

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND
FRANCHISES

----- X

May 22, 2024
Start: 11:30 a.m.
Recess: 12:03 p.m.

HELD AT: 250 BROADWAY, COMMITTEE ROOM - 14TH
FLOOR

B E F O R E: Kevin C. Riley, Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Shaun Abreu
David M. Carr
Kamillah Hanks
Francisco P. Moya
Yusef Salaam
Lynn C. Schulman

2 SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Check, check. This is a
3 mic check on the Committee on Zoning and Franchises.
4 Recorded on the 14th Floor on the 22nd of May by
5 Patrick K. Check, check.

6 SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Good morning, and
7 welcome to the New York City hybrid hearing on the
8 Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises.

9 Please silence all electronic devices. If
10 you have to use your phones, please do that outside
11 the hearing room.

12 Also, there will be no food or drink in
13 the 14th Floor Hearing Room.

14 Please, do not approach the dais.

15 Thank you very much for your kind
16 cooperation.

17 Chair, we are ready to begin.

18 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: [GAVEL] Good morning,
19 everyone, and welcome to a meeting of the
20 Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises. I am Council
21 Member Kevin Riley, Chair of the Subcommittee. Today,
22 I am joined by Council Members Schulman, Salaam,
23 Carr, Abreu, Hanks, and remotely by Council Member
24 Moya.

1 Today, we are scheduled to hold votes on
2 three applications. The first vote is to approve LUs
3 Number 55 and 56 with modifications. This is a Major
4 Regulatory Initiative by the Administration that is
5 known as Zoning for Economic Opportunity, also
6 referred to as ZEO. ZEO is the second of three major
7 amendments to the City's Zoning Resolution, which
8 regulates what can be built and the allowed uses
9 within a building. The first initiative was Zoning
10 for Carbon Neutrality, which the Council adopted and
11 voted on last year. The second amendment is ZEO, and
12 the third amendment is known as Zoning for Housing
13 Opportunity. This third amendment was just referred
14 to Community Boards, and Council will vote on it
15 later this year. Together, these three amendments to
16 the Zoning Resolution are known as the City of Yes. I
17 want to make it clear to the public watching today
18 and those in the room that today we are only voting
19 on ZEO. The focus on ZEO is on how the Zoning
20 Resolution regulates businesses. The City's Zoning
21 Resolution dates back to 1961, and many of the Zoning
22 Regulations that relate to allowed commercial uses
23 were written over 60 years ago. The issue is that
24 since the 1960s, the City has significantly changed.
25

1 In the '60s, personal computers did not exist, and
2 heavy manufacturing was still a major part of the
3 City's economy. Today, the City's economy is vastly
4 different. Life sciences, healthcare, tech, and the
5 film industry are now major sectors of the City's
6 economy. Heavy manufacturing has been largely
7 replaced by small-scale clean production. The City is
8 a tourist destination for people around the world,
9 and different types of entertainment that the City
10 has to offer is one of the main reasons people visit
11 New York City. How people shop has also fundamentally
12 changed with e-commerce. The differences since the
13 1960s do not stop there. Work from home has also
14 transformed how people commute and what residents
15 expect of their neighborhoods. In the short, the
16 Zoning Regulations that govern where and how
17 businesses can operate are out of date, and there is
18 a wide consensus throughout the City that these
19 regulations need to be updated. To update what a
20 business can do in a certain neighborhood, the
21 Administration created 18 different proposals. That
22 is a lot. Together, the proposals are over 1,000
23 pages. We have heard a lot of concerns about the
24 content and complexity of ZEO. Today, I want to

confirm that these concerns were heard. In response, we at the City Council are making significant changes to the ZEO to address these concerns. There were consistent themes among the concerns voiced by community boards, civic organizations, and individual New Yorkers throughout the City. First, there is a concern that the 18 proposals would allow new types of noisy commercial uses to locate in local commercial corridors. These new businesses could transform our current pedestrian-centered neighborhood shopping areas by introducing out-of-scale shops, blocking sidewalks for loading, and increasing congestion. There is a clear need in our local retail corridors to prioritize pedestrians, minimize congestion, and ensure that allowed uses are compatible with one another. For example, auto repair shops and businesses involving a lot of loading are not compatible with a restaurant that has outdoor seating or a coffee shop that serves walk-in customers. These are conflicts that communities are understandably concerned about. Local commercial corridors consist primarily of C1 and C2 commercial overlay districts. The Council's modifications to ZEO proposal will maintain C1 overlay districts as

2 pedestrian-friendly local retail corridors intended
3 to serve the surrounding neighborhood. With C2
4 commercial districts, which can serve one or more
5 neighborhoods, the objective of the modification is
6 to ensure the scales of the business is appropriate.

7 The second set of concerns focus on the
8 fact that ZEO should not transform residential areas
9 into mixed-use districts. Several of the ZEO
10 proposals would introduce on as an as-of-right basis,
11 or through an authorization only approved by the City
12 Planning Commission, businesses in purely residential
13 areas throughout the city. In some residential areas,
14 introducing new commercial uses may be appropriate,
15 but this may be determined individually for each
16 neighborhood. A blanket approach that treats all
17 residential neighborhoods the same is not sound Land
18 Use planning. The proposed modification would prevent
19 a one-size-fits-all approach to changing our
20 residential districts into mixed-use districts.

21 The third set of concerns we heard is
22 that ZEO would bypass Community Boards in relation to
23 certain Land Use decisions. We, Council members, are
24 here to represent our individual communities and
25 collectively protect the voices of all our

1 communities. As such, we will be modifying those
2 proposals in ZEO that would bypass Community Boards
3 and the Council on important Land Use issues. ZEO
4 will not be allowed to suppress community input.
5

6 We also consistently heard that in order
7 for ZEO to be effective, there must be meaningful
8 enforcement of Zoning Regulations. Everyone knows the
9 Department of Building is understaffed and needs more
10 inspectors to effectively enforce against zoning
11 violations. If we are going to revise where and how
12 businesses operate, then it is critical that DOB have
13 the needed resources to effectively enforce the new
14 regulations. Additionally, enforcement in regards to
15 the operation of nightlife businesses is also needed.
16 As Chair Salamanca will elaborate on at our Land Use
17 Committee hearing later, the Council has secured
18 commitments from the Administration to fund increases
19 to both DOB personnel and the Mayor's Office of
20 Nightlife Inspectors. Regulatory reform and
21 enforcement go hand-in-hand and must be done at the
22 same time.

23 Lastly, ZEO has a major omission. It
24 lacks a proposal to regulate the Last Mile Warehouse.
25 These large distribution warehouses are

2 disproportionately impacting certain of our
3 communities and raise real environmental justice
4 issues. Right now, operators are concentrating
5 distribution warehouses in the South Bronx in Chair
6 Salamanca's District and in Red Hook in Council
7 Member Avila's District. This is causing increased
8 truck traffic and air pollution in black and brown
9 communities that are already suffering from poor air
10 quality and underinvestment. The City must
11 comprehensively rethink how packages are being
12 delivered to our homes. The health of historically
13 disadvantaged communities should not be further
14 compromised so that other neighborhoods can have
15 access to online shopping. As will be explained
16 further by Chair Salamanca, we obtained commitments
17 from the Administration to set a clear course of
18 action to address the critical issues that face our
19 communities, which are overburdened with Last Mile
20 Warehouses, and plan for equitable distribution of
21 new facilities of this type.

22 I will now go over how we are modifying
23 the proposals in ZEO to be responsive to the
24 community concerns we have heard. The next section is
25 very long, but please bear with me and listen

2 carefully because it is important that our
3 communities understand how we are changing ZEO to
4 address their concerns.

5 Proposal 1. Seek to facilitate the
6 reactivation of vacant storefronts in residential
7 districts. An activated space is better than an empty
8 storefront, but the use that a space is reactivated
9 with has to be compatible with the residential nature
10 of the district. This is why we are modifying ZEO to
11 limit the reactivation of vacant storefronts to shop
12 and offices typically associated with local shopping
13 corridors.

14 Proposal 2. This proposal concerns
15 commercial overlay districts that are mapped within
16 residential areas. The proposal will merge C1 and C2
17 overlay districts to expand where businesses can
18 locate throughout the city. The issue with this
19 proposal is that it treats all local commercial
20 corridors in the city the same way. Depending on the
21 neighborhood and size of the street, local shopping
22 areas throughout the city actually differ quite a
23 bit, so we need to retain the distinction between
24 more locally focused commercial corridors with small
25 retail shops and commercial corridors along avenues

2 that serve multiple neighborhoods and have large
3 businesses. We can preserve the character of our
4 local shopping areas by excluding certain uses from
5 C1 overlay districts such as gas stations, car
6 dealerships, auto repair shops, and laboratories. We
7 are also modifying ZEO to place a size restriction of
8 3,000 square feet on certain types of shops such as
9 makerspaces, amusement-based businesses, and other
10 repair and service businesses to ensure our C2
11 commercial overlay districts do not become out of
12 scale. We are also imposing size limitations ranging
13 from 5,000 square feet to 10,000 square feet on
14 certain businesses.

15 Proposal 3. The City's manufacturing
16 sector has largely shifted from heavy industrial uses
17 to small scale clean production. These small-scale
18 production businesses such as bakeries, coffee
19 roasters, and 3D printing do not raise the same
20 environmental and nuisance concerns as heavy
21 manufacturing. The Administration's proposal here is
22 to allow these small-scale clean production uses in
23 commercial areas. While there is a small rationale
24 for this proposal, it also needs to be sensitive to
25 neighborhood context. This is why our modification is

1 requiring that these new types of uses be limited to
2 3,000 square feet in C1 overlay districts outside of
3 Manhattan and 5,000 square feet in Manhattan and C2
4 overlay districts. We are also requiring that certain
5 of these makerspaces that could increase congestion
6 or generate significant noise not be allowed in C1
7 overlay shopping areas that often have homes right
8 next to or above businesses.

10 Proposal 5. Seeks to facilitate the
11 conversion of office buildings by allowing more
12 flexibility as to where different types of uses can
13 be located within the mixed-use building. How people
14 work has changed since the pandemic and we need to
15 adapt to it as a city. Currently, commercial uses can
16 only locate below residential units in the mixed-use
17 building. The proposal would allow commercial uses on
18 the same floor and above residential uses if these
19 uses have separated entrances, different elevators,
20 and are completely separated from one another. Beyond
21 these protective measures, we are also requiring that
22 the vertical and horizontal separation between
23 residential and non-office uses be strengthened. This
24 modification will create more of a buffer between
25 different types of uses, which will decrease noise

2 and the vibration disturbances for residents in the
3 building. We are further modifying the proposal to
4 only allow eating and drinking establishments above
5 residential units on rooftops in Manhattan and in
6 downtown areas of the other four boroughs. The
7 proposed modification will also require that the
8 amusement uses be located below residential units.

9 The amusement uses will be subject to clear maximum
10 noise levels to further prevent potential
11 disturbances to residents living in the building.

12 This modification will also allow commercial uses on
13 the second floor of neighborhood commercial
14 corridors, where it is currently limited to the
15 ground floor only, but will prohibit the conversion
16 of any existing apartments.

17 Proposal 7. This is an innovative
18 proposal to make the city's food supply more secure
19 and less dependent on trucks by allowing indoor
20 agricultural in commercial areas. Indoor agriculture
21 is presently only allowed in manufacturing districts.
22 This is a proposal that makes a lot of sense, but
23 legitimate concerns were raised about size of these
24 uses as well as the growth of cannabis. First, our
25 proposed modification is to prevent the growth of

2 cannabis in commercial overlays. The growth of
3 cannabis generates odors and is not a household item,
4 which is why we are prohibiting its growth in local
5 shopping areas located in residential districts.
6 Second, in C1 commercial overlay outside of
7 Manhattan, we are limiting indoor agriculture to
8 3,000 square feet, and in C2 commercial overlays also
9 outside of Manhattan, we are imposing a size
10 restriction of 10,000 square feet.

11 Proposal 8. Life sciences have become a
12 major sector of City's economy. This industry
13 provides good-paying jobs at all levels, and we
14 should encourage its growth. That said, laboratories
15 are not compatible with local retail corridors where
16 residents go to pick up bagel and do laundry. Our
17 modification here is to prohibit laboratories from C1
18 commercial overlays to preserve local shopping
19 corridors in predominantly low-density residential
20 neighborhoods.

21 Proposal 10. We are now halfway through
22 the proposal. Is everyone still with me? All right.

23 Proposal 10 is about amusements and
24 making sure we have access to healthy, social, and
25 safe activities. Currently, many of the activities

1 associated with children, such as trampoline parks,
2 obstacle courses, laser tag, and digital-related
3 amusements are only allowed in manufacturing
4 districts. This makes no sense. Of course, to me,
5 this makes no sense, I have three kids. Having our
6 children travel and walk around industrial areas is
7 not safe and also poses challenges to a business
8 operation. This proposal will allow amusement uses in
9 commercial districts. The concern here is that in our
10 commercial overlay districts, these uses need to be
11 context-sensitive. Our modification will limit the
12 size of amusements in C1 overlay districts outside of
13 Manhattan. In Manhattan and in C2 overlay districts,
14 a 5,000-square-foot limitation will apply. We are
15 imposing a size limitation of 5,000 square feet in C2
16 overlay districts outside of Manhattan and 10,000
17 square feet in Manhattan. In mixed-use buildings that
18 have residential units, the proposed modification is
19 to limit the location of amusement uses so that they
20 are only allowed below residence.

22 Proposal 11. This proposal is focused on
23 home businesses, and it drew a lot of attention.
24 Here, it is important to clarify that the current
25 regulation only prohibits a small number of home

businesses, and the list prohibited uses makes little sense. For example, lawyers and accountants can have a home office but not interior designers or stockbrokers. People working in advertising or public relations or individuals cutting hair or doing nails are also currently not allowed to use their home for their work. Not only is this list conceptually flawed, but it has also raised real issues of inequity. We know for a fact that many families throughout the city rely on doing hair or nails for their home to make ends meet, and this should not be unlawful. On the other hand, this proposal goes too far by increasing the number of employees allowed from one to three. Doing hair for customers in your home is one thing, while running a three-chair barbershop out of one's home is another. This is why we are going to modify the proposal to retain the current one-employee limit. We are also going to continue prohibiting any businesses involving live animals. A home is not an appropriate place to run a kennel or for a vet to open up shop and take care of animals. With these modifications, we strongly believe that we will bring the zoning resolution up

1 to date on home occupations while safeguarding the
2 quality of life and safety of residents.

3
4 Proposal 13 seeks to address a long-
5 standing problem that afflicts certain neighborhoods.
6 I am talking about auto repair shops. This is a real
7 problem in the Bronx. Certain streets have been taken
8 over by auto repair shops. This has created
9 congestion issues, preventing pedestrians from using
10 the sidewalks, and has negatively impacted
11 surrounding businesses. ZEO will require new auto
12 repair shops to obtain a BSA special permit before
13 opening in any neighborhood. However, this does not
14 go far enough. We are going to prohibit new auto
15 repair shops from opening in our local shopping
16 areas, consisting of C-1 commercial overlay
17 districts. Auto repair shops, whether it be for tire
18 or engine repair, are simply not compatible with
19 pedestrian-centered retail corridors in residential
20 neighborhoods. In the other zoning districts, we are
21 requiring that the BSA analyze the concentration of
22 existing auto repair shops before it allows another
23 one to open. Together, this proposal and our
24 modification will finally start addressing the over-

concentration of auto repair shops in our community and others.

Proposal 14. This is another innovative solution to a problem that is affecting every single neighborhood in the city, the delivery of packages. E-commerce is convenient, but it has created a real logistical issue for cities. The infrastructure needed to deliver packages to people's homes has not been sufficiently developed or regulated. As a result, a few communities are shouldering the burden of large last-mile distribution facilities. These last-mile warehouses need to be equitable distributed throughout the city, and this is a key demand of the Council as part of approving ZEO. Another part of the solution is to create micro-distribution facilities in each neighborhood, which Proposal 14 does. These are small facilities similar to local post office branches from which packages can be delivered by foot or bike. These micro-distribution facilities are particularly needed in high-density areas, and ZEO will allow them as-of-right in Manhattan up to certain sizes based on their location. Outside of Manhattan, in lower-density districts, we believe a more thorough analysis of what type of local

1 distribution facilities are needed must be performed
2 on a neighborhood-level basis, so we will require
3 micro-distribution facilities outside of Manhattan to
4 apply for BSA's special permit before they can open.
5 The special permit will have size limitations and
6 require BSA to analyze concentration issues in order
7 to prevent these facilities from taking over entire
8 blocks and streets. We believe this two-track
9 approach to micro-distribution facilities, along with
10 the regulation of last-mile distribution facilities,
11 will create a more effective and equitable package
12 delivery system.
13

14 Moving on to Proposal 15, there are large
15 residential developments, primarily NYCHA and
16 Mitchell-Lama campuses, that do not have access to
17 everyday retail shops. Many of these campuses were
18 intentionally located in areas of the city that are
19 hard to access, and they are not well-serviced. This
20 proposal seeks to address this important issue by
21 creating a City Planning Commission authorization
22 that will allow businesses up to 15,000 square feet
23 to open on these large residential campuses. The
24 concept of providing more access to retail is good,
25 but residents of these large residential campuses and

2 local community need to be the one who decides where
3 shops are appropriate. This is why we are modifying
4 the authorization to a CPC special permit that will
5 be subject to a full year loop.

6 Proposal 16 is known as the corner store.
7 This plan raised a lot of concerns. The proposal will
8 have created a CPC authorization that will allow
9 small businesses and offices to locate within 100
10 feet of an intersection in purely residential areas.
11 The concern raised by many Community Boards is that
12 this proposal amounts to a citywide rezoning of
13 residential districts. Corner stores may be
14 appropriate in some residential districts, but this
15 needs to be determined individually by each
16 neighborhood. This is why we are removing this
17 proposal from ZEO. This idea needs to be pursued
18 through individual neighborhood rezoning.

19 Proposal 17. The film industry, is a
20 growing sector of the City's economy and that
21 provides our communities with access to good-paying
22 jobs. Film studios have special requirements in terms
23 of the type of buildings they can operate in. This
24 proposal will create a CPC authorization to modify
25 the bulk of a building to accommodate these special

1 needs. We are modifying the proposal to limit the
2 scope of changes that can be made to the height and
3 overbulk of a building. This will allow the needed
4 flexibility to make sure the film industry can
5 continue to grow in New York City, while ensuring
6 that this new mechanism does not create outsized
7 buildings.
8

9 Now for the last and final section of
10 ZEO, Proposal 18. This is a proposal that the Council
11 requested and it has been a long time in the making.
12 Spearheaded by Council Member Gutiérrez and Majority
13 Leader Fariás, the M-Zone Coalition of the Council
14 Members have been advocating to reform how the City's
15 industrial areas are regulated by zoning. The current
16 set of manufacturing zoning districts date back to
17 1961 and are not adequately protecting our core
18 industrial areas. Under the present regulations,
19 commercial uses like offices, retail shops, bars, and
20 entertainment venues can locate as-of-right in all M-
21 districts. High parking and loading requirements and
22 low FAR make it also very difficult to build new
23 industrial buildings or expand existing ones.
24 Proposal 18 creates a new set of M-districts that can
25 be mapped at a later point in time through ULURP or

on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis. These new M-districts consist of core industrial transition and growth districts. Council modification focused on strengthening the new core industrials and transition districts. In the core industrial districts, we are reducing the allowed non-industrial uses to a maximum of 10,000 square feet. This will preserve essential sites for industrial businesses and infrastructure while still allowing some flexibility for small retail or restaurants serving the industrial workforce. In the transition districts, we are increasing the size of the density incentive if dedicated industrial space is included in a building and at least 50 percent of the ground floor will have to be reserved for the dedicated industrial space. In transition districts, supermarkets will be allowed up to 30,000 square feet to increase access to food stores. Lastly, new M-districts mapped along the waterfront will require a 40-foot setback from the waterfront to preserve maritime freight access.

Together, Proposal 18 with the modifications is a true gamechanger and will finally provide the needed tools to maintain the strong industrial base that our

2 city needs to function properly and keep providing
3 access to jobs for all New Yorkers.

4 I just discussed a lot of information. We
5 will be posting materials on the Council's Planning
6 and Land Use webpage that explains the changes we are
7 making to ZEO. I hope your main takeaway from today
8 is that we really listened to the concerns expressed
9 by the communities throughout the whole city and
10 modified ZEO to squarely address these concerns.

11 Okay, we are also voting to approve LU-74
12 relating to a project known as the 15-21 West 124th
13 Street. Applicant is seeking a text amendment to
14 facilitate the development of a residential building
15 in Harlem within Council Member Salaam's district.
16 The proposed text amendment will reduce the required
17 parking in the R7/2 residential district within the
18 125 Street Special District. This reduction will
19 facilitate the development of a new seven-story 33-
20 unit residential building at 15-21 West 124th Street.
21 Council Member Salaam supports this proposal.

22 Counsel, are there any Council Members
23 with questions or remarks at this time? Members who
24 are appearing remotely who have questions or remarks
25 about today's items should use the raise hand button.

2 Counsel will announce Members in order the hands are
3 raised.

4 COMMITTEE COUNSEL VIDAL: Chair, Council
5 Members do not have any questions at this time.

6 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you. I now call
7 for a vote to approve with modifications LUs 55 and
8 56 relating to the Zoning for Economic Opportunity
9 Text Amendment Proposal and to approve LU-74 relating
10 to the 15-21 124th Street Text Amendment Proposal.

11 Counsel, please call the roll.

12 COMMITTEE COUNSEL VIDAL: Chair Riley.

13 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Aye on all.

14 COMMITTEE COUNSEL VIDAL: Council Member
15 Moya.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER MOYA: Aye on all.

17 COMMITTEE COUNSEL VIDAL: Council Member
18 Abreu.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER ABREU: Aye.

20 COMMITTEE COUNSEL VIDAL: Council Member
21 Hanks.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER HANKS: Permission to
23 explain my vote.

24 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Permission granted.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER HANKS: Thank you, Chair.

3 Firstly, I would like to take a moment to thank the
4 Department of City Planning, City Council, Land Use,
5 the Administration for their diligent efforts with
6 City of Yes for Economic Opportunity. Your dedication
7 to community outreach and education as well as your
8 willingness to modify the proposal based on your
9 feedback is truly commendable. There's a lot of good
10 things in here.

11 However, despite these efforts, it's
12 important to note that the civic organizations,
13 constituents, and community members in my District
14 simply do not agree with the proposal and, as a
15 representative of Staten Island's 49th District, it
16 is my duty to honor and follow the collective voice
17 of my constituents so, therefore, I will be voting no
18 on Land Use items 55 and 56 and aye on all the rest.
19 Thank you.

20 COMMITTEE COUNSEL VIDAL: Council Member
21 Schulman.

22 COUNCIL MEMBER SCHULMAN: Aye on all.

23 COMMITTEE COUNSEL VIDAL: Council Member
24 Salaam.

25 COUNCIL MEMBER SALAAM: I vote aye.

2 COMMITTEE COUNSEL VIDAL: Council Member
3 Carr.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER CARR: Permission to
5 explain my vote?

6 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Permission granted.

7 COUNCIL MEMBER CARR: Thank you, Chair. I
8 want to just mention that I think that the Zoning for
9 Economic Opportunity Text Amendments have improved by
10 leaps and bounds, and I want to commend the Land Use
11 Division Staff here and all those of my Colleagues
12 who worked to kind of reach this point. So many of
13 the aspects that were incredibly troubling to me and
14 those I represent are no longer in the text amendment
15 thankfully. Corner store is chief among them, but I
16 believe that as I look at this text amendment,
17 there's not really anything here that I believe is
18 actually going to improve the quality of life of the
19 people I represent, and there are a couple of items
20 still in this text amendment that give me pause for
21 some concern. In particular, the micro-distributions
22 being permitted with the BSA process in C1 and C2s
23 outside of Manhattan and the expansion of some
24 acceptable home business uses that are not currently
25 allowed under the current zoning text so there's a

2 lot here that I think is sort of no impact or no
3 moment to the people I represent and then there's
4 some items which could end up not meaning anything in
5 the long run but could possibly have negative
6 externalities down the road and, so in an abundance
7 of caution, I'll be voting no on those two Land Use
8 items 55 and 56 and yes on Land Use item 74. Thank
9 you.

10 COMMITTEE COUNSEL VIDAL: By a vote of
11 five in the affirmative, two opposing, and zero
12 abstentions, the items are approved and referred to
13 the full Land Use Committee.

14 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Counsel.
15 That concludes today's business. I would like to
16 thank the members of the public, my Colleagues,
17 Subcommittee Counsel, Land Use and other Council
18 Staff and the Sergeant-at-Arms for participating in
19 today's meeting. This meeting is hereby adjourned.
20 Thank you. [GAVEL]

21 COMMITTEE COUNSEL VIDAL: It's actually a
22 vote by a four. Okay, I'm going to try to get the
23 record right this time, so we have LUs 55 and 56 have
24 five votes in the affirmative, two in opposition, and
25

2 zero abstention and are approved and referred to a
3 full Land Use Committee.

4 However, as to LU number 74, it is
5 approved by seven votes and therefore approved and
6 referred to the full Land Use Committee. Sorry for
7 the confusion.

8 CHAIRPERSON RILEY: Thank you, Counsel.
9 That concludes today's business again. Thank you.

10 [GAVEL]

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

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 June 28, 2024