

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING
AND FRANCHISES

----- X

February 3, 2026
Start: 11:09 a.m.
Recess: 1:34 p.m.

HELD AT: 250 Broadway-8th Fl.- Hearing Rm. 1

B E F O R E: Farah N. Louis
Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

David M. Carr
Elsie Encarnación
Amanda C. Farías
Simcha Felder
Yusef Salaam
Justin E. Sanchez
Lynn C. Schulman

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

Richard Bass
Akerman LLP

Frank St. Jacques
Akerman LLP

Andrew Esposito
APEX Development

Frank Quatela
Architect

Kevin Williams

Richard Lobel
Sheldon Lobel, PC

Sam Zirkiev
Applicant

John Cori
Community Board 14 Chair of Land Use Committee

Delores Orr
Community Board 14 Chairperson

Lisa Orrantia

Steven Sinacori

Fayanne Betan
Sheldon Lobel, PC

Todd Dale

Scott Barone
Barone Management

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

Sylvia Johnson

James Colasante
Bayside Gables Homeowner's Association

Leo Marinello

Barbara Griffel

Megan Rha
Community Board 11

Roseann Henry

Walter Mugdan
President of Homeowner's Association

Matthew Silverstein
President of Bay Terrace Community Alliance

Henry Euler
Community Board 11 Second Vice Chair

Paul Graziano

Phil Konigsberg
Queens Community Board 7

Carol Marion

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 5

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Quiet please. Keep it down. Good morning and welcome to the New York City hybrid hearing on the Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises. Please silent all electronic devices at this time. Also, please do not approach the dais. If you have any questions, please raise your hand. One of us Sergeant at Arms will kindly assist you. Chair, we are ready to begin.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: [gavel] Good morning and welcome to our meeting of the Subcommittee on Zoning and Franchises. I'm Council Member Farah Louis, Chair of the Subcommittee. This morning I am joined by Council Members Amanda Farías, Lynn Schulman, Yusef Salaam, Simcha Felder, Elsie Encarnación, Justin Sanchez, Shanel Thomas-Henry, David Carr, Tiffany Cabán, Selvena Brooks-Powers, and Inna Vernikov. I am excited about this first meeting as Chair of the Subcommittee. I look forward to working with each of the Subcommittee Members, Chair Riley of the Land Use Committee, and Chair Marte of the Landmarks Subcommittee. I also look forward to working with applicant teams, and most importantly, hearing from the public. We have a full calendar, so let's get started. Today, we are holding eight

public hearings on 1417 Avenue U, mixed-use residential rezoning in Council Member Vernikov's district; 14-10 Beach Channel Drive residential rezoning in Council Member Brooks-Power's district; 33-01 11th Street, a mixed-use residential zoning in Council Member Cabán's district; 78-08 Linden Boulevard, a mixed-use residential rezoning in Council Member Ariola's district; 63-12 Brooklyn-- sorry-- Broadway residential rezoning in Council Member Won's district; and 247-56 90th Avenue residential rezoning in Council Member Lee's district; 217-14 24th Avenue, residential rezoning in Council Member Paladino's district; and a sidewalk café application by Ethyl's [sic] Alcohol and Food in Speaker Menin's district. This meeting is being held in a hybrid format. Members of the public who wish to testify may testify in person or via Zoom. Members of the public wishing to testify remotely may register by visiting the New York City Council website at www.council.nyc.gov/landuse to sign up, or for those of you here in person, please see one of the Sergeant at Arms to prepare and submit a speaker card. Members of the public may also view a live stream broadcast of the meeting at the Council's

website. When you are called to testify before the committee, if you are joining us remotely, you will remain muted until recognized by myself to speak. When you are recognized, your microphone will be unmuted. We will limit public testimony to two minutes per witness. If you have additional testimony that you would like the Subcommittee to consider, or if you have written testimony that you would like the Subcommittee-- sorry-- that you would like to submit instead of appearing in-person, please email to landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. Written testimony must be submitted up to three days after the hearing is closed. Please indicate the area number and/or project name in the subject line of your email. We request that witnesses joining us remotely remain in the meeting until excused by the Chair, as Council Members may have questions. Lastly, for everyone attending today's meeting, this is a government proceeding and decorum must be observed at all times. Members of the public are asked not to speak during the meeting unless you are testifying. The witness table is reserved for people who are called to testify, and no video recording or photography is allowed from the witness table.

Further, members of the public may not present audio or video recordings as testimony, but may submit transcripts of such recordings to the Sergeant at Arms for inclusion in the hearing record. And we've also been joined by Council Member Ariola. I now open the public hearing on LU numbers 33 and 34 regarding the 33-01 11th Street residential mixed-use rezoning proposal in Ravenswood, Queens in Council Member Cabán's district. The proposal involves a zoning map and text amendment. Applicant is seeking to build a mixed-use residential building with approximately 256 apartments. Mandatory Inclusionary Housing would be mapped as part of this application. So, between 52 and 77 of the apartments would be approximately affordable depending on affordability options selected. For anyone wishing to testify regarding this proposal remotely, if you have not already done so, you must register online by visiting the Council's website at council.nyc.gov/landuse. For anyone with us in-person, please see one of the Sergeant at Arms to submit a Speaker card. If you would prefer to submit written testimony, you can also do so by emailing

landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. I now recognize Council Member Cabán for remarks.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Thank you, Chair. Much of the Ravenswood area in District 22 is still governed by zoning that has not been updated since 1961. Since 2018, six private rezoning applications have been approved allowing up to 1,192 new units, including approximately 300 MIH units, yet only one project has even filed permits to begin construction. None of these projects have broken ground, and the community deserves a more comprehensive community-driven approach to ensure equitable and coordinated planning for development in this area, and I look forward to seeing how this individual development can better meet the community's priorities and continue conversations in our community about how to better-- bring better planning to this part of Astoria. So, thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Council Member Cabán. I now call the applicant panel for this proposal which consists of Richard Bass [sp?]. Counsel, please administer the affirmation.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Good morning.

Standing, I like it. Can you please state your name for the record and--

RICHARD BASS: Richard Bass.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: the project you're--

RICHARD BASS: [inaudible] 33-01 11th Street.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. And do you swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony this morning and in response to Council Member questions?

RICHARD BASS: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. You may begin your testimony which is limited to eight minutes. It's a strict eight minutes. And I would just ask you to please restate your name and organization for the record. You may begin.

RICHARD BASS: Am I on? Madam Chair, congratulations. I look forward to working with you. I'm Richard Bass. I'm with the law firm Akerman LLP. I can do my presentation, but I need my deck on the screen. Oh, so I have to look there, not here?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: When you're ready to go to the next slide, you can say next slide, but you could go.

RICHARD BASS: 33-01 11 Street is currently owned by Catholic Medical Mission. They provide medical services to developing countries. As the Council Member mentioned, this zoning R5 has been in place since 1961. It was actually studied in the late 50s. So, it's almost 70 years out of date. And when City Planning rezoned the area north of Broadway, it was 200 and something blocks. They promised to come back and do south of Broadway. That didn't occur, so we're now doing a block by block by block rezoning. And if you look at this picture, I'll just use it as an example. It's like north, west and south were rezoned by my office. Another law firm is doing the block to the east. Next slide, please. This is the block. It's a full block. We're a block south of Broadway. Oh, thank you. So, we're between 11th--

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: [interposing] Richard, I'm sorry for interrupting. I think something is wrong with your mic. Maybe, can you just pull the mic next to you over and turn this one off.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ZONING AND FRANCHISES 12

RICHARD BASS: I'll scoot over.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yeah, or scoot over.

Thank you. And just turn this one off so
[inaudible]. Thank you.

RICHARD BASS: Does this one work?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yes.

RICHARD BASS: Okay. So, this is-- now
you really can hear me. This is between 11th and 12th
Streets, 33rd Road and 33rd Avenue. Next slide.

Though it's zoned R5, as you can see by the color
coded map, most of the area is industrial. Right
now, our site is used for warehousing. Next slide.
Some of the pictures of the area. I know the Council
Member has been visiting the site, but as you can see
from the slide, this is not a residentially built
environment. The R5 didn't encourage residential
development, and these rezonings, the one that I'm
doing, the three others that my office has done, is
trying to make this a more residential neighborhood.
Next slide. Again, more pictures of the existing
warehouse. On the northeast corner there is a auto
repair business. Next slide. We're seeking two
changes. One's a zoning map change from the R5 to an
MXR7AM14 zoning district. Also, we'd be amending the

zoning text to allow MIH. Why we're doing the MX is that the client would like to remain on the site to continue their mission providing medical supplies to the developing countries around the world. Next slide, please. On the left, you can see the R5 kind of is the hole in the donut. So as I previously described, northwest and south has been rezoned. East of us is being studied for a rezoning. So, it would make good planning sense to do the hole in the donut. So, we're proposing an R7A, M14 rezoning. Next slide, please. What we're proposing is a 10-story building, approximately 186,000 square feet of residential. I would produce 251 units, 63 would be permanently affordable. We worked with the Council Member on reducing the number of studios and increase the number of one-bedrooms. By doing that, we've actually increased the number of two and three-bedrooms to 44 percent of the total units. The light warehouse, almost 14,000, would still be used by Catholic Medical Mission. We anticipate a little shy of 9,000 square feet of commercial, but as in discussions with the Council Member, we'll look at maybe doing a community facility use there, and the 3,300 square feet of community facility use that's on

the slide is going to be for the office of the Catholic Medical Mission. They currently-- I don't really know why, they have space down on Wall Street. So, this would be consolidating their warehouse and their back office space. Next slide. This is the first floor picture. It shows the residential entrances where we would have the trucks backing into the site and the retail. Next slide, please. This shows the massing of the building. We're doing a U shape that takes advantage of the southern light, and as you can see by the dotted lines, the three developments that the Council had previously approved that we put on this slide. Next slide. This is an illustrative rendering of the site. Next slide. And again, a different angle of the proposed building. And I think that's it for my presentation.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. I have a few questions about this project.

RICHARD BASS: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: First, when this proposal was presented to Queens Community Board One back in September, Community Board One responded that they would like to see more family-sized units and

fewer studios. How is this proposal changed in response to that feedback?

RICHARD BASS: Well, we reduced the number of studios. At the full board meeting, there's a little confusion because at that time, 42 percent of the units were two- and three-bedroom, and I think the Community Board missed that. I've subsequently met-- re-met with the Land Use Committee and explained that. They understood. They missed that. I promise in the future that I'll be clearer in my presentations. I've been before this Community Board probably a dozen times over the last 10 years, so I know this board well, so I was a little surprised by that. but we reduced the number of studios. We've increased the one-bedrooms, and because of that, the two's and three's which are more family-sized units are now 44 percent of the units.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. Has the Catholic Medial Mission Board identified a developer partner?

RICHARD BASS: Not yet. They-- nonprofits, as you know, have various options. They can either partner early. They can partner in the middle or they can partner late. They wanted to go

through the process, and once hopefully the Council approves this application, they'll reach out and find a development partner.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. I now recognize Council Member Cabán for questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Thank you. Thank you for the presentation. I mentioned this in my opening, just to put it on the record again, that since 2018 there have been six other private rezonings in the Ravenswood area, and none of them have broken ground. So, I just want to know if you could provide any insight as to why none of these developers in the area are moving forward with construction after these rezonings have been approved?

RICHARD BASS: I reached out to my colleagues, and they reported that they're still in the process of formulating their financing and trying to move forward. So, these projects are still real. They just haven't broken ground. Over the last couple years, as you know, there's been lots of external circumstances that have gotten in the way of development, whether it's COVID, the Trump administration part one/part two, the increase in

1 interest rates, and even the demise of 421A and now
2 485X. So, all these factors, you know, have caused
3 delays. But besides that, I'm giving you a
4 generalized reading of why they haven't broken
5 ground.
6

7 COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Yeah. And then
8 this question I feel like you'll be more equipped to
9 answer, but you know, what makes you confident that
10 this site will move forward with development if it's
11 approved. And the challenges, obviously, that you
12 named still exist to a degree.

13 RICHARD BASS: My crystal ball is a
14 little cloudy right now, but this client wants to
15 move forward, because it will help them accomplish
16 their mission in providing services to the world.
17 So, I think they're committed to finding a
18 development partner and to move forward.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Thank you. I know
20 that we already talked about and addressed, you know,
21 the Community Board One issue. They also in their
22 recommendation prioritized deeper affordability. So
23 would you have any objection to a modification of the
24 site to strike MIH Option Two and add MIH Option
25 Three?

RICHARD BASS: Actually, no, and I wrote that to you in a previous correspondence. The modeling I showed you on the screen was assuming Option One. With City Planning we always do Option One and Two, but we anticipate the Council to make a motion to do Option One. We have no objection to Option Three.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: And again, this is something that we talked about, but for the purposes of this hearing, we-- you know, we took months and months. We worked very closely with the Land Use Division, did a wonderful job, and we are getting ready to release our District 22 Community Planning Guidelines, and as part of our community engagement process, and you know, a few thousand constituents participated in this, residents identified childcare, health clinics and supermarkets as the top services that they'd like to see increase in the neighborhood. So, can you make a commitment to prioritizing these uses in the development's ground floor space? Like, I know on community use obviously is for the organization, the developers organizations, but-- or the owner's organization, but

1
2 yeah, is that a commitment that you can make to
3 prioritize those uses?

4 RICHARD BASS: Yes, and as we previously
5 discussed, depending on if we're forced-- or where we
6 are in the development process, we don't want to
7 provide a daycare center if the other developments
8 are doing that. So, we're going to be somewhat
9 nimble in terms of what service we're providing to
10 the community. But that's a promise we'll work with
11 you and the Community Board.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Great. And since
13 you've worked along this corridor plenty before, I
14 know that you know this area is vulnerable to both
15 storm surge and flooding from heavy rainfall. It's
16 only getting worse. So, can you talk to me a little
17 bit about the commitment to investing in green
18 infrastructure, stormwater management, you know,
19 whether it's rain gardens, tree pits, permeable
20 pavements, things like that-- public space
21 surrounding the development.

22 RICHARD BASS: Well, in our re-- this was
23 a question your raised when we discussed-- by the
24 way, how is your pet? You were leaving the vet that
25 day.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Yes, she's good.
She's good. More spoiled than ever.

RICHARD BASS: So, we're going to have a
green--

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: [interposing]
Expensive.

RICHARD BASS: They always are.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Yeah.

RICHARD BASS: We're going to have a
green roof. We're going to be a fully-electric
building. The only thing in the basement will be
the-- there actually is no basement. The part of the
ground floor will be the warehousing. The building
will be waterproofed. Our architect who is a WBE has
assured us that the building will be sustainable and
will not be impacted if there's a storm flow.

COUNCIL MEMBER CABÁN: Thank you, and
thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Council
Member. If there are any members of the public who
wish to testify regarding this proposal remotely,
please press the raise hand button now. If you are
in-person, please identify yourself to one of the
Sergeants. Being that there are no members of the

public who wish testify regarding LUs 33 and 34 relating to the 33-01 11th Street mixed-use residential rezoning proposal, the public hearing is now closed, and these items are laid over. Thank you.

RICHARD BASS: Thank you. Be well. Be safe.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Alright, I will now open the public hearing on LUs 17, 18 and 19 regarding the 1417 Avenue U mixed-use rezoning proposal in Sheepshead Bay, Brooklyn in Council Member Vernikov's district. The proposal involves a zoning map and text amendment as well as the cancelation of an existing restrictive declaration recorded against the development site. Applicant is-- the applicant is seeking to build a mixed-use residential building with approximately 76 apartments. Mandatory Inclusionary Housing would be mapped at-- mapped as part of this application. So, approximately 19 of the apartments would be permanently affordable depending on the affordability option selected. For anyone wishing to testify regarding this proposal remotely, if you have not already done so, you must register online by visiting

the Council's website at council.nyc.gov/landuse.
For anyone with us in-person, please see one of our
Sergeant at Arms to submit a speaker card. If you
would prefer to submit written testimony, you can
also do by emailing landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov.
I now recognize Council Member Vernikov for remarks.

COUNCIL MEMBER VERNIKOV: Thank you,
Chairwoman. Good after-- I'm sorry, good morning.
Okay, so 1417 Avenue U, this proposed housing
development at 1417 Avenue U is a project that
ordinarily would not receive my support. Community
Board 15 voted down this proposal. The no vote
driven by the issue of parking. Parking has been a
huge concern throughout my district throughout my
tenure. However, I'm happy to report that the
applicant and development team have listened to our
community, understood the concerns and did what they
could to alleviate them. Because of this good faith
negotiation, we are presented in a commitment letter
nearly 40 percent of the proposed 76 housing units at
this location will have a dedicated parking spot.
This level of parking is particularly notable, given
that the site is located just half a block from a
subway station, providing residents with immediate

access to public transportation. This is especially relevant considering reforms that allow them to have as few as zero parking spaces. I do not believe that policy is workable in the 48th District and many other districts across the outer boroughs. Because the applicant and their team have worked with us on this issue, achieving what hopefully will be a one-to-one parking for those who have cars in the proposed development or very close to it. This is something that I can proudly support. I also appreciate the creative and balanced approach they're taking to my preference of a split across 6080 on 100 AMI. Additionally, since Avenue U is a commercial corridor and we receive a fair amount of trash complaints on the street, it is very important for the proposed 1417 Avenue U location to have a viable sanitation plan, which they do, and we will hold them to it. just as citywide housing plans should respect and consider the unique needs of our neighborhoods and communities, new buildings and developments should respect it and be a good neighbor, both in spirit and tangible detail. I believe that is being met here. I'd like to thank everyone involved in this project, and I encourage the members of this

subcommittee to ask questions as you see fit today as we work together to build and rebuild a city with sensible housing solutions that take the unique needs and preferences of each neighborhood into account. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Council Member Vernikov. I now call the applicant panel for this proposal which consists of Frank St. Jacques and Andrew Esposito. Counsel, please administer the affirmation.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: No problem. Good morning, please raise your right hand. Could you please state your name for your record?

FRANK ST. JACQUES: Frank St. Jacques, Akerman LLP.

ANDREW ESPOSITO: APEX Development.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do you swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony this morning in response to Council Member questions?

ANDREW ESPOSITO: Yes.

FRANK ST. JACQUES: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. You may now begin your testimony which is limited to eight

minutes, and I will just ask to please restate your name and organization for the record.

FRANK ST. JACQUES: Thank you, Council Member Louis. Welcome. My name is Frank St. Jacques. I'm with Akerman LLP. As noted, I'm joined by Andrew Esposito from the applicant team. I'll try and move through the slide show quickly. Next slide, please. The rezoning areas on the northside of Avenue U between East 14th and East 15th Streets was designated an R5 in 1961 and a private application in 1979 established that the C13 overlay on this block front. That overlay was intended to facilitate the redevelopment of the site with a drive-through bank and its accessory parking lot, and a restrictive declaration was recorded against the development site in connection with that rezoning. That restrictive declaration is now mute, and I'll explain in a moment one of the actions is to remove that historic restrictive declaration. I'll note the rezoning area is within the outer transit zone. Next slide, please? The rezoning area is the full block front. The development site is highlighted there. It's a single applicant-owned tax lot 37 which is an approximately 12,600 square foot corner and interior lot. It's

currently cleared for development. It was previously improved with a one-story commercial building that was initially a drive-through bank and then retail, several different iterations over the years. Next slide, please. The land use that was shown here, land uses in the built context is generally commercial along Avenue U which is the local retail corridor that runs east to west. Avenue U is considered a wide street under zoning, and the mid-blocks are generally lower-density residential with some multi-family apartment buildings on the block ends and within the mid-blocks. Some of them are called out on the slide with the six's indicating that they're either six stories or six stories and basement. Next slide, please. Then you can see that surrounding context in this aerial view looking north. You can see how close the rezoning area is to the Avenue U Q Station and some of that existing multi-family context in the area. Next slide, please. So, the application is seeking land use actions, a zoning map amendment to change that existing R5 to R7A, and then reduce the depth of the commercial overlay and change it to a C24 from a C13. We're also requesting to map Mandatory Inclusionary

Housing. And as I noted at the outset, modification of the restrictive declaration to cancel it, given that it is no longer applicable to the site. Next slide, please. This slide just shows that the proposed zoning district boundary, it consists of that, that northside of Avenue U between East 14th to the west and East 15th Street to the east. Again, establishing the R7A on this block front. Next slide, please. Here you can see where R7A is mapped within the surrounding area, both in community of District 14 and community District 15 extensively along Ocean Avenue, Kings Highway, and Coney Island Avenue. Next slide, please. The proposed actions would facilitate the development of a new seven-story mixed-use building at the development site with approximately 76 apartments-- excuse me, MIH would be mapped at the site, and there's a mix of bedroom sizes between studios one's and two's. Council Member Vernikov noted at the outset we've been able to accommodate a higher parking ratio than what would be required pursuant to zoning. So, 27 parking spaces would be provided in the building, and we've committed to that. The application team has committed to that in a letter to the Council. Next slide, please. Just

move through this quickly. This is a site plan showing the building configuration. It's essentially an L-shaped building wrapping Avenue U to the south and east 14th Street to the east, rising to seven stories at the corner of Avenue U and then stepping down at the northern edge of the building with an open space at the interior site. Next slide, please. This ground floor plan shows that retail shaded in red here is situated along the Avenue U frontage with a residential lobby on East 15th and then a ramp to that seller [sic] parking on the northern-most portion of the building. Next slide, please. Here we're showing that 27-space parking garage. Next slide, please. And then just some illustrative massings showing that the building was designed with articulation to add some visual interest and break up the massing. The ground floor retail is consistent with the Avenue U streetscape and will activate further this portion of Avenue U with local retail. Next slide, please. This is our illustrative MIH breakdown showing the mix of incomes that Council Member Vernikov just mentioned, eight units at 60 AMI, seven units at 80 percent AMI, and eight units at 100 percent AMI. This option provides 23

Mandatory Inclusionary Housing units which would be permanently affordable for the life of the project. Next slide, please? That concludes our presentation and we're happy to answer any questions. And I neglected to thank Council Member Vernikov at the beginning of my presentation, but we're, again, available for questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. I have a couple of questions. How did you arrive at the proposed unit mix for this project?

FRANK ST. JACQUES: I think there's a combination of working within the footprint of the building. It's certainly not set in stone, but initially trying to dial in on both the number of units as it related to the parking requirement. There's a parking waiver for fewer than 15 spaces. That was something that we were initially looking at. But the-- really the idea was to provide a sufficient number of units at a range of sizes to accommodate the community, but also not run afoul of the-- I'm sorry, let me say that differently. Not trigger a parking requirement that was greater than what we could accommodate in the cellar [sic] parking space.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Do you have the capacity to provide more two or three bedrooms for this project?

FRANK ST. JACQUES: It's possible. I would need to take it ownership and the design team, but it's-- you know, this is an illustrative plan. It's certainly what the applicant is envisioning, but we certainly won't rule out larger units.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Okay. what type of retail tenants do you have in mind to occupy the ground floor commercial space?

FRANK ST. JACQUES: No firm plans, but this is a lively local retail corridor. Many of the lettered east/west streets, Avenue U being one of them, are really just local retail corridors. We anticipate probably even breaking up that retail space into smaller units or just having a larger, again, local service, serving either food store or some type of service use.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Okay. Council Member, do you have any questions. Alright, and I invite my colleagues to ask questions. Any one of the panel have questions? Alright. If there are any members of the public who wish to testify regarding

this proposal remotely, please press the raise hand button now. If you are in-person, please identify yourself to one of the Sergeants. Being there are no members of the public who wish to testify regarding LUs 17, 18 and 19 relating to 1417 Avenue U mixed-use residential rezoning proposal, the public hearing is now closed and these items are laid over.

FRANK ST. JACQUES: Thank you, Chair Louis. Thank you, Council Member Vernikov.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. I will now open the public hearing on LU's 28, 29 and 30 regarding the 14-10 Beach Channel Drive residential rezoning proposal in Far Rockaway, Queens in Council Member Brooks-Power's district. The proposal involves a zoning map and text amendment. Applicant is seeking to build a mixed-use residential building with approximately 97 apartments. Mandatory Inclusionary Housing would be mapped as part of this application. So, between 19 and 29 of the apartments would be permanently affordable depending on the affordability option selected. For anyone wishing to testify regarding this proposal remotely, if you not already done so, you must register online by visiting the Council's website at council.nyc.gov/landuse.

For anyone with us in-person, please use-- please see one of the Sergeant at Arms to submit a speaker card. If you would prefer to submit written testimony, you can always do so by emailing it

landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. I now recognize Council Member Brooks-Powers for remarks.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Good morning and thank you, Chair Louis, for holding today's hearing. I also want to thank the community stakeholders and residents who have taken time to engage in this process as we review the proposal for 14-10 Beach Channel Drive in Far Rockaway. The Rockaway peninsula has experienced a significant level of development and transformation over the past decade. The Rockaways are uniquely vulnerable to environmental and climate-related threats including coastal storms, flooding and extreme weather events. As we continue-- excuse me. As we consider new housing opportunities, we must ensure that surrounding infrastructure including transportation, schools, resiliency protections, and utilities can support both existing residents and future growth. Sustainable development means building housing that is not only accessible, but also safe, resilient and

well-integrated into the fabric of the community. It is also critically important that as we discuss new housing production, we remain focused on expanding pathways to homeownership. For many working families in southeast Queens and the Rockaways, home ownership has long been one of the most reliable ways to build generational wealth and to achieve long-term stability. As new developments are proposed, we should continue exploring opportunities to incorporate home ownership models alongside rental housing so that families who have built this community have an opportunity to remain and thrive here for generations to come. Today's hearing is an important opportunity to hear directly from the applicants, stakeholders and the public about how this proposal addresses community concerns, housing needs, and long-term resiliency for the peninsula. I look forward to a productive discussion and to ensuring that any development in this area reflects the priorities and realities of the community it will serve. Thank you, Chair, once again, and I look forward to the testimony.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Council Member. I will now call the applicant panel for this

proposal which consists of Richard Lobel, Kevin Williams, Frank Quatela, I apologize, and Sam Zirkiev. Alright. Counsel, please administer the administration-- affirmation.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Good morning. Could you please raise your right hand? Alright, please state your name for the record from right to left.

FRANK QUATELA: Frank Quatela, architect.

KEVIN WILLIAMS: Kevin Williams, planner.

RICHARD LOBEL: Richard Lobel, zoning attorney.

SAM ZIRKIEV: Sam Zirkiev, applicant.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do you swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony before Council and in response to Council Member questions?

UNIDENTIFIED: I do.

UNIDENTIFIED: I do.

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. You may now begin your testimony which is limited to eight minutes, and I will just ask you to please restate

your name and organization for the record. You may begin.

RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you, Chair Louis, committee members, Richard Lobel of Sheldon Lobel, PC. I'm here with Sam Zirkiev with regards to the 1410 Beach Channel Drive rezoning which you see before you. The next slide contains a project summary which is for a proposed rezoning of roughly six lots from an existing R5 district to an R6A, C24, and R6A district. This rezoning would facilitate the development of a new seven-story building which would be mixed-use commercial community facility and residential. Roughly 110,000 square feet with 98 dwelling units. The construction would take place on lots one and 51. Importantly, when we look at this rezoning, you'll see this from the maps and photos, this lot is sorely under-developed. It has been zoned R5 since 1961, and basically when we look to rezonings in areas where housing is needed where there are underutilized lots, proximate to transportation. It's really an excellent example of a potential rezoning. In addition, of course, as with all such rezonings, we'd be mapping a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing text amendment to allow for

Option One at the site, producing roughly 25 units. The next slide, the numbers behind the proposed development. So, we've got a seven-story plus cellar buildings. Similar in scope to some of the other buildings in the area, giving the existing zoning districts which we'll review. The building itself, 110,000 square feet of which roughly 100,000 square feet be residential, 4,800 for commercial use, and 4,400 for intended house of worship. There's an existing church at the site. Sam's been working with the church group in order to repopulate the space there. The commercial use would be devoted to local retail. Right now, the site is used for open parking and a used car lot. So, this is a real nice upgrade in terms of potential uses for the site and for the area. Roughly 65 feet of the street wall with setbacks at the six and seventh stories, 77-foot tall building, 81 parking spaces which in accordance with a reduced number of units, 98 units, give us roughly one for one in terms of parking spaces for a number of units, and then 25 affordable units including sustainability measures as listed at the bottom of the slide. You can see from the next slide, the zoning map, again that R5 district. To note to the

immediate east and south of the site, you have the downtown Far Rockaway District which in 2017 provided for a rezoning to allow for R71 in similar district near modes of transport such as the Long Island railroad which sits 200 feet from the property. So, while there's limited transportation generally in the area, this site's great. It has transportation in terms of the Long Island railroad as well as the A Train which is roughly a third of a mile from the site, inclusive of several bus stops and bus lines as well. The next slide is a tax map showing with particularity the rezoning. You can see the R6A zoned on the R5 district immediately adjacent to that R71 to the east, allowing for very similar type buildings including new 12-story buildings that have been built within the last two years, and a commercial overlay along Beach Channel Drive, reflecting the more active street frontage on Beach Channel. The next slide is h area map which I think tells the story well in terms of what we've been discussing. We've got the Red Fern Houses to the immediate north with multiple six-story buildings. To the east there are multiple 12-story, 10-story, nine-story buildings, and you can see that Beach

Channel widens to 80 feet there. So, when you look at a sight which is approximate to transportation, it's situated adjacent to a wide street, and is severely underbuilt. It's really-- kind of when you look at that transit-oriented development, it's a really great opportunity for the site. In addition to which the site itself is 28,00 square feet and right not it's 3,800 square feet of building on it-- severely underbuilt. And including uses which are not really reflective of the best uses in the area, including like I said, a car lot and parking. The next several slides show the existing buildings at the site. Again, that long-standing church building as well as the used parking lot. And then if we page through the photos on the site, we come to the plans and materials. Frank, do you want to just run us through basic plans for the next couple of minutes, and then we can answer questions.

FRANK QUATELA: Sure. Frank Quatela, architect. I could just start from the ground up. So, we have a cellar with a fully-- integrated with a self-park facility, so it's not for a mand-- attendant parking. Full cellar. No utilities in the cellar because we are within the 100-year floodplain.

I don't know if you hear me well. Can you? Okay.

You can go through the next slide, please. That's the cellar parking, self-park again, with a two-way ramp, from Nameoke Street. Next slide. First floor is also some parking with commercial and community facility with the residential lobby there. The commercial and community facility uses will be dry flood-proof with flood gates at their entry doors and exit doors. The residential lobby will not have that, although the residential starts above the floodplain level at the first-- second story, sorry.

Next slide. A mix of units here, as you can see, from the second through the sixth floor where the setback happens-- one's two's and studios. Next slide. At the sixth floor is where the setback happens. Go-- there are private terraces flanking the residential units. Next slide. And you could go up to the roof where we will incorporate some green and solar as per the code, and consider more conservation of stormwater in order to satisfy that requirement for sort of a low-consumption building.

You can go to the next slide. These are just some elevations for Beach Channel and Nameoke Street.

Noticing that we are showing the green roof there at

the setbacks, public and private. Next slide. And the architectural rendering which shows the commercial use at the corner of Nameoke and Beach Channel, and the church would be set back further up on Beach Channel Drive. We're anticipating a fresh food supermarket there at the corner for the commercial use. Thank you.

RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you. And if we could just advance one more slide, we would just note that we've worked with Council Member Brooks-Powers and had several conversations with her in her office. There were changes to the building design which we think are more reflective of the context of the area, and the result would be the proposed building that you see in front of you. And with that, the entire applicant team is happy to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. Some quick questions. Recent development in the downtown Far Rockaway area have been HPD-financed 100 percent affordable projects. Have you considered HPD financing for this site and discussed it with HPD?

RICHARD LOBEL: So, we haven't for the following reason. Oftentimes, when we have spoken to the development community and Sam's own experience is

that HPD-financed projects take a lot of time. And so we've got we've projects where we've been involved in rezonings in this community district which have been literally waiting years in terms of the opportunity to not only just to finish the ULURP hearings, but also to go into the development. Sam felt strongly at this site that he's able to-- particularly in light of market rate units being able to subsidize the affordable units to be able to move forward with an actual development here. And so while we understand the importance of 100 percent affordable developments, here we felt that the mix of units here and mix of income ranges would better serve both the opportunity to develop, as well as the community.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. For the retail component, which businesses have you reached out to and how many businesses are you planning to lease to?

RICHARD LOBEL: Sure. So, there's a limited amount of commercial space here. There's about 4,800 square feet of commercial space, and currently as we discussed, this is utilized by community facility building and an open parking lot

for the sale of used cars. So, the opportunity to have actual retail here and local retail was very important to the project. When we did have discussions with the Community Board, there was a discussion around the opportunity to do food store and something local, really an opportunity to provide produce fresh-- because to people in the surrounding area, inclusive of the people who would be living in the proposed development. So, that's currently the goal. And Sam has talked to various food store providers who would be interested in the space, and those conversations are ongoing.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Alright. Thank you. I will now recognize Council Member Brooks-Powers for questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Thank you, Chair, and thank you for the presentation and testimony today. We have been in conversation I want to say since I first got elected.

RICHARD LOBEL: Right.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: So, I do appreciate the sponsor reaching out with a lot of lead time. We still have some more work to be done. I did notice the color scheme change there, but

there's some more stronger commitments that are very important to the community if we're going to move forward with this project. Have you explored opportunities for affordable homeownership unit as a part of this proposal.

RICHARD LOBEL: Yeah. So, thank you, Council Member, and thank you for your continued conversations. It's not a given that we have the kind of access that we have in terms of our opportunity to discuss these issues with you. We appreciate it. With regards to affordable homeownership, Sam has gone out and spoken to others who have developed in the nearby area and who have basically allowed for a mix of rental and affordable homeownership. It's something he's currently working on and also working on in terms of his opportunity to actually proceed with the development. So, I'd say that the door is open right now, and he's instructed us to do further work in this regard. I know it's part of an ongoing conversation. I think it's a challenge for him, frankly, just given the financing in terms of the site. Having said that, I know he has had some ideas in that regard, and we're hopeful

to at least for a portion of it to be able to satisfy the Council Member.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: And I will say, as I said privately and I'll say here on the record, you know, there are a number of examples that we could look at. In Astoria there's a project that has both rental and home ownership, Ocean Crest in Far Rockaway, that this council was able to move forward-- was home-- became home ownership as well. We have L&M. That is a mixture also of rental and homeownership for the Arverne East Project in Rockaway. So, there is precedent for it. I feel extremely strongly as you all know in terms of the homeownership element to it. In terms of the type of development that we've seen in Rockaway, we-- you know, the blessing in it is that in a-- the midst of a housing crisis, we have options, but we have options that still lead out a vast majority of the people that live in the community that want to stay and that want to have access to generational wealth. So, the home ownership piece is very important. What is the proposed unit mix of the project, and is it-- well, I saw it on this slide, so let me just rephrase this. Again, is it feasible to provide more family-

sized units? I saw that you decreased the studio.

Thank you for that. But I would like to-- I think we need more two- and three-family, because the-- when you look at the development and I appreciate that Sam has done the research around the community in terms of what has been built. A lot of those deeply-affordable apartments have been studio and one-bedrooms, and we want to be able to create opportunity for families to be able to have the room that they need as they're growing.

RICHARD LOBEL: So, thank you, Council Member. First of all, Sam, nodded in agreement with the statement. We appreciate that. So, as you mentioned, there was a reduction in the number of units. The application as it was before the Community Board was 118 units. That's been reduced to 98 which we feel is a nice move towards where we want to be in terms of unit sizes. There's only one studio left in the development that's essentially allocated for the super's unit. So, we've really managed to allow for--

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS:

[interposing] Supers have families, too.

RICHARD LOBEL: We understand.

Absolutely. But just happened to be the layout and where that was located in terms of the layout. It wasn't intentional in that regard. But I will say that necessarily when we reduce from 118 to 98, we did get more unit combinations. I'd have Frank just speak to the actual unit count.

FRANK QUATELA: Yeah, so the-- in the presentation, as Richard mentioned, we did significantly reduce the amount of units as well as provide more three-bedrooms, two-bedrooms, and one-bedrooms, and a significant reduction in studios. So this one studio, a larger amount of two-- I can get you the number exactly if you don't mind thumbing through--

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS:

[interposing] It was like about 20 and then like 10 on the three-bedroom, or yeah. It was about 40 total--

FRANK QUATELA: [interposing] Yeah, 10 three-bedrooms.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: which is two of them of combined. But it was like 56--

FRANK QUATELA: [interposing] Yeah.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: one-
bedrooms.

FRANK QUATELA: Right. So now there are
57 one's, 30 two's and 10 three's with one studio.

RICHARD LOBEL: So, it's a full 40
percent of two's and three's which I think compares
pretty favorably to a lot of these applications.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Would love
to see how much further we can go on that. Again,
just looking at the landscape of what we already have
in the community and what the needs are that I've
heard in the community. Several adjacent blocks are
characterized by two- and three-story homes. Have
you done any local outreach about the project and
what additional engagement do you commit to do before
the ULURP process concludes?

RICHARD LOBEL: So, we have. And I think
one thing that's important to note is that we are in
an area where there is some similar typology in terms
of the height of buildings. So, there are six-story
buildings in the area, and to the east of the
property there are anywhere from nine to 12-story
buildings. So, we didn't want to do a rezoning where
we're inserting a potential seven-story next to two's

and three's. Having said that, Sam is very local in terms of his development experience as well as his outreach. I know he has talked to adjacent landowners on the site and also others in the community. We're absolute willing over the next several weeks to continue that outreach. Inclusive of which I think is important for us, the church on the site which is excited about the opportunity to update their space and to come back in and to continue to do good works for the community. So, I think with all that we are, you know, we're still happy to keep coming and keep having those conversations. The building itself, six stories and then set back, we feel is within the context, but you know, again we're keeping the door open and continue to have those conversations.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Chair, I just had a few more questions, is that okay?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: If you could do one more question given the amount of projects we have today.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Okay. Would we be able to submit a letter and get-- have something submitted-- a response in writing for the record? Okay. you mentioned the rezones that took

place several years ago, do you know why this site was not included in that rezone?

RICHARD LOBEL: Yes. So, the rezoning would have been a downtown Far Rockaway rezoning which was city-sponsored, and I think that the city as with a private applicant needs to engage in land use and environmental studies in order to complete their rezoning. So, oftentimes we find ourselves in the position where properties are locked out because the city only chooses to go up to a certain distance from public transportation, etcetera. So, while we are considered to be within the area of the train and subway, within that main corridor which was rezoned-- and presumed to downtown Far Rockaway. Were it to be a private rezoning and we could have spoken to the applicant, that's one thing. Sam was not involved at the property at the time of the downtown Far Rockaway rezoning, so other than that, yeah, it's just whatever the public records state in terms of the boundaries of that rezoning area.

COUNCIL MEMBER BROOKS-POWERS: Thank you. And as I shared with the Chair, I would like to have submitted for the record responses to what specific MWBE participation and local hiring goals are you

committing to, and will you partner with my office and local elected officials to partner on the local job fairs, and how much parking is proposed and how does it compare to the one-to-one ratio that we also spoke of? And if you can submit that for the record, I would appreciate it.

RICHARD LOBEL: Happy to do so. Thank you, Council Member Brooks-Powers.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Council Member. Counsel, are there any members of the public who wish to testify remotely or in-person regarding this proposal?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yes, we have one member of the public whose name is John Cori. You're excused, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Yeah, this panel is excused.

RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. You could press the button and you may begin.

JOHN CORI: Yep. Thanks for having me. I'm representing CB14. I had submitted some testimony. I'm not going to read the whole thing, because it's going to be a little bit-- you know,

it's kind of unfair we have only two minutes to respond. So, basically we're an absolute no on this project in CB14. I'm Chair of the Community Board, the Land Use Committee. And the people out there are very clear about the issues that are-- there's been massive overbuilding. You mentioned the downtown Far Rockaway project, and the-- there's also a very large cement facility that's causing major havoc in the neighborhood with massive amounts of dust and that's a big concern. And then the other concerns were from the community about the lack of real community benefit. You know, we approve these projects, and the community benefits are not really there. The developer will say yes, the church is going to relocate there, but that just really gives the-- it's really kind of a swap. You know, it's not really a major benefit, you know? There was another property where Peninsula Hospital site, they gave \$2 million to the community. It's a much larger project. I heard that they were able to build seven times the amount that they were able to build, because we said, you know, it was a yes. So, what happened was they gave us a decent amount of money for the community. It's not a shakedown. It's only fair, because every

community gets major benefits except for Rockaway in these smaller projects. The larger projects, yes, are beneficial. But we really need to hold accountable these developers when they want to come into communities that are definitely causing a burden from the building, from the overcrowding, you know? We just mentioned that downtown Far Rockaway project. And throughout the peninsula we have about-- I think there's 17,000 units. I think it's number one and number two for all the affordable housing in New York City, and that's kind of unfair burden, because then it also goes onto the issue of property taxes. When you give a property tax abatement for 30 years, the burden goes onto the one- and two- and three-family homes. That's extremely unfair and should be considered in all your decisions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. Counsel, is there any other members of the public that wish to testify?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Yes, Chair, we have one member of the public.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Delores Orr. Delores Orr? Delores, if you can hear us, if you can unmute yourself.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Delores, if you can hear us?

DELORES ORR: Can you hear me now?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: We can.

DELORES ORR: Yes, okay, great.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: You may begin.

DELORES ORR: Thank you. My name is Delores Orr. I'm a lifetime resident of [inaudible] Rockaway, and I am currently the Chair of Community Board 14. So, just quickly, we'll be sending a letter. The Board did vote on this and we objected to this project, not in the project itself, but the fact that in 2022 we voted on a moratorium of no new high-rise developments, because we don't have the schools, we don't have the hospitals. We don't have a route for evacuation. We're a flood zone one. And for all those reasons we set a moratorium in 2022, and we have not supported any high-rise development since then. So, let me just-- specifically to this location. It is a little-- oh, in the past nine years we've already built 10,000 units on a small peninsula. So, no one is thinking about that, and this is a very nice project, but it's not one we can

support. There is one concerning issue. When we had a meeting with the developer and the team, we had asked for environmental concerns, and they were unaware of the Inwood material terminal. It was not part of their study. It's only two to three blocks from where this is going to happen. This group, they recycle asphalt, concrete, bricks and rocks, and they use-- and it's actually in Nassau county. They're actually operating without a permit right now, and we're waiting to escape to do their evaluation on that. NYCHA, the Red Fern Houses, are right across the street.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Thank you. Your time expired.

DELORES ORR: And [inaudible]--

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: [interposing] Thank you, Delores.

DELORES ORR: the dust and health issues. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you.

DELORES ORR: [inaudible] writing, because it's a lot more. Thank--

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Delores.

And Delores, if you have anything else to add, please

submit your written testimony. Alright, if there are any members of the public who wish to testify regarding this proposal remotely, please press the raise hand button now. If you are in-person, please identify yourself to one of the Sergeant. Being there are no members of the public who wish to testify regarding LUs 28 and 29 relating to the 14-10 Beach Channel Drive residential rezoning proposal, the public hearing is now closed and these items are now laid over. I will now open the public hearing on LUs 24, 25 and 26 regarding 78-08 Linden Boulevard residential rezoning proposal in Lindenwood, Queens in Council Member Ariola's district. The proposal involves a zoning map and text amendment as well as cancelling an existing restrictive declaration recorded against the development site. Applicant is seeking to build a mixed-use residential building with approximately 264 apartments. Mandatory Inclusionary Housing would be mapped as part of this application. So, between 53 to 59 of the apartments would be permanently affordable depending on the affordability options selected. For anyone wishing to testify regarding this proposal remotely, if you have not already done so you must register online by

visiting the Council's website at council.nyc.gov/landuse. For anyone with us in-person, please see one of the Sergeant at Arms to submit a speaker card. If you prefer to submit written testimony, you can also do so by emailing it to landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. I now recognize Council Member Ariola for remarks.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARIOLA: Thank you, Chair. I really would like to say that I appreciate this developer. This developer came to the community for input prior to us getting to this point in the ULURP process. When we see a developer that comes into a district and they want to make community input, Community Board input and work with us to make sure that the development is beneficial to themselves, for the community, for the future residents, to the existing residents, and to be good neighbors. We've worked hard to identify different aspects of this development, and it would include a community facility use that is really needed at this location, and we appreciate how the applicants have responded to the feedback of using a stacked model, because at one point of the building on 79th Street there are two-family homes and they're using the height and

bulk away from the 79th Street portion of the development. So, I'll reserve my questions for later, but we wholeheartedly support this project.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Council Member. I will now call the applicant panel for this proposal which consists of Lisa AR-- save me.

LISA ORRANTIA: Orrantia.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Orrantia. I didn't want to butcher your name. Frank Quatela, we've been through this already. Steven Sinacori, alright, and Danielle Drake [sp?]. Perfect. Counsel, please administer that affirmation.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Good morning. Could you please raise your right hand? Thank you. And could you please restate your name?

FRANK QUATELA: Frank Quatela.

LISA ORRANTIA: Lisa Orrantia.

STEVEN SINACORI: Steven Sinacori.

DANIELLE DRAKE: Danielle Drake.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Do you swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony this morning and in response to Council Member questions?

LISA ORRANTIA: Yes.

FRANK QUATELA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. You may begin your testimony which is limited to eight minutes, and I will just ask you-- you don't need to restate your name. Just go straight into the project. Thank you.

LISA ORRANTIA: Thank you, Chair Louis, and good afternoon members of the Subcommittee. 7808 Linden Boulevard-- next slide, please-- is in a transitional area with higher density commercial and residential buildings west of 79th Street and lower density residences east of 79th Street. Next slide, please. Current tenants of the one-story commercial building rent month-to-month. Next slide. The site is currently mapped in a low-density R4 district with a C12 overlay, and we're proposing a medium density R7D with a C24 overlay along Linden Boulevard with an R6A at mid-block which is suitable for a spacious intersection on a major roadway with access to public transportation and outdoor recreation space and near compatible R6, R7 and R8 districts to the west. The new districts are also consistent with the Jewel streets neighborhood plan, land use framework. We're also proposing an MIH area for options one and two

and a modification of a 1976 restrictive declaration to allow for as-of-right development. The proposed actions would encourage the production of new affordable homes and essential services, and that respond to the surrounding transitional context.

Next slide, please. The proposed building design was improved with community input resulting in a lowered street wall and building height along 79th Street.

97 units of senior housing shown in yellow, among the 267 proposed total units, as well as space for two community facilities. Next slide please. The proposed six and 12-story buildings would contain 224,000 square feet of residential and community facility floor area, 267 dwell units, including 97 senior units, and 86 residential parking spaces. It would also incorporate sustainable and flood-resilient design features. Next slide, please.

Parking access would be along the side streets with entrances on Linden Boulevard and a residential entrance on 79th Street. Next slide. All units

would be income-restricted. The applicant is an experienced affordable housing developer, plans to use HPD's new construction financing program with mix income option to fund construction of apartments for

residents earning a range of affordability tiers.

And we'll work with HPD to set aside 30 percent of residential floor area as permanently affordable to comply with the term sheet requirements for MIH

Option Two. Next slide, please. Negative

declaration was issued with e-designations for hazmat, air quality and noise. Next slide. HPD 10

recommended approval of the application with

conditions. The applicant has already revised the

design to include senior housing and shift bulk away from two-story buildings on 79th Street and has

agreed to work with the community on specific use of

the community facility space. You can go forward two

slides, please. Next slide. Borough President--

Borough President recommended approval with

conditions that the developer set a minimum hiring

and contracting goal of 30 percent MWBE firms, local

residents and locally-based organizations with

quarterly reports to the Borough President and

Council Member for hiring initiatives until a hiring

goal is reached and to provide the Borough President

and Council Member with copies of the written CB10

commitments. Next slide, please. The land use

framework of the Jewel Streets Neighborhood Plan

identifies the development site as an area that is appropriate for medium density development as a part of a comprehensive strategy to encourage redevelopment of under-utilized sites, invest in affordable homes, and improve sidewalks and streets. And that concludes presentation. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. A few questions about this project. You mentioned that the project will be an HPD-financed project that is 100 percent affordable. Did HPD give you a timeline for closing on the financing?

LISA ORRANTIA: We're in the queue, but we don't have a date yet.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Alright. Do you have an alternative plan if you cannot close in the next couple of years?

FRANK QUATELA: This developer predominantly develops affordable housing and is very familiar with the HPD timelines. So, we're in the queue. We intend to do this as 100 percent affordable housing, and that's really the plan.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Do you know who the developer is and do they have intentions on market rate, or is it completely affordable?

FRANK QUATELA: Completely affordable.

The developer is Radson [sp?] Development which has a track record probably developing close to 2,000 units with HPD. They've been developing affordable housing since approximately 2005 in many different iterations. So, that's really-- that's their business, affordable housing. They don't develop market rate.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Alright. This application includes a request to cancel a restrictive declaration tied to the site. Can you clarify the original purpose of that declaration and why this project requires its termination for your site.

LISA ORRANTIA: Sure. So, that restrictive declaration was established in 1976 and it was done so in connection with the initial mapping of the overlay of the C12, and it was mapped-- and the terms of the restrictive deck require no windows, doors, or advertising facing 79th Street. So, the proposed development doesn't include, you know, those commercial features at this time. And the modification of the RD would allow the development to proceed as-of-right under the proposed designation.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you for that.

and how has the applicant evaluated traffic circulation, pedestrian safety, and potential congestion impacts, particularly at this already complex intersection near South Conduit Avenue?

LISA ORRANTIA: Right. Well, it is on a wide street, approximately 170 feet wide, and we've designed entrances to the parking garage on the side streets.

STEVEN SINACORI: There are two entrances to the parking space, one from 79th and one from Sapphire, and they're both two directional doors. So, we're trying to alleviate the traffic off of Linden and both from the lower density residential and the heavy traffic on Linden. So, they have choice that--

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: [interposing] Choices are good. Alright. I now recognize Council Member Ariola for questions.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARIOLA: Thank you so much for the presentation. And you noted the Community Boards conditions, our office's conditions, the Borough President's conditions. Would there be a way for you to commit to those in writing to us and to the committee so that we have that on record?

FRANK QUATELA: Yes, we-- Council Member Ariola, we're happy to put together a commitment letter and send that to the committee as well as to the Land Use staff.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARIOLA: Wonderful. Thank you. And the adjacent project for Jewel Street was mentioned. How would the project be affected if the grade of the side streets were raised? Would there be any impact?

LISA ORRANTIA: Well, the project will be aligned with the Jewel Streets Plan. Ultimately, DOT and DDC will determine the elevation of streets. A builder's pavement plan will be submitted and reviewed by DOT and DOB, and our design is flexible enough to adjust to any adjusted grade levels along those streets.

COUNCIL MEMBER ARIOLA: Wonderful. Thank you. That's all the questions I have. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Council Member. I now invite my colleagues to ask questions. Anyone have questions? I now excuse this panel. Thank you for making time.

FRANK QUATELA: Thank you, Council Member.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Counsel, are there any members of the public who wish to testify remotely or in-person regarding this proposal?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: No, no one has signed up remotely or in-person.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: If there any members of the public who wish to testify regarding this proposal remotely, please press the raise hand button now or if you are in-person, please identify yourself to the Sergeant. Being there are no members of the public who wish to testify regarding LUs 24, 25 and 26 relating to the 78-08 Linden Boulevard residential rezoning proposal, the public hearing is now closed, and these items are now laid over. I will now open the public hearing on LUs 22 and 23 regarding the 63-12 Broadway residential proposal in Woodside, Queens in Council Member Won's district. The proposal involves a zoning map and text amendment. Applicant is seeking to build a residential building with approximately 67 apartments. Mandatory Inclusionary Housing would be mapped as part of this application. So, between 30 to 20 of the apartments would be

permanently affordable depending on the affordability option selected. For anyone wishing to testify regarding this proposal remotely. If you have not already done so, you must register online by visiting council's website at council.nyc.gov/landuse. For anyone with us in-person, please see one of the Sergeant at Arms to submit a speaker card. If you would prefer to submit written testimony, you can always do so by emailing to landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. I now recognize Council Member Won for remarks. Alright, we're going to move forward. I will now call the applicant panel for this proposal which consists of Richard Lobel. Council, please administer the affirmation.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: We're now going to switch to the afternoon. So, good afternoon. We have one more person coming up. Thank you. Could you please state your name for the record?

RICHARD LOBEL: Richard Lobel of Sheldon Lobel.

FAYANNE BETAN: Fayanne Betan, Sheldon Lobel.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Please raise your right hand. Do you swear to say nothing

but the truth in your testimony and in your response to Council Member questions?

RICHARD LOBEL: I do.

FAYANNE BETAN: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: You may now begin your testimony which is limited to eight minutes. You may begin.

RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you, Chair Louis, Committee Members, Subcommittee Members. Richard Lobel of Sheldon Lobel. I'm joined by Fayanne Betan from my office. We're here today for the 6312 Broadway rezoning which we hope to gain the Council support in the rezoning which has the support of Community Board Two, 29 to one vote in favor, because they saw the merit of this rezoning as well as the Queens Borough President and City Planning. So, the next page has the project description. This is a proposed zoning map amendment to allow for a change from an existing R5C22 to an R7AC24 and R5C22 to R5C24. So, we'll go over the map, but basically it would allow for a rezoning of the front portion where the C24 and the rear portion with the change of the underlying residential towards the front portion of

the rezoning. In addition to that, and if you want to change the slide to the next slide there's the project description. There's a, of course, a text amendment to allow for Mandatory Inclusionary Housing at this site. This would allow for redevelopment of the site with an approximately 55,000 square foot building on lot 58. This would include roughly 67 dwelling units, and depending on the affordability levels, 22 at MIH Option Two, although that is obviously subject to the decision in terms of the options. Community Board Two like I mentioned voted unanimously in favor, except for that one guy. The next slide is a zoning map. The zoning map importantly has been unchanged in this block since 1961. Again, dating back over 60 years we've got an R5 district with a C22 overlay. So, again, this property even more so than other applications we've brought to the Council, this property is located literally adjacent to less than a block from the MNR lines on the subway. So, you've got a site, roughly 11,000 square feet built with 7,700 square foot of commercial and sitting along a wide street in terms of an 80-foot wide street on Broadway. This is a great example of a potentially beneficial development

for transit-oriented development and the Community Board recognized that. I think that's why we got their strong support. The next slide shows the map and zoning change map in terms of the tax map. You can see the site itself highlighted in red adjacent to that. Five lots along Broadway which would also benefit from the R7A zoning and then beyond that to the rear, the C22 district will be changed to a C24 district. This is at the request and upon consultation with City Planning which wants to update these districts to reflect kind of modern traffic parking requirements and such. The next slide is the area map which I think tells the story well in terms of the site and why it would be such a benefit to rezone the site. You got a site with a immediate five-story buildings to the east. The site itself located again on Broadway. Great site access in terms of both 64th and 63rd Streets, and transportation abounds in the area inclusive of bus transportation within the immediate area. Just a great site in terms of a potential rezoning with no residential displacement on our site. There's no residences on our lot itself. The next several slides show you pictures of the site itself. Again,

low-lying one-story commercial uses. I would note perhaps in anticipation of questions that our owner has a good relationship with his commercial tenants and asked them to come back after the proposed development is effectuated, inclusive of some medical office, local doctors. He, himself, is a doctor and has a relationship with those medical offices. So, we'll be looking forward to that. The next several slides if you want to fast forward to the site map in terms of the plans. There you go. So, there's the zoning calculations, and the next slide shows the site plan with the front portion of the building, a nine-story with cellar, one-story commercial portion in the back. Given that we're in the transit zone and that we've got that immediate subway access, there's no parking provided for the site. Our Community Board knew this and was supportive of that. although, we would of course include bike parking, roughly 23 bike parking spaces. And then the remaining plans the next slide shows the first floor and cellar and commercial uses. And then residential uses above, and the residential units numbering 67 would be primarily one's, two's, and three's with roughly 37 percent or over a third of those units at

two and three bedrooms. So, we did a get nice unit count and a nice breakdown in terms of the family-sized units. So, you know, in conclusion, we've got a really well-supported application here, one which takes advantage of an existing underbuilt site and would allow for productive development. We're just excited to move forward, and we'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. I have a couple of questions. How did you arrive at the unit mix for this project? Could you provide two or three bedrooms to the project?

RICHARD LOBEL: Yeah, so the unit mix is no studios, 42 one-bedrooms, and then 23 two's, and two three's. So, 25 out of those 67 units are two's and three's. You know, this-- we feel that the square footage per unit is fairly generous, and the applicant here really tried to stay away from studios and tried to weight the development more heavily towards two's and three's. So, again, I think were successful in doing that. And you know, we understand the needs of the area. We were able to get that really nice two-bedroom count of 23 units, which is over a third of the development.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Could you further share with us your selection of MIH options and why does it not include Option Three?

RICHARD LOBEL: Sure. So, this is a conversation we've had offline with the Council Member, Council Member's office and Council Land Use staff. The applicant here wanted to use Option Two, basically just in terms of financing for the site as well as the availability of other options in the area. Since that time, given the discussions with Council Member Won's office, we have consulted with firms that are responsible for securing construction financing and have actually run the numbers in a meaningful way in order to determine how this development would work. In doing so, we determined that Option Two provide a opportunity to finance the application development. Option One would just allow for project financing and the numbers that they went through with us were that the permanent financing has to be able to take out the construction financing. There needs to be a demonstrated return in the permanent financing that would allow them to take out the construction loan. Option Two allows that comfortably. Sorry, Option Two allows that

comfortably; Option One close, but is also acceptable. Option Three results in a negative return such that we wouldn't be able to take out the construction financing. So, sadly, for Option Two at this site, or for Option Three at this site, the numbers do not work out in order to obtain financing to build the project. We have done and our office is proud to have done developments with Option Two-- I'm sorry, with Option Three, deep affordability, most specifically along Atlantic Avenue in Brooklyn in Community Board Eight. And so I don't think it's a matter of the inability of the developer to consider that. I think it's more that he wants to build this project here, and to do that, Option Two was the strongest option. Option One, perhaps would allow for that, but Option Three would I think prevent the development from going forward.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you for your honesty. I now invite my colleagues if they have any questions. Alright. Counsel, are there any members of the public who wish to testify remotely or in-person regarding this proposal? Oh, sorry, this panel is now excused.

RICHARD LOBEL: Thank you, Chair.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: No, Chair, there's no one that signed up in person or online for this application.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. If there are no members of the public who wish testify regarding this proposal remotely, please press the raise hand button now. If you are in-person, please identify yourself to one of the Sergeants. Seeing none. No members of the public who wish to testify regarding LUs 22, 23 relating to 63-12 Broadway residential rezoning proposal, the public hearing is now closed, and these items are now laid over. I know open the public hearing for LUs numbers 27 regarding the 247-56 90th Avenue residential rezoning proposal in Bellerose, Queens in Council Member Lee's district. The proposal involves a zoning map amendment to build a two-family home on an existing zoning lot. For anyone wishing to testify regarding this proposal remotely, if you have not already done so, you must register online by visiting the Council's website at council.nyc.gov/landuse. For anyone with us in-person, please see one of the Sergeants to submit a speaker card. If you would prefer to submit written testimony, you always do so

by emailing it to landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. I will now call-- okay. I will now call the applicant panel for this proposal which consists of Todd Dale [sp?]. Frank St. Jacques-- nope. One moment.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do we have an applicant in the room for this project?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Todd Dale, are you online?

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

TODD DALE: Hi, good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Good afternoon. You may begin. Oh, wait, sorry. I will now call the applicant-- sorry. We got thrown off a little bit. I will now call the Counsel to administer the affirmation.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you, Chair. Can you please raise your right hand, and state your name for the record.

TODD DALE: My name is Todd Dale.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Do you swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony this afternoon and in response to Council Member questions?

TODD DALE: I do so affirm.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Todd. You may now begin your testimony which is limited to eight minutes. You may begin.

TODD DALE: Great. Thank you, Chair, and members of the Committee. This application seeks a zoning map amendment that would change an R41 district to an R4 district within block 8662 in the Bellerose neighborhood of Queens on an area that's located along the south side of 90th Avenue near Commonwealth Boulevard. Next slide, please. This amendment would enable the development of vacant lot 31 in the subject block with a new two-family dwelling on a single zoning lot on adjacent lot 30. Lots 30 and 31 that are the development site are approximately 4,100 square feet in area, and they're currently developed with a single two-story residential building. Next slide, please. As noted, this site's located along 90th Avenue near Commonwealth Boulevard in Queens Community District 13. Immediately south of the area is Jericho Turnpike in the boundary between Queens and Nassau County. 90th Avenue is a narrow local street only 50 feet wide and Commonwealth Boulevard is a wide

north/south neighborhood arterial. Next slide, please. The surrounding area is-- exhibits a mix of developments and different uses, predominantly residential uses to the north which is actually at the bottom of this slide and commercial uses to the south along Jericho Turnpike. Next slide, please. And then one more slide, please. And one more slide. Thank you. I'll show this area. So, this area, it's currently zoned R41 and R4 with a C13 commercial overlay. It was zoned R4 at the inception of the 1961 zoning resolution, but then in August 1991, a rezoning occurred, the Bellerose rezoning, and the area was amended to be this current split district condition. And it was amended to an R4 to R41. Next slide, please. This more clearly shows the boundary when it was rezoned ran along the middle portion of the block creating the split district in this particular subject block. The proposed action would seek an amendment from R41 to R4 that would include the development site as lots to the east and the west that are currently developed. The proposed zoning map amendment would basically relocate the southern boundary of the R41 district to the center line of 90th Avenue, and it would remove the split district

condition affecting the block and the development site, and allow for the proposed development. The proposed action would enable the development of lot 31's currently vacant with a new two-family dwelling on a shared zoning lot with lot 30. The new building would be a two-story, two-family building, approximately 1,500 square feet, and with the existing home on the zoning lot, approximately 3,200 square feet. Essentially, this action just seeks to shift the line on the block to create and remove the existing split zoning district so that it would entirely be consistent with zoning and allow for the proposed development. That is this particular action. I'm happy to answer any questions about what I said or any of the presentation slides.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. I only have one question about this proposal. You are proposing to build a new two-family home attached to the existing one you own. Are there many attached homes on this block and the surrounding area?

TODD DALE: There are, and actually-- I'm sorry we have to-- the slide closed down, but if you look at the original photograph you'll see that actually immediately adjacent there's attached homes

both to the east and the west on 90th Avenue, and across the street is characterized by attached homes also. So, this would actually be fully in character with all of the residential development along 90th Avenue.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. I now invite my colleagues to ask questions. Alright. If there are any members of the public who wish to testify regarding this proposal remotely, please press the raise hand button now. If you are in-person, please identify yourself to one of the Sergeants. Being there are no members of the public who wish to testify regarding Pre-considered LUs relating to 247-56 90th Avenue residential rezoning proposal, the public hearing is now closed. The items are laid over, and Todd, you are excused.

TODD DALE: Alright. Thank you for your time and welcome to Chairship of the committee.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. I will now open the public hearing on LUs 20 and 21 regarding the 217-14 24th Ave. residential rezoning proposal in Bay Terrace, Queens in Council Member Paladino's district. The proposal involves a zoning map and text amendment. Applicant is seeking to

build a residential building with approximately 255 apartments. Mandatory Inclusionary Housing would be mapped as part of this application. So, between 51 to 77 of the apartments would be permanently affordable depending on the affordability option selected. If anyone wishing to testify regarding this proposal remotely, if you have not already done so, you must register online by visiting Council's website at council.nyc.gov/landuse. For anyone with us in person, please see one of our Sergeant at Arms to submit a speaker card. If you would prefer to submit written testimony, you can always do by emailing landusetestimony@council.nyc.gov. Council Member Paladino couldn't be with us today. I will now call the applicant panel for the proposal which consists of Frank St. Jacques, Scott Barone, alright, and Andrew Esposito. Got it. Counsel, please administer the affirmation.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Good afternoon.

Could you please raise your right hand and state your name for the record.

FRANK ST. JACQUES: Frank St. Jacques,
Akerman LLP.

SCOTT BARONE: Scott Barone, Barone Management.

ANDREW ESPOSITO: And Andrew Esposito, APEX Development.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Welcome back. You have to keep your hands raised. Do you swear to tell the truth and nothing but the truth in your testimony this afternoon and in response to Council Member questions?

FRANK ST. JACQUES: I do.

SCOTT BARONE: Yes.

ANDREW ESPOSITO: I do.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. You may now begin your testimony which is limited to eight minutes. You may begin.

FRANK ST. JACQUES: Thank you. Frank St. Jacques, Akerman LLP for the applicant. I'm joined with members of the applicant team. Next slide, please. The site is located in R12 zoning district. It was initially mapped R2 in 1961 and changed to R12 in the Bayside Rezoning in 2005. The baseline rezoning eliminated several zoning districts that permitted multi-family development, effectively

limiting new housing production except for one and two-family homes in the area. There are R5 and C41 R5 equivalent districts mapped to the north and northwest of the site. Next slide, please. Zooming in a bit on this land use map you can see that the site is located on the south side of 24th Avenue where it terminates just east of the intersection with Waters Edge Drive on the north side of 24th Avenue. Any maps for unbuilt portion of Little Neck Boulevard to the south. The site is within Community District 11, and the boundary with Community District Seven runs along 24th Avenue. So, essentially everything north of 24th Avenue is in Community District Seven, and then the site and the area to the south is within Community District 11. The site is a single tax lot that measure approximately 55,000 square feet. It's corner and interior lot. Next slide, please. So, the site is shown here in this aerial view and in the next few slides. It's been used as the Bay Terrace Country Club, a membership based private club that has been on the site for approximately 60 years which operated through the 2025 summer season. Oh, you can go ahead to that-- let's go back one slide. Thank you. So, this is,

again, another aerial view looking to the northwest, and you can see how the site is situated between the lower density context to the south in Community District 11, again, the area south of 24th Avenue and the multifamily contacts to the north in Community District Seven. The site faces open space. There is a planned park to the north, and to the east there's the Crossland Parkway and the bay just a little bit farther east. Next slide, please. There's a clear need for new housing and affordable housing in this area, and we submit that this rezoning presents an opportunity to meet that need. I'll also note that Community District 11 has the highest population of Queens residents age 65 and older, and the third highest in the city. Next slide, please. We're proposing two land use actions, a zoning map amendment to change the underlying R12 zoning district to an R6A contextual zoning district, and a zoning text amendment to establish Mandatory Inclusionary Housing area. Next slide, please. So, this slide demonstrates what the proposed zoning map amendment would look like. On the left-hand side of the screen is the existing R12 zoning and you can see that the rezoning area is shaded and that the site is

outlined. The proposed rezoning if approved would change the-- that existing R12 to R6A as shown on the right-hand side of the screen. Next slide, please. The proposed land use actions would facilitate the redevelopment of the site with an eight-story mixed-use building, approximately 217,000 square feet of floor area, 160,000 of which would be residential. There would be 183 total apartments in the building, split between both market rate and permanently affordable MIH units. So, 128 of the units would be market-rate, 55 would be again permanently affordable under MIH. We've selected Option Two, and I'll show you what that breakdown looks like in a moment. Approximately 56,000 square feet of the proposed building would be for a senior assisted living facility with 65 units. That would be on the second floor with senior amenity space on the ground floor. The cellar would contain parking. There's an 86-space parking garage in the cellar. In addition to other sustainability features, the building would be entirely electric and it would also be built pursuant to flood rezoning construction by virtue of the site being within the flood zone. Next slide, please. Just run through these next slides quickly. I know

I'm running close to time, and I'll note on this illustrative site plan that north is on the top of the screen. The building is an essential u-shaped taking into account that cul-de-sac of 24th Avenue on the bottom of the screen or the north of the site. And it is set back from the southern and eastern lot lines. So, again, the top and left-hand side of the screen by 30 feet on either of those block lines, creating separation between the lower density context to the south and the proposed new building. Next slide, please. Here again we're showing the site differentiating between the lower density context and the R12 to the south, essentially all single-family homes, and the more multi-family mix context to the north in the R5 and R5 equivalent. There's a large shopping center, several multi-family buildings. The proposed illustrative massing of the proposed building is shown here, also note that the park is proposed for directly to the north and there's a new public school proposed directly to the northwest of the site. Next slide, please. MIH Option Two requires 30 percent of the residential floor area at a weighted average of 80 percent of the area median income. These units would be permanently affordable,

and then subject to HPD approval we're showing 55 total MIH units with the breakdown shown on the screen. Running short on time, so if you could advance to the next slide, and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: We could give you another minute to add to that.

FRANK ST. JACQUES: Actually, I misread my presentation. So, that concludes my presentation. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: You did well. Thank you. I have a few quick questions. This site is currently occupied by a private swimming pool club. Will this development be providing a similar community facility, because we didn't see that in the presentation?

FRANK ST. JACQUES: No, this-- the community facility component of this project is the senior assisted living facility. So, the existing private pool club will no longer be active at the site.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Okay.

FRANK ST. JACQUES: It'll be replaced.

SCOTT BARONE: Share on that? I just want to make a statement for the record which is important. That pool club was entered into a bankruptcy proceeding in 2018. It's been diminishing and closing down ever since. This was there past summer, and that's how we got involved as the applicant to try to re-envision this development.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. Could you please explain why you're requesting MIH Option Two rather than One?

FRANK ST. JACQUES: Sure. Just-- grab my notes. With respect to adjacent income levels-- bear with me one moment where I find it in my notes. It's really consistent with some of the incomes we see in the surrounding area. Bear with me one moment. At the outset, MIH Option Two provides more affordable units and I'll note that the-- it's in line with a census tract 997.03 where the median household income is \$116,000. That's the census tract it's contained within. The adjacent census tract, 1093 to the south has a median household income of \$139,000, and the adjacent census tract in the southwest 997.04 has a median household income of \$95,000. So, the preference here was to provide more units at income

levels that were a little bit more comparable to the immediate surrounding area.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. Do any of my colleagues have questions?

FRANK ST. JACQUES: And Chair Louis, if I could just add to that. We have mapped both MIH Options One and Two which-- proceeding with Option Two.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. Council Member Encarnacion? Council Member Thomas-Henry.

COUNCIL MEMBER THOMAS-HENRY: Thank you. Just a little more clarity on the 65 units for senior long-term care. What are the rates of those units and just a little more detail about what will be provided?

FRANK ST. JACQUES: Sure. So, this would be a-- according to zoning, a senior assisted living facility. Essentially, would be required to serve seniors. There's a mix of-- and I don't think I have it on the screen anymore-- a mix of 20 studios and 45 one-bedroom units to accommodate singles and older senior couples or those that require a larger bedroom. A long-term care facility operator has not been selected, but we anticipate beginning at that

search if this project is approved in the ULURP process. So, at this point, we don't have any further details as it relates to rents, the types of amenities, but we anticipate because there's a need, I think there's a relatively small world of operators. You know, we anticipate choosing from one of those operators.

COUNCIL MEMBER THOMAS-HENRY: And would those be incorporated into the overall development, or are they on a specific level, or what--

FRANK ST. JACQUES: [interposing] So, there's a separation that's required. Essentially, that would be the ground and first floor--

COUNCIL MEMBER THOMAS-HENRY:
[interposing] Okay.

FRANK ST. JACQUES: for that-- again, what's considered community facility space. It's entirely separated, although housed within the same building from the residential units above.

COUNCIL MEMBER THOMAS-HENRY: Thank you.

FRANK ST. JACQUES: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Council Member Encarnacion?

COUNCIL MEMBER ENCARNACION: Do you have the square footage for the studios and one-bedrooms for the seniors?

FRANK ST. JACQUES: Off-hand, I don't, but I'm-- I can certainly provide that to staff and make sure that you get that.

COUNCIL MEMBER ENCARNACION: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Council Member. This panel is now excused. Thank you for being here.

FRANK ST. JACQUES: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Counsel, are there any members of the public who wish to testify remotely or in-person regarding this proposal?

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: We do, Chair. To separate from the prior seven hearings you've done. Good job. So, we have five people here in-person, and then we have also eight people signed up online. We are going to start with the people who are here online. Sorry, in-person.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Alright. For members of the public here to testify, please note that witnesses will generally be called in panels of three. If you are a member of the public signed up

to testify, please standby when you hear your name being called and prepare to speak when I indicate that you may begin. Please also note that once all panelists in your group have completed their testimony if remote, you will be removed from the meeting as a group, and the next group of speakers will be introduced. Once removed, participants may continue to view the livestream podcast of this hearing on the council website. Members of the public will begin-- will be given two minutes to speak. Please do not begin until the Sergeant at Arms has started the clock. The following individuals who signed up to testify should now come to the witness table. We will start with Sylvia Johnson, James Colasante, and Leo Marileno [sp?]. Sylvia, you may begin.

SYLVIA JOHNSON: This dead-end [sic] intersection cannot safely handle the traffic which would be created by buses, ambulances, and emergency vehicles and resident traffic. The property is in a flood zone, and strong rainstorms create heavy flooding which damage cars and will inhibit emergency vehicles from reaching the assisted living facility. The property is built over wetlands and was

originally a swamp. This corner is adjacent to the
aforementioned school construction, a New York City
park and above sewer pumping station. The dynamics
of this proposed construction to this corner will be
overwhelming to the neighborhood. There is already
limited existing parking without the addition of 572-
student school plus additional teachers,
administrative staff, and park attendees. Where will
they park? Public transportation is five blocks away
which need to be navigated in all forms of weather.
School bus District 75 transportation, vehicles,
parent drop-off, pick-up will create severe
congestion and difficulty for neighbors to maneuver
to and from their homes, and ultimately and as
important as the safety of the children, assisted
living patients and residents immediately adjacent to
the space needed-- needing emergency assistance. The
property in question is an R1 for one family attached
homes which maintains integrity of the immediate
neighborhood. Three large projects thrust upon us on
a small narrow residential street is too much. This
overdevelopment will be burdensome to the community
and a poor location for an eight-story facility which
will not provide affordable housing and just create

enormous congestion. To raise the zoning from R1 to R6 is an insult to the community and absurd increase to proposed. Hundreds of people who signed my petitions and over 500 attendees who came to the Community Board 11 general meeting to show their opposition to this upzoning were-- came in opposition. Please vote no.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Sylvia. I'll now call on-- see you made it before the bell. Alright. I now call on James Colasante.

JAMES COLASANTE: I'm speaking on behalf of the Bayside Gables Homeowners Association and the homeowners on 24th Avenue. I resided in Bayside for 60 years, 48 of those years in the historical Bayside community. Along with our adjoining names on 24th avenue, we've enjoyed the opportunity living in single-family homes in a suburban setting for almost a century. The introduction of a multi-family building on a posted stamp size piece of property within our community will be extremely injurious, not only as a contextual zoning issue, but also it will create a serious collapse in the surrounding environmental infrastructure. 24th Avenue is a dead-end street lying in a high-water flood zone. The

easterly portion of the property is bounded by dedicated wetlands. The environmental study done by the developer was flawed when they used a 2010 study. The water table has risen precipitously since then. The pile driving done for the adjacent new school attests to the existing weak and unstable conditions in the area. The present sewer system cannot handle the volume of water. Now it will only be exacerbated by the additional buildings. In the last four years, there were two serious storms that caused flooding to parking lots. Cars were destroyed, basements flooded and toilets overflowed. This did and will happen again. Between the school and the apartment building will be a shortage of almost 100 parking spaces. Where will all the cars park? The traffic light at 24th Avenue and Bell Boulevard controls the flow of traffic from the Bay Terrace shopping center, Bell Boulevard, and 24th Avenue. Traffic exiting 24th Avenue will be insurmountable and a nightmare. The proposed building is only 30 feet away from the existing homes, and the sky [inaudible] exposure will tower over them like a giant cloud that never goes away. This is not a [inaudible] issue. This is factual issues that should not be ignored. The

quality of life of our residents and surrounding buildings will be impacted for generations to come, and if approved, there's no turning back. This project is ill-conceived and our elected officials have no confunction [sic] to reject it outright. We ask our Councilwoman Vicki Paladino and her fellow Council Members to vote no to save our community and way of life.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you.

JAMES COLASANTE: I thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. Leo?

LEO MARINELLO: Hi. My name is Leo Marinello. I've lived in Bayside for 60 years. First, this is not a NYMBY [sic] thing. This project has nothing to do with affordable housing. The motivation for the project is pure profit without any regard for the concerns of the community. If this unthinkable upzoning is approved, it will set a terrible precedent, sanctioning rampant and unrestrained overdevelopment that will be replicated throughout Bayside and beyond. I'm not an activist, but I was reminded in church a couple of months ago that sometimes inaction is a sin. So, I made up a flyer before the Community Board hearing, went door

to door in a mile and a half radius, stood outside the shopping center to speak to the community members face to face, and I spoke to hundreds and hundreds of people, and I can honestly tell you I have not met a single person who is in favor of this project, and that I can attest without reservation that there is bipartisan unity in the community against this project. There's a Greek proverb that says, "A society goes great when old men plant trees whose shade they know they will never sit in." Because this is about the future. This is about the future. Okay? And is-- sometimes preservation is the most potent form of progress, and it is like the Jewish tradition of Tikkun Olam which means to repair the world. And New York City and our communities is our little corner of the world, and although we certainly do not have to agree on everything, I hope that we can all agree that each of us as neighbors and as New Yorkers have an obligation to repair, nurture, protect, and preserve our communities and our city for future generations of New Yorkers coming from places near and far whom we continue to welcome and who will be here long after all of us are gone, and for those reasons, I'm asking the City Council to

vote against this project and in particular our Councilwoman Paladino to stand with the community against this project and to fulfill her promise made in public and on the record at the Community Board 11 meeting where she said she would vote against this project. I thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Leo.

LEO MARINELLO: God bless you all, and God bless the City of New York.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you--

LEO MARINELLO: [interposing] Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: for your testimony. Are there any members-- are there any Council Members with questions for this panel? Council Member Thomas-Henry.

COUNCIL MEMBER THOMAS-HENRY: Thank you. So, as a resident of Queens, and I do frequent the shopping center over there, so I'm just trying to orient myself to this particular parcel. So, if we're at the shopping center, I do know there's a couple of high rises over there. So, is the main concern is the traffic or the infrastructure of this particular site? It sounds like all three are members--

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: It's for the whole panel. So, yeah, anyone can answer.

COUNCIL MEMBER THOMAS-HENRY: [inaudible]

SYLVIA JOHNSON: [inaudible] across from the shopping center-- across from the shopping center is-- at that light is 24th Avenue. If you travel down that street, that street is so narrow it only has parking on one side. When you get to the end, it's five blocks down. It's a dead-end and that's where the pool club was. They're building-- adjacent corner, they're building a school, 570 unit-- 577 student school with District 75. So, that means there's going to be not only the buses from Whitestone, Beachurst [sp?], and College Point being bussed into this narrow street, and then the-- where the left turn is is the school. There's-- if you have assisted living, there's going to be ambulances and it's in a flood zone over a sewer pumping station with really actually no parking now. There's-- I think they've allotted 60 underground parking spots for the building, but there's 183 units. So, people will have to park on the street, and we don't know where. The teachers and administrative staff of the school are going to need to park somewhere, but

people don't have parking now. The park is going need people-- a place for people to go there and park. We don't know where. So, it's a dead end. It's a flood zone. The building that's adjacent to the school, the-- and our parking lot-- my co-op is adjacent to where the school's being built which is across the street from where this unit is. And the-- we had-- when heavy storms that the street that's adjacent flooded terribly. The building next door, the cars were all damaged in the underground parking lot which is as I said adjacent to the school. It's just-- it's just a poor place--

COUNCIL MEMBER THOMAS-HENRY:

[interposing] Thank you.

SYLVIA JOHNSON: for a building of this size, and in a one-family zone.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank-- Council Member, does that answer your question.

JAMES COLASANTE: [inaudible]

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Please. If you could speak into the mic, James.

JAMES COLASANTE: That traffic light at the corner of 24th Avenue and Bell Boulevard which encompasses also the shopping center has six

different settings for cars to make turns, lefts, rights, east, west, north, south. It's going to be-- I don't know how many cars are going to come out of there. But one thing that the developer did mention about and he showed it on the screen that the building's only 30 feet away from existing single-family homes. It's going to tower over them. He did mention that well, we have multiple family buildings across the way. Those buildings are over 300 feet away from the single-family homes that exist there now today. When you build a school, as you all know, all the traffic, all the parking on the perimeter of that school is eradicated. It's gone. You cannot park there. Right now, there's parking there. Once that school is built, there's no more parking. The signs say no parking during school hours. So, now, where's all the cars going to park? There's going to be 100 cars at least of non-existent parking. It'll be a nightmare. And like I said in my speech, once you make a decision, you can't go back. It's very poor place to put a building of this type. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thanks.

LEO MARINELLO: And I would also like to point out that with regard to the flood zone issue, which is important, because we're talking about seniors. The current pool club, any time it rains, the first floor, the locker rooms are flooded. Okay. they're going to put seniors-- seniors-- on the first and second floor in a flood zone on a dead-end street with no escape route for them. I don't know. I think it's immoral.

JAMES COLASANTE: I have one more thing to say. Several years ago-- the drainage is so bad there, and the sewer system is so poor that several years ago-- and I believe it was 15 or more-- they had to put a pumping station at the end of this block to push the water further up to Willis Point from where we are at this-- and that still didn't help. I wish I could show you the pictures of the flooding that was in the area. It was-- it floated the cars off the street onto the sidewalks, that's how bad it was. That's how bad it was.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you for that.

JAMES COLASANTE: It's just the wrong place for this. And the back is the Cross Island Parkway. So there's nowhere for people to go.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. Council Member?

COUNCIL MEMBER THOMAS-HENRY: So, that answers my question. But for the record, I would like to say I would like if there's a way for us to check with the city if there are any infrastructure plans in that area, because again, I am familiar with that part of Queens. And I remember when College Point used to flood like that. So, just curious to see with this development with the school and this proposed project, if there are any larger infrastructure plans to avoid.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: And it does sound compounded. It's congestion with infrastructure all at the same time, so we'll definitely look into that.

COUNCIL MEMBER THOMAS-HENRY: Correct.

JAMES COLASANTE: What the school did was, they didn't build the first floor on ground level. They went up about five feet off the ground knowing the possibility of future flooding. So there's no ground floor level with the school. So that tells you something right there.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you so much.

Being that there's no more Council Member questions,
this panel is now excused. Thank you.

JAMES COLASANTE: Thank you.

LEO MARINELLO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: I will now call the
next panel of individuals who signed up to testify.
Would the following individuals be seated at the
witness table: Barbara Griffel [sp?] and Scott Blanc
[sp?]. Sorry. It's all yours, Barbara. You may
start.

BARBARA GRIFFEL: Yeah, they-- the three
people that spoke said a lot, and it's all true. We
have two streets, 24th Avenue, Waters Edge Drive,
both narrow streets going into a corner where they
are currently building a large school, elementary
school, that I am watching from my window going up.
Then across the street, they will be putting a park.
Neither the school nor the park has any facilities
for parking for people who work there, teachers,
staff. And in a few yards away is where they're
proposing to put this eight-story facility, a large
facility. It doesn't-- it's almost like, yes,
affordable housing is important, but you have to ask

yourself do you just squeeze as many things in a small area as you possibly can? I mean, why don't they just put the Empire State Building there? And as they said, there is no one who knows this area that is for it. It's like almost a unanimous thing. If you were able-- you said you've been in the area. if you walk down 24th Avenue and you look at what's going on, just the size of the school in that small corner, and you couldn't even imagine putting a big building there. It just makes no sense. You know, the parking is an incredible problem, because currently before the building-- before the school was built, before a building goes up, before there's a park with no parking in it, there's almost no parking. So, what can I say? It doesn't affect me. I happen to have my own parking spot, but many people don't and certainly not the staff of the school.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Barbara.

BARBARA GRIFFEL: Anyway, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. Do you any Council Members have questions for this panel? Alright, you're now excused. Thank you. I will now call the next panel of individuals who signed up to testify online. I will now call Megan Rha.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

MEGAN RHA: Hello, yes. Hi.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: You may begin.

MEGAN RHA: Good af-- yes, thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair. Good afternoon Subcommittee

Chair and members of the Subcommittee. My name is

Megan Rha and I serve as a member of Community Board

11 which covers the area involved in the 217-14 24th

Avenue zoning project in Bayside, Queens. And I am

also a resident of the area for the last 30 years of

my life. I am here to express my strong opposition

to the proposed development that would add 183

dwelling units and 65 long-term stay units in the

heart of a single-family residential community.

While the goal of the developers to build senior

assisted living units is commendable, and I do want

that myself, where they want to build the facility is

the issue at this time. Based on everything I have

researched and studied, this proposal is

fundamentally incompatible with the character,

infrastructure, safety, and the realities of this

particular neighborhood. If I could help you,

members of the Subcommittee, to imagine what the

developers want to do, please imagine an elephant and

then imagine that the elephant is dropped on top of a flock of baby chicks. The elephant won't-- will not feel a thing, but the baby chicks will get crushed and either die or be unable to breathe. That is how I believe this proposal will impact this particular community. The project sits-- the project location or site sits of the nexus of Bell Boulevard, our community's primary commercial and transportation corridor, and the Cross Island Parkway whose entrance--

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: [interposing] Thank you, Megan. Thank you for your--

MEGAN RHA: [interposing] Oh, I'm already done?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: testimony. Thank you so much.

MEGAN RHA: Oh, am I done with the time?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Yes.

MEGAN RHA: Oh, okay.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: You can submit the rest of your testimony online at landusetestimony@--

MEGAN RHA: [interposing] Yes.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: council.nyc.gov.
thank you so much.

MEGAN RHA: Okay, I will do that.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Megan.

Next up we're going to have Roseann Henry, Walter Mugden [sp?], and Matthew Silverstein [sp?]. We'll start with Roseanne Henry.

ROSEANN HENRY: Hello. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: If you could put your volume up a little bit louder.

ROSEANN HENRY: Okay. Alright, better?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Yes, you may begin.

ROSEANN HENRY: Hi. My name is Roseann Henry. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. I grew up in Queens Village and have owned a home in Bayside for 27 years. I recognize the need for new housing citywide, and I recognize the parcels of 55,000 square feet don't become available very often. Multi-family development is not unreasonable on that lot. I'm not just a cranky homeowner with a knee-jerk reaction to any change in single-family zoning, but approving this request would send a clear message of disregard for the community, and I urge you not to do that. This is a residential neighborhood that is not accessible by subway, is not on a bus route, and is nearly a mile and a half from a commuter railroad.

For reference, that's like building new apartments at Columbus Circle and telling residents that the nearest train is at Harold's Square and it only goes to Queens. It is a simple fact that residents of whatever is built on this lot will have cars. This is northeastern Queens. We have been asked to believe that the market will dictate how much parking is provided with new developments, but this plan shows how inaccurate that is. The proposed building will accommodate only 80-something cars for more than 250 apartments with hundreds of residents plus visitors, building staff, food service and medical staff for the assisted living facility, contractors, and delivery trucks. That's hundreds of vehicles everyday with completely inadequate parking. This is the third new development at this corridor, and the block will be swamped with traffic, cars, and people with no comprehensive plan for managing the entirety of the changes. This is an egregious example of a developer who wants to squeeze the most money possible out of a project, then walk away and leave a community to deal with the mess left behind. And make no mistake, this one would be quite a mess. I strongly urge you to reject this proposal and let's

send the developer back to the drawing board to come up with an alternative more appropriate to the site and the neighborhood. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. We'll now hear from Walter Mugdan.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

WALTER MUDGAN: I'm the President of a nearby Homeowner's Association and the President of a conservation group that is concerned with the quality of Little Neck Bay, the adjacent water body. As others have stated in great detail, this project is the wrong project for this location. This is a dead-end street, a narrow dead-end street with very limited ingress/egress opportunities, and the traffic is going to be exacerbated by the school that is already now being built right near the same location on the same street. School that will be serviced by school buses as well as parents picking up and dropping off their children. There is no inadequate parking that is being proposed or required of this particular apartment building proposal, and the flooding risk that you've heard about from other speakers is really significant and severe. There are, in my view, other reasonable opportunities for

appropriate development at this site that would still provide an adequate return on investment and that would not so dramatically burden the neighborhood. So, again, we urge you to vote against it and hope that you have paid close attention to the detailed information you've received from people who live immediately adjacent to the area. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Walter.
We'll now hear from Matthew Silverstein.

MATTHEW SILVERSTEIN: Yes, can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Yes.

MATTHEW SILVERSTEIN: Okay. Thank you, Council Members, for letting me testify. My name is Matthew Silverstein. I'm actually the President of the Bay Terrace Community Alliance. We're the civic association for the Bay Terrace community. I have lived on Waters Edge Drive for the last decade. I used to live in the rental building that was-- that is right next door to this project. I just moved to the towers at Waters Edge a few months back. This project is a terrible idea. Everyone has talked about the overburdening of the area with the

congestion. Also, this upzoning is a joke, right?

This project belongs-- this project sits in Community

Board 11 and Community Board 11 is mostly single-

family, low-density housing. This will be a domino

effect that will have huge bur-- this could be a

disaster for zoning in Community Board 11. Also, the

fact that you're talking about 86 spaces, parking

spaces in this development when there's going to be

hundreds of units and people coming in with the

assisted living. That's also a joke, right? And for

me, right, I have a child. I have a four-year-old

child who's probably going to go to that school on

that block. This school that's being built across

the street from this proposed project is right up to

the property line. You're going to have hundreds and

hundreds of children walking all over. They're going

to be crossing the street to go to the park. You're

going to have parents coming in with their cars from

7:30 in the morning 'til 8:30 when school starts in

the afternoon. You won't even be able to get out of

your homes if these are people who are living there.

So, this project, again, this is not like a NYMBY

thing, but this project does not belong on this

block. It is just-- it is a huge mistake, and we urge the Council Members to vote no.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you. This panel is now excused and we'll call the next panel of individuals who have signed up online to testify. We will hear from Henry Euler, Paul Graziano, Phil-- Graziano, oops-- Phil Konigsberg and Carol Marion. We will start with Henry Euler.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

HENRY EULER: Thank you. My name is Henry Euler. I'm the Second Vice Chair of Community Board 11, Queens. I am reading some testimony from our Chair, Paul DiBenedetto, who was unable to attend today due to work considerations. He urges that the project rezoning for this particular address we voted down. As the CB Chair Paul said that he met with the applicants a little over a year ago to discuss plans for the proposed building. After careful review, he told them the project would be regarded by the community as unacceptable development. At no point during the pre-certification period did the applicant come back to us to discuss alternative designs which would have been welcomed. CB11 voted unanimously against the project, both at our Land Use Committee

in September and full board meeting in October 2025.

At the October full board meeting, hundreds of people came from the community, all in opposition to this project. The people that spoke-- there were tens and tens of them, dozens actually. They all spoke against the project. Nobody spoke in favor of the project. Council Member Paladino came. She was against the project. Paul spoke to her during the meeting and asked her if she would be voting no at the City Council. She unequivocally said she would be voting no. All of our meetings are recorded via audio and video so it becomes part of the public record. The property does lie in a flood zone area. It's very concerning to us. And this should not be built on 24th Avenue.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Thank you. Your time expired.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Henry.

HENRY EULER: Thank you. We'll submit the testimony--

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: [interposing] You can submit, yes. You can submit it online.

HENRY EULER: And I hope to submit my own testimony as well. I'm against it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Henry. We will now hear from Paul Grandiano [sic], Graziano. Paul?

PAUL GRAZIANO: Hello?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Good afternoon. You may begin.

PAUL GRAZIANO: Hi. How are you?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Hello. You may begin.

PAUL GRAZIANO: Thank you, Chair Louis and thank you Council. I'm Paul Graziano. I'm a zoning land use and building consultant and work with communities not just in northeast Queens but around the city, and I was actually retained by Community Board 11 to examine the EIS and the entire proposal that was put forth by the applicants. Just a few things. And I'm also a resident. I live nearby, not in that area, but close by. Just a few points. I think a lot of things have been said. One of the things that needs to be understood is, you know, when we're talking about this being in a flood zone. In the EIS, the applicant's solution to dealing with severe flooding which this site will have, is to build-- eventually build flood gates and to build the buildings such that the bottom floors will ultimately

not be able to be used as the sea level rise and flooding continues, making them obsolete. You know, building them as obsolescence built into their development which is really, again, kind of speaks to the fact that this site is not an appropriate location for any kind of development like this. The developers also, as you saw, did not show what this building looks like when it's in context with the surrounding community beyond that one kind of overview showing the other buildings within mile radius that are taller buildings, all in Community Board Seven, I would just want to mention as opposed to in Community Board 11 which is entirely zoned for single-family zoning. So, in a nutshell, the location is terrible. We know that. The park that's being built was actually leased by the pool club for parking for their members [inaudible]

SERGEANT AT ARMS: [interposing] Thank you. Your time expired.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Paul.

PAUL GRAZIANO: So, yes. So, I'll be-- I can send additional graphics--

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: [interposing] Yes.

PAUL GRAZIANO: in a email to you.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you so much.

We'll now hear from Phil.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Phil, are you still with us?

PHIL KONIGSBERG: Yes, I'm sorry. I just unmuted. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Yes, we can hear you. You may begin.

PHIL KONISBERG: Okay, great. First, I'm very surprised. I'm shocked that our Council Member has not made a statement or appeared at this meeting. But let me start my testimony here. My name is Phil Konigsberg. I'm a Queens Community Board Seven member which 17 [sic] is directly across the street on 24th Avenue. I'm also the Second Vice President of the Bay Terrace Community Alliance. I'm speaking against the application that would negatively impact the quality of life of my neighborhood. Now, as Megan asked you to imagine, I want to paint a picture for the community to also think. Imagine a relatively quiet street that ends at a dead-end with private homes and two small apartment buildings. Now, imagine next year a new 572-seat elementary

school opens with school buses and cars double-parked on this relatively narrow road with no intersecting through streets. Now, add the new public park across the street from this school. It's starting to get a little congested, right? But wait, if the property across the street from the new school and park is rezoned to allow a 462-unit, eight-story residential building with a senior care facility, Can you understand the fear our community has or the gridlock situation that will occur weekdays? Do you this picture in your mind? Great. Now imagine an emergency, medical, fire or structural. Just imagine large emergency vehicles--

SERGEANT AT ARMS: [interposing] thank yo.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you so much, Phil.

PHIL KONIGSBERG: [inaudible] narrow street for the--

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: [interposing] Thank you.

PHIL KONIGSBERG: [inaudible] response time would have life or death consequences for everyone on the block. You see that exit?

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Phil.

Thank you so much for your testimony. If you have additional testimony, you can email it. Now, we'll hear from Carol Marion.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: You may begin.

CAROL MARION: Thank you. I am registering a negative attitude about this project. I am going to reiterate one of the biggest issues I can see is that the building is going to be flood resilient, but that is not going to remit the flooding issue or mitigate the flooding in the neighborhood. That is what the applicant has not really explained. So, as it was brought ahead, we're right next to the Cross Island Parkway which is known for its flooding. This project will make the land that exists impermeable and will flood the neighborhood homes. What happens when you build structure this huge, you are cementing over the permeability factor that we have for water drainage. And with the school-- I'm just reiterating what everybody has said. This rezoning is out of the question. It is an extreme, extreme zoning change. It is not possible to support this. And I am speaking on behalf of my neighbors also. We live even

a little further away but we would be affected by and the Cross Island Parkway, also. And the emergency vehicles, it's unbelievable that they even submitted this particular proposal. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON LOUIS: Thank you, Carol.

This is the last call. If there any members of the public who wish to testify regarding this proposal remotely, please press the raise hand button now. If you are in person, please identify yourself to one of the Sergeants. Being there are no members of the public who wish to testify regarding LUs 20 and 21 relating to 217-14 24th Ave. residential rezoning proposal, the public hearing is now closed, and the items are laid over. I now open the public hearing on LU 30, a request for a sidewalk café by the restaurant known as Ethel's [sic] Alcohol and Food in Speaker Menin's district. They seek to place four tables and 16 chairs along the sidewalk in front of this establishment. My understanding is the Speaker has resolved the outstanding issues between the establishment and the Community Board. Is there anyone from the public who wishes to testify remotely or in-person regarding this sidewalk café application? Being there are no members of the

public who wish to testify regarding the request for a sidewalk café by Ethel's Alcohol and Food, the public hearing for LUs 30 is now closed, and this item is laid over. That concludes today's business. I want to thank my colleagues for staying for this marathon. Thank you so much for staying through this marathon. I truly appreciate you guys for participating. This concludes today's business. I would like to thank the members of the public, my colleagues, Subcommittee Counsel, Land Use, and other Council staff, and the Sergeant at Arms for participating in today's meeting. This meeting is hereby adjourned.

[gavel]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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 February 11, 2026