the door be kept closed and the music volume low. There is propped open most days for I guess eight months of the year, whenever the weather is pleasant. And the music can be heard in the street.

This application shouldn't be on your agenda today and I'm respectfully requesting that you return it to Community Board 7 and to the Department of Consumer Affairs for them to revisit with all of the pertinent information available and community sentiment represented.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I've walked up and down Central Park West and  $5^{\rm th}$  Avenue and all of the major two-way streets. There is not one business that occupies on inch of sidewalk on  $72^{\rm nd}$ ,  $81^{\rm st}$ ,  $86^{\rm th}$ , and  $96^{\rm th}$  on the West Side and the comparable on the east. There's no reason to have this. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you Ms. Cassidy. Who's going to go next? Ladies?

KAY SHEEHAN: Good morning. My name is Kay Sheehan (Phonetic) and I live at the Oliver Cromwell which is 12 West 72<sup>nd</sup>. And have been a resident, happily a resident there for over 10 years and I come today really to have added to the record the petition from our building. We have right about 145 separate housing units in our building and we have 105 signatures on our petition in opposition to this sidewalk café. And just speaking personally from my experience on this street. You know we have heavy pedestrian traffic. There is really significant citywide concern on the safety of pedestrians on the street. We have a lot of tourists going to Strawberry Fields. You know, it's just a very busy street and I personally object to taking away space that's supposed to be available to the

_					
1 1		$\triangle$ T	$\sigma \cap \text{NITNI} \cap$	7/ 7/ 7/	
	SUBCOMMITTEE	UIV	7.() V      V ( <del>-</del>	AIVI	F K ANCH I SES

2 public for the benefit of a private enterprise.

3 Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: You're welcome.

5 Thank you.

2.1

Ralph, we okay? Yes, one more. Ma'am.

JAN LEVY: I'm Jan Levy. I'm a 28 year resident of the landmark Majestic. I'm a former 20 year member of Manhattan Community Board 7 and I am the founder of the CB7 Landmarks Committee. And yes I am the Jan Levy who went to the July 2007 State Liquor Authority Hearing at 317 Lennox Avenue to caution the Reposo attorney not to ask for a sidewalk café because our block would oppose the request. So I'm here to voice my unequivocal opposition to the Department of Consumer Affairs approval of a sidewalk café for the Reposo Wine Bar and to urge the subcommittee to disapprove the application.

Many years ago, concerned by various proposals for inappropriate or obstructive uses on the West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street park block the four residential buildings joined together and framed a policy. The buildings include two landmarks, The Dakota, One West and The Majestic. The others are Mayfair Towers, 15 West and the Oliver Cromwell, 12 West. Our objective

2.1

was to protect the residential quality of this

principal thoroughfare in the heart of the Central

Park West Historic District. Our policy is to refuse

all applications for sidewalk cafes or other

obstructions thereby assuring that all applications

are treated fairly and equally. We remain steadfast

to this principal.

Today in my remarks, which I've made available with copies. I parse the SLA approval of this license in 2007. I found it interesting that there were two of the three members of the SLA board there and the meeting was held in Canandaigua, which is a very familiar place to West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street. The SLA rationale could reasonably lead to the conclusion that the advantage is to the applicant regardless of community board or public arguments and opposition.

So on the first page of the SLA approval there's a paragraph that says, I'll quote the application, and in that paragraph is says. There will be no sidewalk café. And it goes onto document it's rationale for why it allowed this to happen and there's plenty of wiggle room which comes from the Alcoholic Beverage Commission. You shouldn't do it if there three similar premises within 500 feet of

the café. Well I can assure you that we don't lack for restaurants or bars on West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street, nor does the community lack for those. We're awash in the public benefit of restaurants, delis and multiple sources of take-out and delivered food.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you.

JAN LEVY: Just one more and I'll conclude. I know I'm over time. I'm looking at the application that was dated April 9<sup>th</sup> and signed by Mr. Alotta. And in it, this is the application from the unenclosed sidewalk request for recommendation. And a question on the application is, is your café in a historic district or adjacent to a landmark building or district and it says yes. If yes, have you applied to the Landmark Preservation Commission for approval to operate to your café? He says yes. But if yes, have you received approval from LPC to operate your café? No.

Now I don't know if that's current to the amendment here to limit the number of chairs and tables but I would like to know if I may whether or not we can have an answer to whether the Landmark Preservation Commission....

2.1

and this is not a building in his district. Okay.

But I'm here as private citizen and a resident of the

building where this sidewalk café is being proposed.

22

23

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

It's a building called the Ruxton. It's one of the few rental buildings still on 72<sup>nd</sup> Street on the Park block. A lot of us are still rent stabilized tenants. I remember when there used to be a lot of us. On November 1st of this year I will have lived in the Ruxton for 40 years. It's like hard to believe. Anyway. You know, when Reposo first came... I'm going to scan my testimony because I think the Chairman referred to me when he said don't be long winded. You know, when they first proposed this bar in 2007 we basically weren't real happy about it. Because he was going to rent a tiny little store which was a deli and try to make a go of this very little store and make it into a restaurant with a lot of seats and thinking he'd make a lot of money there. It was never a really good idea. seems like his business is really hurting from what they've been telling people and now they want to have a sidewalk café. Which essentially is going to cause problems for all of us who live there. Both in my building and on the rest of the block. You know, I really feel bad for the people who live in my building on the lower floors in the front. Because we went out to look at it the other night with

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

Council Member Rosenthal and we looked up and the windows are literally like feet above where all of these people are going to be sitting and drinking and eating and making noise. The wine bar initially opened with a limited menu. And the menu has grown. And so have other problems. Vermin in the building, bugs in the building. There's a problem with their exhaust and it's strange, because the fire department is coming to our building a lot with fire engines blaring and they come down the street and then it's like what's going on, there's no fire here. It's the exhaust in the kitchen. Another big issue is trash. When you put trash out on our building... I'm finishing.

[Interpose]

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Just don't go too far over.

MARTIN ALGAZE: When they put trash out, they put trash out at like 6 o'clock at night before the staff goes home. The other night we went for a tour with Council Member Rosenthal. And we saw there was so many huge mountains of trash in front of the building. This sidewalk is going to be inches away

from where that trash is. 25

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2	[Interpose
7.	i interpose

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Marty I'm going to ask you about this picture when I get to questions. How's that?

MARTIN ALGAZE: And basically in closing, this is the wrong place for a sidewalk café. There are no sidewalk cafes on 72<sup>nd</sup> Street. This will set a bad precedent and we are... well look at how many people are here. All the elected officials are with us. And lastly when the community board held their hearing in July everybody who signed up to speak on this issue was opposed to it. Like 30 to 40 people. There's no support for this in the community.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you Mr. Algaze. Who's going next?

Congratulations on your new job by the way.

[Background talk]

Can we have quiet please in the room?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Now I'm ready to give you my...

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Can we have quiet please, in the room? Whenever you're ready.

[Pause]

2.1

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: I would keep going because your clock is running.

 $\mbox{SUSAN RUTNER:} \quad \mbox{I'm okay with the clock,}$  but I just want to...

I have lived at 15 West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street since 1979. The neighborhood in the 1980's was not what you see today. I used to work at the corner of 72<sup>nd</sup> Street and Broadway and I remember one particular day that between my office and my home there was seven beggars on the street. The decision in 1985 to allow restaurants to create outdoor cafes was obviously a wise one. Increasing the visibility of law abiding citizens and encouraging them to patronize neighborhood establishments into the evening and that has done the trick.

I have been a real estate broker since 1983. The fact that the Upper East Side with the exception of certain trophy properties is now far less expensive a local than the Upper West Side is well documented. The corner where my office building stood has apartments that rent for \$9,000 to \$10,000 a month for a two-bedroom apartment. Now it's your time to serve the best interest of the many people

who live there. You will see the photos of the
crowds, local and tourists that walk our block. You
have been given petitions from hundreds of residents
of our block. What more proof do you need to care
about your local citizenry and not just the
additional business income of yet another bar?

Ladies and gentlemen you represent us, and to allow this incursion on our sidewalks doesn't show representation or even consideration. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Alright. Thank you Ms. Rutner. Mr. Bloom you can go next.

RICHARD BLOOM: Yes, I'll go next. I have nothing to distribute so I ask for your undivided attention. We went to the community board about two months ago. The subcommittee of the board. And there was one person who voted against the sidewalk café and that person was the only person who had actually lived on our block. Okay, now what does she know that the rest of the people didn't know. She gave a darn. Now I know that you guys don't live on our block but I don't think it matters because conversations like this are happening all over the

1 | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.1

city, between boards and tenants and people in the
neighborhood.

Now, the thing is, if you allow this sidewalk café to happen to our neighborhood. It's going to open the floodgates. We're not just talking about one sidewalk café. Here's what the owner of PJ Clarks who took over Sambuca's said. Not the owner, the broker, the man who brokered the deal. He said, we're expecting great things from this location, great things from this deal. Because it's impossible to duplicate location since that is in a non-commercial block. They're getting lined up and they're getting ready to go.

Okay, impossible duplicate, why? Because it's one of the most incredible neighborhoods in the entire world. Where else can you walk down the street and see people, like in the time I've been there, Rudolph Nureyev or Lauren Bacall, John Lennon. It's not just the building, it's the people and it's the culture. So, I have heard that one of the reasons the board might vote against this is because... and I'll close up. You may be afraid of lawsuits. I hope that's not true. Because if it is, where would we have been if George Washington had been afraid to

### 1 | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2 spirit to voice their opposition. They've written

3 | letters and signed a petition. I only brought one

4 copy because I kind of thought we had others. But

5 I'm happy to let you see this. You can have it.

CHAIRPERSON WELPRIN: Thank you. Sargent

at Arms.

2.1

NINA PINSKY: We want to convey our frustration that we feel that the various agencies are playing the game who's on first. Nobody is coordinating their efforts. We understand that the landmarks met and approved this based on architectural issues alone and when members of the audience here expressed their opposition. They said those are not our issues. You have to go to the police. You have to go to another agency for that.

[Background talk]

Okay. Alright.

CHAIRPERSON WELPRIN: Ask the audience not to....

NINA PINSKY: Thank you. And we were told that the Department of Consumer Affairs weighs in only on, does this application meet the written regulations as stated. It doesn't take into consideration the entire impact of the issue. The

I took last week, like on Thursday night. That's

just like, one representation. But the other picture
you'll see is even worse. They pick up the garbage.
The garbage is along the curb. There's a muni-meter
there. There's garbage around the muni-meter because
there's nowhere else to put it. And the mountains of
garbage on Thursday night before we we sat down with
Council Member Rosenthal Thursday night and there was
so much garbage that nobody could believe how much
garbage was there. And it's just the residential
garbage of the building. The other thing that we saw
the other night at the same time, was that the front
door of the bar is open. They agreed that the door
would be closed with their liquor license. Every
night the door is opened. We actually closed the
door. Council Member Rosenthal actually said to the
owner or the manager, you have to close the door,
it's illegal to have the door open. Well every night
it reopens. I mean they shut the door if somebody
complains and then they reopen it a few minutes
later. They're not good neighbors. We can't trust
them to do what they say in their sidewalk café
application, because everything they've ever agreed
to they never have lived up to

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 35
2	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Ms. Rutman, just
3	briefly, is there something you wanted to add?
4	Rutner, sorry.
5	SUSAN RUTNER: That's okay. It always
6	happens. Yes I just wanted to correct the record. I
7	believe it was the architect who said that the
8	original request was for 16 tables and 30 chairs.
9	Our understanding has always been that it was 13
10	tables and 30 chairs. And at the community board
11	meeting the owner was asked if he would take fewer
12	than 13. I was present. And he said no.
13	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Sometimes
14	no's become yes's.
15	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I have a better
16	picture.
17	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Well that's
18	alright. I got the idea from the garbage. I think
19	the panel would agree.
20	[Interpose]
21	UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There is no way for
22	the clearance…
23	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Don't move. Council
24	Member Garodnick has a question.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

much Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to straighten out one issue. Really I guess it's the fundamental issue for the committee based on the rules and regs. appreciate the quality of life and safety issues that you've raised. And seeing the picture, you know it's clear that adding an obstacle with the number of people who are passing by on 72<sup>nd</sup> Street will be a challenge. But as to the rules, I just wanted to probe on one point because in the information that we have here from Mayfair Towers. It says that the, well we know the minimum clear path would be eight feet and that the clearance here would be seven and The plans that we have in front of us from change. the bar show eight feet and four and a half inches of clearance between the end of the sidewalk café and what I presume is either the muni-meter or the lamp post that is closest to the sidewalk café. missing?

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you very

NINA PINSKY: Our comments and that illustration was made before the bar agreed to cut back a row and to keep only... well to keep eight tables instead of 13. So that's why our measurements are as they are. But, I have a picture here that

2.1

NINA PINSKY: Well we took, you know, our measuring tape and we went out and we walked this ourselves.

 $\label{thm:council_member_garodnick:} Council \mbox{ Member GARODNICK: Yes, that's } % \mbox{ what I'm asking.} % % \mbox{ The substitution of t$ 

NINA PINSKY: I don't know. All I know is that we did it. Several of the people here in the room actually walked it and wrote down the measurements. So I'm not an architect, I'm not an artist, all I know is that we took the measurements and came up with these conclusions.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay. The revised plans looks like it has 10 feet of clearance between the end of the sidewalk café and the street lamp. Is that consistent with what your tape measure showed?

NINA PINSKY: I don't know because we never saw the revised plan, number one. And number two, it never took into consideration the fact that if you see the garbage juts out more than two feet beyond the parking meter.

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Okay, there it is for whatever it's worth. There's an extra copy for you. Well let's just talk about that garbage

### 1 | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.1

issue for a second. Because that's a mess and obviously if you had a sidewalk café out there you would not be able to get eight feet of clearance.

Also, presumably if they were to put a sidewalk café out there they probably be a little more careful about their garbage.

#### [Crosstalk]

COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Ahh, it's the building's garbage. I misunderstood okay.

SUSAN CASSIDY: It's the building's garbage because their location is right next door to the service entrance so that...

#### [Crosstalk]

barrier would go flush with the service entrance door or within inches and its other side, its east side barrier is right at the lobby. So what you're asking is that people don't come out and join the flow of traffic on an angle which is what most people do.

But they would have to come out and join the flow of traffic or come out and... especially if it's a safety issue. Which one of my other neighbors is going to talk about, if there's a fire and multiple numbers of people are coming out the service entrance which is

to say that if you went over there to see it like

24

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 41
2	Council Member Rosenthal did, you won't believe how
3	there's no way they can do this.
4	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Well we can get a
5	sense of that from the pictures. Anyone else have a
6	question for this panel?
7	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you I'm
8	done.
9	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Do you have more?
10	Are you done?
11	Okay. Thank you very much panel. I
12	appreciate it. We have seven more people to speak.
13	I know you're wondering. We'll be taking them up in
14	two panels. Okay, so again. With two minute limits
15	on each person. Um, Lewis Boxenbaum (Phonetic),
16	Funsho Owolabi, Marion Conti, is it? Okay. And
17	Steven Heller. And I apologize for butchering names
18	Mr. Heller is not speaking but shares the
19	opposition. Are you Mr. Heller?
20	Okay. Thank you Mr. Heller.
21	[Background talk]
22	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. We're going
23	to do the six now, three and three. So the last
24	three will go in the next panel.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Whenever you ready sir. You seem ready to go, so.

Now you're ready.

LEWIS BOXENBAUM: My name is Lewis Boxenbaum. I've been a resident of Mayfair Towers at 15 West 72<sup>nd</sup> for 16 years. The single issue I want to focus on is safety which is much broader even than the impact of Il Riposo. We already have a safety problem. Let me describe it. 72<sup>nd</sup> Street is not a quiet residential street in the good weather. We have busloads of tourists coming down. We have tourists gathering in front of the Dakota where John Lennon was assassinated before they go into the park. We have special events in the park, as you all know, where 72<sup>nd</sup> Street is either a starting point or a finishing point. With huge crowds on the sidewalks. The street is already restricted. We have a safety problem now. For example. So many tourists gather in front of the Dakota, taking pictures where John Lennon was assassinated that when I walk to the subway I have to walk out in to the street to get passed them. Because courtesy to tourists and the benefit to the city of New York dictates that we don't say anything to them. We have the same problem

towards Columbus Avenue where the Dakota Bar was allowed to build... extend the building and restrict the sidewalk which is almost opposite from Il Riposo. We also have crowds in front of the Dallas BBQ, tourists, waiting to get in, that restrict sidewalk movement. So 72<sup>nd</sup> Street doesn't have free walking path right now without Il Riposo. And I submit that more people will be forced to go out into the street to get passed this restriction raising the issue of potential safety. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you sir. Who's going next now?

2.1

MARION CONTI: Hi. My name is Marion

Conte. I'm a resident of Mayfair Towers and a member of the board. You've been given... we are a building of close to 500 apartments and you've been given the application... the petitions and the letters that people have written. We have been, and I wanted to reiterate what Nina Pinsky has been saying. We have been going to meetings and have heard summaries from the CB7, the LPC, possibly the DLB, the DCA, the SLA, today it's the subcommittee, tomorrow it's the full committee of the Zoning. It appears that each committee has only a focus on its area of expertise.

It's very discouraging because it doesn't seem as			
though anyone is of these committees is looking at			
the big picture. So we gave you the big picture and			
we want to give you a feeling of what our street is			
about. The first picture. This was grandfathered			
in. This is the Dakota Bar at the northeast side of			
the street. Right now, people, this is a Sunday			
morning People are going you can't you have to			
wait online to get to the end of the street. Like			
Lou and other people walk in the street just to avoid			
the lines or across the street with the Riposo 72 is.			
And you can see here, if you look at the next it's			
congested here. And you can see how if you look at			
the other one. This is on Columbus. We have plenty			
of cafes on Columbus Avenue. We don't need any more.			
And you can see how it encroaches the way we			
communicate. If you look at the next one, this is			
what we want to preserve. There are families			
talking sorry. We want space to meet our neighbors,			
share our thoughts, walk our dogs, enjoy our families			
and be able to dodge any skateboards that come our			
way.			

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you Ms. Conti.

MARION CONTI: Now I do just...

Assembly Member Linda B. Rosenthal and I represent

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

the 67<sup>th</sup> Assembly District which includes the Upper West Side, and parts of Clinton, Hell's Kitchen neighborhood in Manhattan. I am testifying today in opposition to the application to operate an unenclosed sidewalk café at 50 West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street. community has been is in opposition to the proposed unenclosed sidewalk café and I share their concerns. The full length of 72<sup>nd</sup> Street which particularly the Grand block between Central Park West and Columbus Avenue is one of the main pedestrian thoroughfares between Central Park and the 123 subway lines and it's always congested at all times. Allowing the addition of a sidewalk café on this heavily treacherous street would be more overcrowding on an already over-burdened residential side street. Upper West Side Central Park West art district include 72<sup>nd</sup> Street where both the Dakota, on the north side and the Majestic on the south side of the street and individual city landmarks. The park block is also the site of other architecturally north buildings are other densely populated and close proximity to the proposed sidewalk café. Central Park and Strawberry Fields also lure visitors... and we'll skip to the back.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

When the applicant first granted its liquor license to the New York State Liquor Authority in 2007, the applicant stated repeatedly its intention not to operate a sidewalk café and any other kind of location. Also, the original liquor license was granted subject to three specific stipulations. One of which required the applicant and I quote, an effort to keep the sidewalk clear of smokers and noise. Keeping the door closed at all times was another stipulation. And it's often violated. Clearly the presence of an unenclosed sidewalk café and its patrons will create additional noise and flies in the face of those stipulations. It has come to my attention that SLA in granting applicant a condition approval for an alteration to its existing liquor license to operate the unenclosed sidewalk café the subject of which is today's hearing did not consider those stipulations in its final decision. I have raised this issues with SLA which has agreed to investigate its approval of the alteration in light of this new information. In conclusion, the New York City Council

is not responsible for enforcing those stipulations on the liquor licenses. I believe it would be

1 SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 48 inappropriate for this body to act before the 2 community as well as my office have had an ample 3 opportunity to explore this new information. 4 5 end the community and I respectfully request that this subcommittee reserve its judgment until all 6 facts have been brought to light. 7 Thank you. 8 CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much. 9 And I didn't realize that you were here earlier, but 10 I did speak to Assembly Member Rosenthal last week. 11 She called me on this, to express her concerns and we 12 do appreciate you coming down and testifying on her 13 behalf. And please send her our regards and mine in

Does anyone have any questions for this panel?

particular, later on.

Okay. Not now. So thank you very much. This is the last panel, I believe, unless... and if I haven't called your name after I read these last three names and you want to testify, please raise your hand.

Josh Cole, Gerald Kahn, the problem is the K got mixed in with the please print part here, and then the letter E. Lyons. Got them all. Is

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

25

2 there anyone else who is here to testify whose name I
3 have not called?

Good. Alright.

[Background talk]

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: We didn't purposely leave the gentleman for last, but... maybe I'll just keep my mouth shut.

Alright, whenever you're ready gentleman.

JOSH COLE: Hello, my name is Josh Cole.

I'm here on behalf of State Senator Brad Hoylman.

12 | Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony to

13 the subcommittee regarding this application here

14 today. Senator Hoylman represents the 27<sup>th</sup> State

15 | Senate District within which this establishment is

16 located and he urges the subcommittee to deny this

17 application. While sidewalk café's themselves are

18 | not inherently problematic, we've heard from numerous

19 constituents who've lived on West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street between

20 | Central Park West and Columbus Avenue for many years

21 and in some decades. That it is not an appropriate

22 | location for such usage. This largely residential

23 | block has relatively few commercial establishments

24 | and in an effort to preserve its residential nature,

sidewalk cafes have historically absent. Residents

9 block has long been burdened by foot traffic from the 10 subway station on the eastern end. Neighbors say 11 that in recent years with the rise of several 12 establishments targeted to tourists and New Yorker's

threats from commercial and tourist interests.

residential nature of their block has recently faced

50

from outside neighborhood, it's traditional character has begun to erode and overcrowding of the streets

and sidewalks has become a significant concern.

benefits of a sidewalk café here would be far

outweighed by the cost to our constituents in 17

diminished quality of life and sidewalk congestion. 18

19 As such, we urge this subcommittee to deny this

application. Thank you again for the opportunity to 20

submit testimony and for your consideration of 2.1

22 Senator Hoylman's comments.

23 CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr. Cole. 24

And please thank the Senator for us as well.

7

8

13

14

15

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

EDWARD LYONS: My name is Ed Lyons. I'm from Douglas Elliman, I represent the Dakota, a property we manage, in opposition to the sidewalk café. I'll read a quick... and I also have for distribution a quick statement from the board of directors.

The Dakota mindful of thousands from throughout the world would come to West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street block to photograph our iconic building and visit Strawberry Fields has worked with neighbors in Mayfair Towers, The Majestic and the Oliver Cromwell to preserve the residential character of the block. We were active participants in discussions resulting in the decision to refuse requests for sidewalk cafes of other obstructions and appreciated the support of our neighbors to squash a proposal to remain the street John Lennon Way. Residents and neighbors know the Dakota, a major tourism attraction and an equally important contributor to the city's economy. Consequently, anything that detracts from our efforts to protect the special status of the block presents a significant challenge. Therefore, we join the many residents of West 72<sup>nd</sup> Street park block who are opposed to the Riposo application for a sidewalk

café. It can only add clutter to the already heavily trafficked area while affording no improvement or benefits to residents. We request that the Zoning and Franchises Committee disapprove the Riposo sidewalk café application. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you Mr. Lyons.

a resident of the Majestic. I've lived there for 42 years, since 1972. I'm here today in that capacity. My neighbors have fully stated all pertinent objections to the permission to grant sidewalk café application to the Riposo. There's just one other thing that I'd like to say. I've taken a look at the Department of Consumer Affairs sidewalk café street guide. And I note that on East 72<sup>nd</sup> Street, from the East River to 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue no sidewalk cafés are permitted. And I would suggest that what the city council does is just extend that an additional block on the West Side of Central Park and extend it from Central Park West to Columbus Avenue. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you. Does anyone have any questions for this panel? I see none.

2.1

2.1

By the way, we've been joined by Council
Member Jumanne Williams, who is sitting at the end of
the table over here. Anybody else have any
questions? I see none. Thank you very much
gentleman.

Okay. I know Council Member Rosenthal has comments she wants to make. I first want to call on Council Member David Greenfield, the Chair of the Land Use Committee who has some comments he wants to make on this item.

I want to thank you all for coming out here today.

We certainly appreciate it and we take all of the comments and suggestions very seriously. When you sees us chatting we're not talking about the weather or the sports score, we're actually having private conversations about the issues that you brought up in front of us and we're going back and forth in terms of the legality of those issues and what is, in fact, appropriate and inappropriate. I think that the part of the challenge of what we have here today is that clearly the community does not support this. Right? I think that's very obvious and I think we understand that and we appreciate that. The council member

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

doesn't support it, the other local elected officials don't support it. The problem is, and this is really the crux of a lot of the items that we have in the Land Use world and I'm just trying to sort of explain in terms of our decision making process. that, we in fact, are, and I know some folks would wish that we wouldn't be, but we in fact, are constrained by the zoning regulations. And when we make decisions we need to make decisions based on those set of rules and regulations that we must follow. And I know somebody here mentioned that, you know George Washington wasn't worried about lawyers. I don't think they had very active lawyers when George Washington was president, but seriously speaking, we do have a responsibility to insure that we are enforcing the law correctly across the board regardless of individual circumstances. And that's I think part of what makes this very challenging here today. And specifically, I just want to address some of the issues. Because issues were addressed and we were, in fact, researching and discussing it while you were up there. Someone had mentioned, in fact, that the Landmark Preservation Commission did not sign off on this. It's actually not correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

researched it, we have confirmation from the

Landmarks Preservation Commission that the Landmark

Preservation Commission did, in fact, sign off on

that. It's an important point. And once again we

were having a sidebar, because if that was the case

we would stop the application. We're certainly

trying to work with you in terms of the issues that

you mentioned.

The issue of the garbage. The garbage is not an issue where it's not counted as part of the clearance. Because obviously, as you can imagine, garbage is a temporary manufactured situation. not like it's something that's there permanently but as a matter of law which we have looked into, that becomes something that, while we're sympathetic, just so you understand, in terms of a very specific legal rubric, right. That doesn't count for the eight feet which many folks have mentioned. We looked into that as well. My point is that we're taking all of these issues very seriously. In fact, we have a letter here from the owner of 50 West  $72^{nd}$  Street, Ruxton Tower Limited Partnership, who actually promises in writing to resolve the garbage issue. To move the garbage if necessary and to change the hours of when

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

2 the garbage will be deposited to prevent that 3 situation from happening.

The final issue just that you mentioned. I just wanted you to understand that we are addressing the issues that you brought before us was, someone mentioned an issue about the tables in terms of whether in fact they did take less tables. answer is that there was originally an application for 16 tables and 30 seats. Consumer Affairs actually approved 13 tables and 26 seats. And in fact the applicant has agreed to, in fact, reduce that to eight tables and 16 seats. So there has in fact been a reduction. I understand, obviously, that doesn't make you happy. But I do believe that's because of the advocacy of your Council Member who made it very clear that she was not in favor of this, as she's made it clear before. That, in fact, you literally have cut the number of tables and seats by half which is progress. Although obviously not exactly what you wanted.

So I just wanted to address those issues because those are the issues that folks mentioned. We took notes. We researched it with staff. We've had the conversations. Just to let you know we do

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

take your concerns very seriously and certainly we think that there are many legitimate concerns. we don't just have, as the last panelist mentioned, simply the ability on our own to change the zoning regulations. It doesn't work that way. Even if we wanted to do that, we can't. There has to be processes, there's hearings. We don't simply have the ability to say we can ignore the law and that's really why we have a challenging situation here today. Because based on everything that we've seen and the research that we've done, it appears that the law, and just so you know our staff actually does go out there. We take it very seriously, with a tape measure, where it Pete, right over here. He goes out there with the tape measure. We look at every issue. We meet to discuss this in advance. We certainly take the responsibility very seriously. appear however, based on after all the testimony, and all the information and all the research, that it does seem like the restaurant still would be within its legal rights to, in fact, have a sidewalk café under the law as it's currently written and just to be clear we are not empowered at this meeting to change that law.

2.1

And so I just wanted to share that with you just as background information just so you understand what exactly has transpired here today.

I've been on the other side before. I understand the frustrations, but I feel at least hopefully if you get an explanation you'll have an understanding.

This is not a Q&A session. I apologize. I'm just going to hand it over now to Council Member.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: So let me call on Council Member Rosenthal. By the way we have closed this public hearing now and I note you have a statement you want to make so, whenever you're ready Council Member Rosenthal.

much. My name is Council Member Helen Rosenthal.

And as a new member to the council, I want to thank the chairs and this committee and the City Council for its procedure of giving the individual council members the opportunity for a call-up. I know this isn't... we approve hundreds of sidewalk cafés across the year. I know you don't listen to every situation and I'm very appreciative that we spent the last hour and a half talking about this café in particular.

25 | It's incredibly important to my community that they

be heard about this. I want to be clear that I'm firmly opposed to this sidewalk café. This is, I'm going to repeat some of the facts. They're incredibly salient. It's a historic district. It's the entrance to the park. It suffers from idling tour busses which my office is trying to deal with day after day without a lot of help from DEP.

Unfortunately or the NYPD. It's an extremely crowded block and there's absolutely no support for it in my community. I want you to know that I've worked very closely with this applicant and we have come to the following revisions to the initial application, as you mentioned. But I want to expand on a few more.

In addition to reducing the seating by half, they have agree to keep all of... and I want this to be on the record. They have agreed to keep all of the two top tables close together so that they will serve as four person tables. So that there will be four, four person tables along... crushed up against the building. They have agreed to the reduced hours so that on no night will it be open beyond midnight. So neither Friday night, nor Saturday. They have agreed to... well, the building has agreed to the

2.1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

garbage removal and we will attach that letter to
whatever the finding is today.

I do want to reiterate to what Council Member Greenfield said. The internal city council conversations that I have had prior to this hearing. Peter Janosik, as council member mentioned, we have explored every legal opportunity to reject this application. I will say that eight years ago, there was an opportunity for the council to take away this block from being one that could have a sidewalk café. And eight years ago this block was not entered into the list of blocks that could not have commercial activity. Now, if the community would like me to start an ULURP Proceeding, I am delighted to work with you on this. It would have to be a full ULURP which would mean it would require an EIS and it would be a big headache. But I know this community and I know you'd be willing to go through it. And I will walk you through it. I'm committed to walking you through it every step of the way. To add this block, 72<sup>nd</sup> Street between Central Park West and Columbus as one of the blocks that could not have commercial outdoor activity. I will stand with you every step of the way.

2.1

Let's see. Okay. We are still waiting to hear. We did have a meeting last week.

Apparently we are still waiting to hear from Assembly Woman Rosenthal as to whether or not they will have a problem getting their liquor license for the sidewalk café component. So just so everyone is clear. As of today, if the sidewalk café is approved, they may not serve liquor in that sidewalk café until they get approval from the SLA.

So I want to reiterate that I firmly oppose this application. And I am counting on the community as we discussed to be the eyes and ears of the Upper West Side. To put as much energy as you put up to this point, collecting the signatures of hundreds of your residents in your buildings to call in 311 complaints and to report all violations immediately. Upon getting those complaint numbers from 311, please send them to my office. We will be following up on them. So if they're door is open, if they serve liquor which they're not allowed to do at the outdoor café, and any other of the violations having to do with noise and smoking call them in. I have assurances from... and well the garbage is on the building. Right. So you can call in those

2.1

violations as well, but just be clear call them in
about 50 as opposed to... about the building. They
will get violations as well.

So, I... you know, as I said, as I was about today. I will work with Peter. As the number of violations grows, right, that they get against them, working with the counsel here, the lawyers here at the city council. I will pursue enforcement of these violations and if it is the case that the violations stack up, we may... we can padlock the restaurant. So, I firmly oppose this and I will work with you steadfast to keep a clear record of all the violations against this restaurant, should they not abide by their sidewalk café rules and by the liquor license rules. And I will work with you to close it down should there be numerous violations.

I want to thank the committee for taking all of this time about this sidewalk café. I do think it's indicative, I don't, you know I don't sit on the committee, but as many times as you have meetings such as this, it does raise the specter that perhaps there are other blocks, not just this one that would like their block to be exempted from those that can have commercial activity. Now it's been

2.1

eight years. I don't know how often the council does this, but perhaps the council could take it up and will see that there are other side streets that want not to have commercial activity.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Great. Thank you

Council Member Rosenthal. I just want to reiterate a

little bit about what Council Member Greenfield said

about the law. It is a frustrating thing for us

because we could change the law in the future, it's

possible. But at the time that this application was

brought, this is a legal café as far as the DCA is

concerned. It was mentioned about us being afraid of

lawyers. We're not afraid of lawsuits but if we were

to reject this and our Article 78 is brought then the

owner is then allowed to go along with what was

originally was approved by the Department of Consumer

Affairs which was 13 tables and 26 chairs.

### [Background talk]

Hours, right. Ten in the morning till midnight during the week and ten in the morning till one a.m. on the weekends. That is the fear here, is that in an effort to make a statement that we don't like this, we end up making it worse.

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

I see that people want to talk about things. They can grab their council member later on.

I know we have been speaking to the assembly member and the senator as well as Helen, who has been working very hard on this issue, and working with you. Anyone else have any comment or questions? No?

Alright, we are going to move on. We've closed this public hearing. We're going to move onto our next item on our agenda, which is the Woodward Avenue rezoning. I appreciate everyone's patience as well as their very good behavior. I know this is a sensitive issue for a lot of people and we do appreciate that.

So I am now going to call up the following people. David Schwartz, Steven Sinacori and Ariel Ofgong (Phonetic). Sorry.

[Pause]

[Background talk]

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Gentlemen, when you're ready. Again, remember when you speak, state your name. And when you speak again state your name. And we appreciate that. I ask for quiet in the room and whenever you're ready Mr. Schwartz.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

DAVID SCHWARTZ: Good morning. David
Schwartz, representing Woodward Avenue owner. Good
morning Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman Greenfield,
Councilman Reynoso and other members of the
committee. I'm happy that we're doing something
simple like a rezoning and not a sidewalk café here
this morning. So it should be a little bit quicker.
We're here to talk about rezoning of in Ridgewood,
Queens. We are rezoning properties from M1-1 to R6B
and R5B. It's really one lot and mostly small
houses. We've been working at length with the
various members of the community. We had a positive
vote from the Community Board and the Borough
President and then we had a vote at City Planning in
favor and we've been working closely with Councilman
Reynoso's office over the past several months, almost
daily as of recent. And I'll let Steven Sinacori go
through the specifics of the rezoning. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you Mr.
Schwartz.
CERTIFIE CIVIL CODIT. C. 1

STEVEN SINACORI: Good morning Chairman.

Good morning Council Member Greenfield, Council

Member Reynoso and members of the committee. My name
is Steven Sinacori. I'm a partner with the firm of

### 1 | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Akerman LLP appearing on behalf of 176 Woodward Owner LLC the applicant in this matter. This application requests approval of a zoning map amendment to the project area from an M1-1 district to an R6B, R5B in a C2-3 district in order to construct a mixed-use 88-unit building.

The site is located at 176 Woodward It is a regular block bounded by Starr Street to the east, Woodward Avenue to the north, Troutman Street and Onderdonk Avenue to the south. The site which is located on lot 16 has a total of approximately 45,000 square feet. The site is current vacant of buildings other than a small shed that is used for the storage of motor vehicles and is a contractor's yard. The truck storage and dumping of construction materials has caused noise, dust, and fumes to pollute the project area to the detriment and protest of its residents. By rezoning the area, so as to permit the proposed building, will vastly improve condition in the area. Moreover, the proposed development will create 88 units of new housing of which approximately 45 units will be affordable. Further it should be noted that although the predominant active use in the project area is

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

residential, the area with in the project area is
entirely residential even though it's within an M1-1
district.

Working with Council Member Reynoso, we've come together to provide 45 units of affordable out of an 88 unit project. We've proposed a permanent space as an incubator for local artists in the community. At the same time we've amended the original proposal which was to have a C1-3 zoning district to allow for a C2-3 zoning district. what the C2-3 zoning district does, it allows use groups within 6 through 9, but 7, 8 and 9 allow somewhat more industrial type uses. Like light industrial uses. So together with the councilman, we've accomplished something that we believe is a good project that has the support at many different facets of the community and we're very happy at the outcome. And we look forward to the support of the city council. And again we thank you for the opportunity to speak here this morning. And thank you Council Member Reynoso for your leadership and your assistance is working with us.

DAVIS SCHWARTZ: David Schwartz. Just one thing I wanted to add. I learned this time. The

every other similarly situated homeowner to obtain

financing and obtain a home equity loan and will

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.1

2 allow them to upgrade the houses and remain in those homes.

So we appreciate the support of this committee.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you Mr.

Sinacori. I'm going to call on now, Council Member

Antonio Reynoso who has a statement to make as well

as maybe possibly questions.

being here. Thank you Chair for this opportunity. I want to speak to the history of the project more so than anything else in my statement. The project was approved under, what I consider a narrow scope.

Making it very difficult to be creative as we move forward to maximize the benefits and resources available to our community. The original plan had no affordable housing and did not do what I thought was necessary for manufacturing. I've been a strong proponent for our industrial businesses and believe that this development would encroach in a zone that would be more conducive to providing and maintaining jobs.

There is a mandate set forth by the  $34^{\rm th}$  District and the city overall to build affordable

### 1 | SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES

2.1

housing. Any project that runs through a ULURP
process will need to meet demands of real
affordability. Luckily we met with developers, Slate
Property Group, that understood the issues and
concerns of our residents and were ready to figure
out what would be best for all even under the limited
scope.

We were able to convert the commercial portions of the project from C1 to C2 which would allow for a light manufacturing field as to not disrupt the character of the industrial business zone. The community space would be rented at no cost to arts groups in the district that will maintain it and allow for affordable studios and meeting space in the 3,000 square foot multi-purpose community space. They will still have to maintain it. We understand that. Space for artists to display their work or develop their art has been hard to come by, in and around this area. This project will provide much needed assistance to a vibrant and strong portion of the community.

Next the affordable housing portion.

Working with developers we were able to achieve about 50% affordable housing. About 33% of the housing

2.1

specifically.

would be, what I and Council Member Williams, would call real affordable housing. With apartments available to a diverse wide range of constituents. There are units set up at or below 40, 50, 60 and 100% AMI. About 17% of the project is at 125% AMI allowing for the growth of the middle-class that has been traditionally left out of affordable housing opportunities and also move away from a pocket of poverty perception or situation that we've had very

I truly want to thank Amy, Raju and the rest of the Land Use team for their support. My staff, Kevin Worthington and the Slate Group, the Queens Borough President, the residents of Ridgewood and our Chairs of this committee for being supportive. And I am looking for a yes vote on this project. I'm extremely excited about it and I think we've done something great here and it is what I consider the first step to getting to where I really want us to go in the future of affordable housing. And I'm glad that you guys are partners with us in that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you. Council Member Greenfield has a comment.

COUNCIL MEMBER GREENFIELD: We're find, 2 3 thank you very much. I did just want to congratulate Council Member Reynoso for a terrific achievement. 4 5 think that this is a great example of what we do here in the Land Use Committee. Which is we reflect the 6 needs of the individual council members. 7 8 project has changed drastically over the last few 9 I want to thank the developers to being 10 amenable as well to those changes. You know, I like to say elections have consequences. He's our great 11 12 new council member and we need to make sure that he and his community are happy. And when you look at 13 the achievements. It's really been spectacular. 14 15 community space, the light manufacturing which is 16 very important to that community. And of course, the 50% affordable housing is just really terrific all 17 18 So I want to congratulate the council member. He was very principled. Stuck to his guns. 19 Achieved a terrify result for his community. And I 20 want to thank the developers for appreciating the 2.1 fact that things do change and for being 22 23 accommodating. And of course, to our Land Use staff. They don't get paid overtime, but they certainly were 24

SUBCOMMITTEE	OM	ZONTNG	$\Delta ND$	FRANCHISES

2.1

working overtime on this project. So we're very grateful for that as well. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Thank you very much.

Anybody else have a question or comment on this. Mr.

Torres.

COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Can I have a breakdown of the development again?

DAVID SCHWARTZ: David Schwartz. Its 6 unites at 40% AMI, 6 units at 50% AMI, 10 units at 60% AMI, 6 unites at 100% AMI, 17 unites at 125% AMI.

CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: Okay. Any other questions or comments? I see none. Is anyone else here to testify on this matter? No, I see none.

So gentleman thank you very much. We're going to close this hearing. We are now going to move to a vote on the items we heard today.

I just want to acknowledge that we are going to couple the following items into one vote.

These are the three sidewalk cafés that we had. Land Use #104, the Sant Ambroeus, Land Use #105, Reposo 72 which we heard extensively about, and Land Use #106, 755 Washington Trattoria. As well as the Land Use item we heard, which is Land Use #107, the Woodward Avenue rezoning, we're going to couple all of those

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 74					
2	items and we are going to wait for one council member					
3	to enter the room and them I'm going to call on Ann					
4	McCoy to call the roll.					
5	Okay, I'd like to call on Ann McCoy to					
6	please call the roll.					
7	ANN MCCOY: Chair Weprin.					
8	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: I vote Aye on all.					
9	ANN MCCOY: Council Member Garodnick.					
10	COUNCIL MEMBER GARODNICK: Thank you,					
11	Aye.					
12	ANN MCCOY: Council Member Richards.					
13	COUNCIL MEMBER RICHARDS: Aye on all.					
14	ANN MCCOY: Council Member Reynoso.					
15	COUNCIL MEMBER REYNOSO: Aye on all.					
16	ANN MCCOY: Council Member Torres.					
17	COUNCIL MEMBER TORRES: Aye on all.					
18	ANN MCCOY: Council Member Williams.					
19	COUNCIL MEMBER WILLIAMS: First I want to					
20	congratulate Council Member Reynoso on a great					
21	project with income targeted units and a wonderful					
22	spread and array of incomes that will be in the					
23	building. I vote Aye on all with the exception of					

Land Use #105 which I abstain.

1	SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 75
2	ANN MCCOY: By a vote of 6 in the
3	affirmative, no abstentions and no negatives. All
4	items are adopted and referred to the full Land Use
5	Committee with the exception of LU #105 which is
6	adopted by a vote of 5 in the affirmative, zero
7	negatives and 1 abstention, is likewise referred to
8	the full Land Use Committee.
9	CHAIRPERSON WEPRIN: That is great. We
10	thank you all very much. I want to remind the
11	members of the committee that the Land Use full
12	committee will be meeting tomorrow at 11:00 a.m. in
13	City Hall in the Committee Room. 11:00 a.m.
14	tomorrow. With that in mind the Subcommittee on
15	Zoning and Franchises is now adjourned.
16	[Gavel]
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

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 23, 2014\_\_\_\_\_