

From: [Vivian Woodburn](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Cc: [Aldona Vaiciunas](#)
Subject: Zoning, 265 Front St. Rezoning, Brooklyn (N180178ZRK)
Date: Saturday, December 5, 2020 8:13:22 PM

To whom it may concern:

Vinegar Hill, with its cobbled narrow streets and its 19th century 3 - 4 story brick rowhouses, presents a unique picture of an earlier era. This is, I believe, what a "historic district" is supposed to do. It shows who we were, what we came from, who we are. If kept intact a district like Vinegar Hill can guide us toward a future which does not rely on total randomness, greed, free-wheeling and wild over-development. It is our desire in Vinegar Hill to keep our historic neighborhood intact and for the remaining empty lots to be developed in character, in scale, in context with the currently existing brick rowhouses. We feel that R6B is the appropriate zoning to achieve this end and we strongly urge you to support that designation for all future development in Vinegar Hill . . . and in this instance, to support rezoning to R6B for 265 Front St.

Other reasons why we are calling for designation of all zoning changes inside Vinegar Hill to be R6B (without commercial overlay) are the following. There is already a dearth of new and still empty commercial space just outside Vinegar Hill's boundaries. The Steiner/Wegman development in the Brooklyn Navy Yard for one example. Another is the renovated Borum Pease building at Front and Hudson which has stood empty for several years now. Coming soon is the very large residential and commercial development at 85 Jay. There is a huge amount of commercial and retail space available in the immediate area and apparently no demand for it.

Re: the affordable housing component of R6A zoning. I feel this is not necessary right inside Vinegar Hill. We are bordered by the NYCHA Farragut Houses on York St. with much low income housing. And just a few blocks away from Vinegar Hill the former Jehovah Witness Hotel at 90 Sands St. is being developed with 491 apartments, 185 of which will be for extremely low-income and moderately low-income households. Three hundred five apartments there will be reserved for formerly homeless individuals.

Something that makes Vinegar Hill unique and special is its quiet ambience. One can walk a few blocks from the now grossly overcrowded F train at York St . . . or through the hordes of "selfie-taking-tourists" crowding Washington St. in DUMBO. . . and come upon a tiny oasis with tree lined, cobbled streets and restored 19th century houses. This isn't Disneyland, this is real. It's Vinegar Hill which we fervently hope to keep intact with R6B zoning.

I respectfully urge you to support rezoning 265 Front St. to R6B.

Thank you,

Vivian Scott Woodburn

From: [Ans Heerdink](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Cc: [Aldona Vaiciunas](#)
Subject: Subject: Opposition to Upzoning of 265 Front St. Reference: 265 Front Street (150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK)
Date: Tuesday, December 8, 2020 1:29:06 PM
Attachments: [265 Front Brooklyn.docx](#)

To whom it may concern.

Subject: Opposition to Upzoning of 265 Front St.
Reference: 265 Front Street (150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK)

Please enter my below attached testimony into your records

Thank you for your time and consideration

Ans Heerdink
Resident of VinegarHill

Brooklyn, NY 12-5-2020

To:
NYC Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises at City Council

In regards to:
Zoning 265 Front Street Rezoning , Brooklyn (N180178ZRK)

To whom it may concern,

As I am not able to attend the hearing this upcoming Monday please note and record into your records my below testimony

I am strongly opposed to the proposed up zoning of 265 Front Street, Brooklyn NY VinegarHill is a tiny Historic Enclave situated between the Navy Yard and Dumbo. We have fought very long and hard and managed to preserve this special neighborhood.

We received Landmark designation in 1997 and a R6B rezoning . Since then the area has been changing drastically and a lot of new tall construction has gone up all around us.

By allowing up zoning of this lot to an R6A you will set precedence for future developers and threatening the integrity of this neighborhood.

We strongly feel that sticking to the R6B zoning is needed so as to build contextual and preserve the character of this important historic enclave.

Further more the developers have made it known that they will NOT build to include MIH (mandatory inclusionary housing)

VinegarHill is not opposed to and would welcome MIH if build contextual.

But may I also point out that VinegarHill already has fulfilled it's MIH at 90 Sands Street (the former Jehova's Witness Hotel)

Thank you for your time and consideration

Ans Heerdink
Resident of VinegarHill

From: [Antonia Lant](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Cc: [Aldona Vaiciunas](#)
Subject: Opposition to Upzoning of 265 Front St.
Date: Monday, December 7, 2020 7:13:43 PM

Reference: 265 Front Street (150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK)
Re: Hearing on Zoning, 265 Front Street, Brooklyn, NY 11201 (*N180178ZRK*)
5 December 2020

Dear Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises Committee,

I am in favor of new neighbors and new development in Vinegar Hill, so long as it responsibly reflects the context of our neighborhood. As a long-time resident of Vinegar Hill, Brooklyn, I am writing to strenuously **oppose the petition** to amend the zoning of 265 Front Street from a R6B District to an R6A one. The building that would be developed, should this plan be approved by your subcommittee, would be monstrous for the neighborhood and destructive of its character as well as of its capacity to function. It would be **double** the height of the buildings around it.

I **vigorously oppose** the 265 Front Street request for up-zoning for these reasons:

- 1) Giving 265 Front a R6A zoning would **increase the infrastructure strain** on the neighborhood in a way that would be permanently damaging and irreversible.
- 2) Vinegar Hill has a **historic district designation** and this request for up-zoning is completely incompatible with the architectural scale of the homes surrounding 265 Front Street.
- 3) Vinegar Hill is designated zone R6B, a zoning which is appropriate to the age, density, and environment of the neighborhood. **Nothing has changed in the neighborhood since the R6B zoning was established** so there is no good reason to change it to R6A now.
- 4) Vinegar Hill is a quiet, residential place in which **everyone knows everyone else**—it's a bit like Willow Town in Brooklyn. Our lives would be overwhelmed by the addition of the scores of units which would be permitted under an upzoning to R6A.
- 5) Granting an upzoning for 265 Front Street would be **the thin end of the wedge** in that it would encourage and enable other developers to build projects incommensurate with our existing, exceptional, 19th century milieu. (The towering building at 85 Jay Street under construction a scant block away gives you a sense of what could happen.)
- 6) On Gold and Front, right by the 265 Front lot, are rows of houses with Landmark status. What is built at 265 Front needs to **meld with those**

beautiful buildings, respect them, and be in harmony with them, not tower threateningly over them.

The quietness of our cobble-stoned parish is rare in New York City. It is time to treasure this rarity by hearing the community of Vinegar Hill and **keeping new development in tune with the surroundings** (there are great examples of such development in Brooklyn, such as the row of recently-built townhouses on State and Bond Streets).

While we welcome new neighbors, affordable housing and development, my family implores you to turn down the request for an up-zoning of 265 Front St from the existing R6B to R6A.

Thank you.

Antonia Lant,
206 Front Street, #PHA, Brooklyn, NY 11201

From: [Conrad Mulcahy](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Cc: [Aldona Vaiciunas](#)
Subject: Opposition to Upzoning of 265 Front St. (150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK)
Date: Monday, December 7, 2020 3:45:01 PM
Attachments: [Objection to zoning change at 265 Front Street \(150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK\) City Council.docx](#)

December 7, 2020

New York City Council
NYC Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises

Re: Brooklyn Borough President's Public Hearing:
"265 Front Street" — C 150178 ZMK and N 180178 ZRK

To the members of the New York City Council,

I'd like to start by saying that thank you for taking the time to read my letter and for all your diligent, hard work on behalf of the Community. I'm guessing that the work can be a little thankless at times and you may often find yourself amid many fraught situations where days are long and the gratitude is short. I'd just like to say thank you for the work you do and make a point of saying how much your work is appreciated.

I am writing to you today regarding the proposed "up-zoning" of the property known as 265 Front Street to R6A. There are several items that I will note in more detail below, but this is my key point: **I vehemently oppose this proposed zone change, and I make the strongest possible plea for your committee to reject this proposal.** An up-zoning to R6A will be devastating to this neighborhood (both on this lot and for the precedent it would set for future development) and it serves nothing other than the greed of developer who has no appreciation for what this would do to our world.

Vinegar Hill is quiet, quaint, and has a VERY specific character. The streets are lined with row houses, the streets are mainly cobble-stone, and life slows down just a bit. You can see the sky and feel the sun on your face as you stroll. It's one of the many unique, and fragile, neighborhoods - ecosystems, really - that make New York such a special place to live.

265 Front Street is on one of these very special blocks: its neighbors are traditional row houses, none of which are more than 3-4 stories tall (those with addresses on Gold Street, and just up the block on Front Street towards DUMBO). The maximum height allowances for an R6A zone would allow for a building that towers over its neighbors and would be totally out of line with the existing neighborhood. An R6A building could be as much as twice as tall as its neighbors. That's crazy.

I understand that neighborhoods must grow and change. That's a fact of life in New York City. But there is sensible, targeted change, and there is neighborhood-ruining change. If a re-zoning is needed, I don't see why an R6B (and nothing more) would not suffice. That would allow for more housing to be built in a quiet, residential neighborhood without destroying the neighborhood in the process.

It's my understanding that the neighborhood has already been examined in detail and re-zoned in 1998. That process involved all of the right groups: City Planning, Community

Board 2, commercial owners, and residents. That re-zoning examined the scale and scope of buildings, and considered the various streetscapes in the neighborhood, and it correctly determined the correct character and zoning mix for the area. An R6A would be totally out of line with this previous good work.

If the developers are arguing the need for additional commercial / retail property in Vinegar Hill, they are basing it on myth or their own fantasy. We have huge amounts of commercial and retail property coming online all around us: development in DUMBO is off the charts and the Navy Yard has brought tens of thousands of square feet of commercial space online in sensible places (where the streets can accommodate the traffic and where there are several transportation options to bring folks to the area in sensible ways). We don't need big commercial lots that sit empty or can only be sustained by chain stores that don't meet the needs of the people who live there. Believe me, there's no one in Vinegar Hill who is clamoring for MORE commercial space. We can get all we need in DUMBO or the Navy Yard.

So, again, I politely but firmly ask you: please do not allow this up-zoning to R6A. Should the developer feel that an up-zoning is necessary, we can all calmly review the situation. We could all discuss what could be achieved with a change to R6B zoning, for example. That would ensure that anything built is in line with the neighborhood and would still allow the lot owner and the developer to make money. My wife and I moved here 8 years ago and we're raising our two children here. We love this place and call it home. Please don't allow a developer to ruin our beautiful and unique neighborhood and home for purely financial reasons.

As always, I look forward to your guidance and leadership on this matter. Again, I appreciate all of your time and consideration on this matter. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Conrad Mulcahy

Resident and Former President of the Board at 37 Bridge Street (Kirkman Lofts)

December 7, 2020

New York City Council
NYC Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises

Re: Brooklyn Borough President's Public Hearing:
"265 Front Street" — C 150178 ZMK and N 180178 ZRK

To the members of the New York City Council,

I'd like to start by saying that thank you for taking the time to read my letter and for all your diligent, hard work on behalf of the Community. I'm guessing that the work can be a little thankless at times and you may often find yourself amid many fraught situations where days are long and the gratitude is short. I'd just like to say thank you for the work you do and make a point of saying how much your work is appreciated.

I am writing to you today regarding the proposed "up-zoning" of the property known as 265 Front Street to R6A. There are several items that I will note in more detail below, but this is my key point: **I vehemently oppose this proposed zone change, and I make the strongest possible plea for your committee to reject this proposal.** An up-zoning to R6A will be devastating to this neighborhood (both on this lot and for the precedent it would set for future development) and it serves nothing other than the greed of developer who has no appreciation for what this would do to our world.

Vinegar Hill is quiet, quaint, and has a VERY specific character. The streets are lined with row houses, the streets are mainly cobble-stone, and life slows down just a bit. You can see the sky and feel the sun on your face as you stroll. It's one of the many unique, and fragile, neighborhoods - ecosystems, really - that make New York such a special place to live.

265 Front Street is on one of these very special blocks: its neighbors are traditional row houses, none of which are more than 3-4 stories tall (those with addresses on Gold Street, and just up the block on Front Street towards DUMBO). The maximum height allowances for an R6A zone would allow for a building that towers over its neighbors and would be totally out of line with the existing neighborhood. An R6A building could be as much as twice as tall as its neighbors. That's crazy.

I understand that neighborhoods must grow and change. That's a fact of life in New York City. But there is sensible, targeted change, and there is neighborhood-ruining change. If a re-zoning is needed, I don't see why an R6B (and nothing more) would not suffice. That would allow for more housing to be built in a quiet, residential neighborhood without destroying the neighborhood in the process.

It's my understanding that the neighborhood has already been examined in detail and re-zoned in 1998. That process involved all of the right groups: City Planning, Community Board 2, commercial owners, and residents. That re-zoning examined the scale and scope of buildings, and considered the various streetscapes in the neighborhood, and it correctly determined the correct character and zoning mix for the area. An R6A would be totally out of line with this previous good work.

If the developers are arguing the need for additional commercial / retail property in Vinegar Hill, they are basing it on myth or their own fantasy. We have huge amounts of commercial and retail property coming online all around us: development in DUMBO is off the charts and the Navy Yard has brought tens of thousands of square feet of commercial space online in sensible places (where the streets can accommodate the traffic and where there are several transportation options to bring folks to the area in sensible ways). We don't need big commercial lots that sit empty or can only be sustained by chain stores that don't meet the needs of the people who live there. Believe me, there's no one in Vinegar Hill who is clamoring for MORE commercial space. We can get all we need in DUMBO or the Navy Yard.

So, again, I politely but firmly ask you: please do not allow this up-zoning to R6A. Should the developer feel that an up-zoning is necessary, we can all calmly review the situation. We could all discuss what could be achieved with a change to R6B zoning, for example. That would ensure that anything built is in line with the neighborhood and would still allow the lot owner and the developer to make money. My wife and I moved here 8 years ago and we're raising our two children here. We love this place and call it home. Please don't allow a developer to ruin our beautiful and unique neighborhood and home for purely financial reasons.

As always, I look forward to your guidance and leadership on this matter. Again, I appreciate all of your time and consideration on this matter. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Conrad Mulcahy

Resident and Former President of the Board at 37 Bridge Street (Kirkman Lofts)

From: [Erin Cox Elder](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Cc: [Aldona Vaiciunas](#)
Subject: Opposition to Upzoning of 265 Front St. / Reference: 265 Front Street (150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK)
Date: Monday, December 7, 2020 3:27:24 PM

Reference: 265 Front Street (150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK)

Dear City Council,

As a resident of Vinegar Hill, I strongly oppose the rezoning of 265 Front St from and M1 to R6A. I welcome new neighbors, affordable housing and development, but only when it can be done contextually and responsibly which an R6B designation would readily provide for.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Erin Elder

From: [ilych Ramirez](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Cc: vinegarhillbklyn@gmail.com
Subject: Land use testimony
Date: Monday, December 7, 2020 2:22:19 PM

Dear City Council,

As a resident of Vinegar Hill, I strongly oppose the rezoning of 265 Front St from M1 to R6A. I welcome new neighbors, affordable housing and development, but only when it can be done contextually and responsibly which an R6B designation would readily provide for.

An R6A designation would negatively impact the quality of life of life-long residents and it would further diminish the architectural heritage of the historical neighborhood.

Please do not allow the designation of 265 Front St to an R6A zone to ruin the the harmony of the ecosystem in which this tightly knit community lives in.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Yours truly

Illych Ramirez
Resident at 69 Gold Street

From: [Julia Ryan & Kane Platt](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Cc: vinegarhillbklyn@gmail.com
Subject: Opposition to Up-zoning of 265 Front St.
Date: Tuesday, December 8, 2020 10:55:44 AM

RE Opposition to Up-zoning of 265 Front St.
Reference: 265 Front Street (150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK)

Dear City Council,

As a resident of Vinegar Hill, I strongly oppose the rezoning of 265 Front St from and M1 to R6A. I welcome new neighbors, affordable housing and development, but only when it can be done contextually and responsibly which an R6B designation would readily provide for.

Additionally, this developer's continued misrepresentation of the scale & height of the proposed project, and the lack of transparency and inaccuracies in communication are alarming.

Finally, there are serious infrastructure considerations to be taken into account which should rule out any up-zoning requests, now or in the future. Our small historic streets cannot handle the commercial traffic that up-zoned development requires, parking is very limited, and public transportation (in particular the York Street Station of the F line) is inadequately scaled for the current needs of Vinegar Hill and the adjacent DUMBO neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Julia Ryan
917 405 8086

From: [ken schleife](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Subject: Fwd: 265 Front St Upzone
Date: Monday, December 7, 2020 2:17:11 PM

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: ken schleife <kschleife@hotmail.com>
Date: December 6, 2020 at 11:39:37 CST
To: "vinegar-hill-neighborhood-association-@googlegroups.com" <vinegar-hill-neighborhood-association-@googlegroups.com>
Cc: Per-Olof Odman <odman77@hotmail.com>
Subject: 265 Front St Upzone

Re: 265 Front St. Proposed up zoning N18o178ZK

To those involved in this decision.

We, my wife and self are long time owners of a NYC Landmarked brownstone At 71 Gold Street, Brooklyn, NY. (over 30 years) We are one of 5 brownstones That run up Gold Street and terminate at the corner of 265 Front St. The location Of proposed development, and up zoning. We would want to make our voices Loudly heard AGAINST the upscale of this development for Mandatory inclusionary Housing. We are witnessing a huge amount of development at this time all around Our small area of Historic Brownstones, and we favor MIH wherever feasible in these Projects. However in this case at the termination of a row of 4 story historic buildings This up scaling DOES NOT FIT. Please use some sensitivity to the long existing Residents that have worked for years in this small neighborhood, give us some Buffer, keep some relevance to the historical buildings that exist. The Owners of this parcel, have also been in this area for as long as we have And have never done a thing to benefit, or be involved in the betterment of the Block. In fact quit the opposite has been true they have for years left the trucks involved In their trucking business idle for long periods, violating codes, in other ways as well By illegally stacking temporary shipping containers on site. It is ironic that now that The "gold rush" is on in our neighborhood that they would try to skirt the law by up zoning With a provision meant to provide affordable housing, when that is the farthest thing From these "developers mind. Thank you. Ken and Marilyn Schleife

A

Sent from my iPad

From: [Laura Denise Milkowski](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Subject: 265 front st Rezoning.
Date: Monday, December 7, 2020 3:19:58 PM

Subject: Opposition to Upzoning of 265 Front St.
Reference: 265 Front Street (150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK)

Please say whatever you like but something simple will suffice such as:

Dear City Council,

As a resident of Vinegar Hill, I sat in on other requests and have and still strongly oppose the rezoning of 265 Front St from and M1 to R6A. Allowing this would set a precedent for all other lots upcoming for development. The streets, F train stop and town cannot accommodate the high volume of foot traffic this would propose.

I am sure that's why the zoning was initially set in place, and thank you for your consideration.

Thank you for taking the time to review this.

Kind Regards,
Laura D. Milkowski

Sent from my iPhone

From: [martin_hirsch](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Subject: 265 Front Street opposition to rezoning
Date: Monday, December 7, 2020 1:48:50 PM
Attachments: [Martin VHNA 265 Front E Adams .docx](#)

Dear Committee members, attached is my letter in opposition to the rezoning application for 265 Front Street,

Martin Hirsch
243 Front Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201
margo.hirsch@gmail.com

December 7, 2020

Honorable Francisco Moya
Chair Land Use Subcommittee
NYC Council

Re: Hearing -265 Front Street, Brooklyn, NY

Dear Councilmember Moya:

I am writing to urge you to deny the application for a zoning change from M1-2 to R6A/C2-4 for the above-listed property.

As you may know, the members of the Committee on Land Use, Community Board Two, recently voted against recommended against R6A/C2-4 and requested Mr. Spinard consider R6B instead. Brooklyn Borough President Eric Adams did the same. Despite this, City Planning would not consider allowing an amendment to the application for R6B zoning as the community has been requesting from the developers since they first spoke to us about the proposed project five years ago.

City Planning's objection was that R6A would insure mandatory inclusionary housing (MIH). But the developer has never planned to build more than nine units which would exempt them from MIH requirements.

The residents on Vinegar Hill are not opposed to low-income housing and supported the development of over 450 units of housing for the formerly homeless and low income families being developed three blocks from my home (the project is on the site of a former Jehovah Witness property on Sand Street.

Vinegar Hill was, and still is, one of those small neighborhoods in need of protection.

Vinegar Hill has a rich history dating back to the early seventeenth century when Dutch settlers bought parcels of land from the Canarsie Indians. The vast majority of the houses standing today were build in the early nineteenth century, the largest building on Front Street between Bridge and Gold Streets is the six story brick building constructed as a factory by Benjamin Moore and Company in 1908.

In the early 1990's St. Anne's was destroyed by the Tocci family despite the pleas of the neighborhood to save the 125 year-old treasure. The destruction of that magnificent church, so rich in history, was the catalyst for having Vinegar Hill

designated as an historic district. As a neighborhood we not only wanted to save our buildings, we wanted to preserve the distinct character of the area and worked to change the zoning to R6B.

Unlike our neighbor to the immediate west, Dumbo, Vinegar Hill is a low rise, quiet enclave. Many of us who own houses have been in the neighborhood for more than three decades and strive to keep housing units affordable for newer residents who have chosen the area because of its unique qualities.

The addition of a low-rise apartment building with R6B zoning would be a welcome addition to our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Martin Hirsch

From: [Nick McDonell](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Cc: [Aldona Vaiciunas](#)
Subject: Opposition to Upzoning of 265 Front St.
Date: Monday, December 7, 2020 3:03:57 PM

Reference: 265 Front Street (150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK)

Dear City Council,

As a resident of Vinegar Hill, I strongly oppose the rezoning of 265 Front St from and M1 to R6A. I welcome new neighbors, affordable housing and development, but only when it can be done contextually and responsibly which an R6B designation would readily provide for.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Nick McDonell
328 Plymouth Street

From: [Bartow Church](#)
To: [Land Use Testimony](#)
Cc: [Aldona](#); [Shimme](#); [Levin, Stephen](#); [Boucher, Jonathan](#); [Solotaire, Ben](#); [Adams, Elizabeth](#); rbearak@brooklynbp.nyc.gov
Subject: 265 Front St. - Rezoning Opposition Testimony
Date: Monday, December 7, 2020 12:49:59 PM
Attachments: [265 Front St. Upzoning Opposition CC.pdf](#)

Mr. Richard Church
75 Gold Street
Brooklyn, NY 11021

Dec 7, 2020

New York City Council
via: landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov

Re: 265 Front Street (150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK)

Dear City Council Members.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to share our testimony on the 265 Front St project. I live at 75 Gold St. immediately adjacent to the site. This is my 4th time providing formal testimony against this project and I would be happy to do it ten more times as would my other neighbors. In my past testimony I've mostly spoken about how this proposed upzoning was inappropriate for the low-lying streets and buildings of our small historic neighborhood, but today I want to focus more on the nature of the conversations we've had with the owners of the property. The owner's attorney paints a rosy picture of the open dialogue and engagement with our community and that they have tried really hard to work with us.

They also claim they have been important members of our community. That's simply not the case on either account.

The owners and their attorney, Eric Palatnik, approached the neighborhood circa 2015 about redeveloping this lot as residential and said they'd be applying for R6A. At that time, we stated we couldn't support R6A or larger for all the reasons you are aware, but would gladly support R6B which is the overall envelope of our small neighborhood and also what sits directly next to and around the site. Yes, there is an R6A building, 99 Gold St, across the street and near the NYCHA housing, but that building was built in 1919 and because of its density could not be R6B when it was converted back in 2005.

In taking this initial meeting, the developers were effectively humoring us in asking what we wanted and simply wanted the optics of "listening to the neighbors". They of course pushed forward for R6A despite our pleas. Only when beginning to feel resistance from the city, did they begin offering "promises" to perhaps build smaller or more historic. They also dangled items they think we'd be in favor of such as only leasing whatever we wanted in the unwanted commercial space. Instead of stringing us along with empty promises, they could have simply withdrawn and applied for R6B anytime in the last 8

years. We would have fully supported that. They chose however to forge ahead. Eventually they encountered more resistance and began trying to offer restrictive declarations. While a viable option in theory, this notion has never felt like anything but a ruse, to get us to come around to R6A.

We all know these restrictive declarations once agreed upon become a civil matter and our small association just can't afford to litigate against a breach of contract with these owners or the deep pocketed developers, they inevitably flip this lot too. We never seen any evidence this works and have only seen it to the contrary. Look at the history of 85 Jay St for example when it was a school that was sold to Jehovahs and now is a mega development. It's just something we'd have to battle for years to come. We would rather see this stay M1 than fight against this. It would be better for the neighborhood.

We've said it all along; we will gladly welcome new neighbors and buildings to our neighborhood as long as its contextual and responsible. We welcome affordable housing - - which they have promised to not build by the way, but our neighborhood can't afford the slippery upwards slope from of R6A to R7A and so forth. Allowing this zoning starts an irreversible trajectory that would change the historic landscape and character of the neighborhood forever. DUMBO is already opening up 85 Jay, 69 Adams and myriad of other tall buildings that are adding thousands of units.

In summary, I ask the councilmembers to stand with us, CB2 and Eric Adams and vote against this upzoning. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Richard Church
75 Gold St.

Cc:
Aldona Vacianas
Stephen Levin
Benjamin Solotaire
Jonathan Boucher
Richard Bearak
Elizabeth Adams

Mr. Richard Church
75 Gold Street
Brooklyn, NY 11021

Dec 7, 2020

New York City Council
via: landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov

Re: 265 Front Street (150178 ZMK, 180178 ZRK)

Dear City Council Members.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to share our testimony on the 265 Front St project. I live at 75 Gold St. immediately adjacent to the site. This is my 4th time providing formal testimony against this project and I would be happy to do it ten more times as would my other neighbors. In my past testimony I've mostly spoken about how this proposed upzoning was inappropriate for the low-lying streets and buildings of our small historic neighborhood, but today I want to focus more on the nature of the conversations we've had with the owners of the property. The owner's attorney paints a rosy picture of the open dialogue and engagement with our community and that they have tried really hard to work with us.

They also claim they have been important members of our community. That's simply not the case on either account.

The owners and their attorney, Eric Palatnik, approached the neighborhood circa 2015 about redeveloping this lot as residential and said they'd be applying for R6A. At that time, we stated we couldn't support R6A or larger for all the reasons you are aware, but would gladly support R6B which is the overall envelope of our small neighborhood and also what sits directly next to and around the site. Yes, there is an R6A building, 99 Gold St, across the street and near the NYCHA housing, but that building was built in 1919 and because of its density could not be R6B when it was converted back in 2005.

In taking this initial meeting, the developers were effectively humoring us in asking what we wanted and simply wanted the optics of "listening to the neighbors". They of course pushed forward for R6A despite our pleas. Only when beginning to feel resistance from the city, did they begin offering "promises" to perhaps build smaller or more historic. They also dangled items they think we'd be in favor of such as only leasing whatever we wanted in the unwanted commercial space. Instead of stringing us along with empty promises, they could have simply withdrawn and applied for R6B anytime in the last 8 years. We would have fully supported that. They chose however to forge ahead. Eventually they encountered more resistance and began trying to offer restrictive declarations. While a viable option in theory, this notion has never felt like anything but a ruse, to get us to come around to R6A.

We all know these restrictive declarations once agreed upon become a civil matter and our small association just can't afford to litigate against a breach of contract with these owners or the deep pocketed developers, they inevitably flip this lot too. We never seen any evidence this works and have only seen it to the contrary. Look at the history of 85 Jay St for example when it was a school that was sold to Jehovahs and now is a mega development. It's just something we'd have to battle for years to

come. We would rather see this stay M1 than fight against this. It would be better for the neighborhood.

We've said it all along; we will gladly welcome new neighbors and buildings to our neighborhood as long as its contextual and responsible. We welcome affordable housing -- which they have promised to not build by the way, but our neighborhood can't afford the slippery upwards slope from of R6A to R7A and so forth. Allowing this zoning starts an irreversible trajectory that would change the historic landscape and character of the neighborhood forever. DUMBO is already opening up 85 Jay, 69 Adams and myriad of other tall buildings that are adding thousands of units.

In summary, I ask the councilmembers to stand with us, CB2 and Eric Adams vote against this upzoning. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Richard Church
75 Gold St.

Cc:

Aldona Vaciunas
Stephen Levin
Benjamin Solotaire
Jonathan Boucher
Richard Bearak
Elizabeth Adams