

Brooklyn Community Board 9
890 Nostrand Avenue
Brooklyn, New York 11225
ULURP/Land Use Committee Meeting Minutes

Nov 7, 2022

Meeting ID:

Attendance (Board Members): Pat Moses, Committee Chair; Warren Berke, Vice Chair; Suki Cheong, recording secretary

Attendance (Community Resident Members): Nichola Cox, Esteban Giron, John Craver

Absent (Board Members): Rashida Sykes,

Absent (Community Resident Members): Tom Thomas (excused)

Guests: Celeste Chase, Alicia Boyd, Jannice Grannum, Andrew Magnus, Theresa Westerdahl, Jay Sorid

CB9 Staff: Mia N. Hilton, Assistant District Manager

I. Meeting called to order by Chair Moses at 7:06pm

II. Old Business

a. City of Yes Text amendments – Discussion

i. Suki – review of Oct 17 public information session

1. Zoning For Zero Carbon – new building regulations to promote green energy use, solar panels etc – **environment committee** should look at this.

2. Zoning For Economic Opportunity – we should interface with **economic development committee**

3. Zoning For Housing Opportunity – this is very broad

a. Allowing office to residential conversions

b. Increase number of small units (studios and one bedrooms) versus 2 bedrooms, permitted in large apartment buildings

c. All R5-R8 districts would be upzoned by 20-50% - this would affect our entire neighborhood apart from Lefferts Manor and Empire Blvd. We already have overdevelopment and the upzoning would make our problems even worse.

i. Potentially hundreds of thousands of units across the city, incentive for demolition over renting to tenants and small business.

ii. Expansion of existing ZQA (zoning for quality and affordability) rules – the former program did not have much impact because HPD term sheet was not ready until a few years after the legislation was

passed and was ended shortly afterward. If the currently proposed expansion of the program beyond senior housing gets past the fair housing rules it would be used much more broadly

- d. DCP has stated the text amendments will go through the ULURP process, similar to ZQA and MIH
- ii. Nichola – There wasn't a rigorous environmental review of the effects of ZQA and MIH
- iii. Alicia – 54 out of 59 of community boards voted against ZQA in 2015. What is the legal process by which a text amendment can be passed?
- iv. Esteban – City planning is saying that nothing is fixed yet but they seem to know what they want. They're not really giving a lot of details and we should be prepared to make recommendations. They're trying to characterize the zoning changes as promoting racial justice but we know this will have the opposite effect because of displacement.
 1. Developers are incentivized to demolish even large buildings
 2. Fifteen years ago when Tivoli Towers was purchased the developer wanted to knock it down and build a taller tower because it was easier than fixing it
 3. John – there's a lot of broad brush proposals being put forth and we need to put a local focus on this.
- b. **Motion:** To create a subcommittee that will analyze the City of Yes Text amendments, their legal ramifications, and their effects on the community, and report findings back to the ulurp committee.

Proposed by: Esteban **Second by:** Nichola
Vote: 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

 - i. Esteban proposes that community residents be allowed to join the committee.
 - ii. John, Nichola, Alicia, Esteban, Suki have volunteered to serve on the committee.
 - iii. The subcommittee meetings will be open to the public. Mia or another staff member will host the virtual meeting and announce to the public.
- c. Removal of committee members – Pat recommends that Rashida Sykes be removed because she has 3 consecutive absences

III. New Business/ Community Resident Concerns

- a. **Jay Sorid – city of yes concerns**
 - i. amendments must be reviewed under the racial impact assessment law that went into effect on June.
 - ii. Fair Housing – affordable housing is not being provided for families. DCP response was that we don't need 3 bedrooms because we will move seniors in large apartments to studios and one bedrooms in affordable housing.
 1. Existing 3 bedrooms might not be affordable
 2. No way to make sure that people already living here are moving into housing – it could be young roommates from outside the city, thereby adding to population rather than reducing overcrowding or rent burden for existing residents.

3. Parking is optional for affordable housing – adds to strain on parking
- b. **Kingsboro West** – 900 unit development. The winning proposal was chosen 18 months before they came to the community board. Community input is a myth.
 - i. **Asks that committee reach out to NYS AG and give a legal opinion on the deed reverter, which would return ownership of the site to the city, making ULURP applicable**
- c. **Clarkson Estates** – troubling that former foster kids/homeless youth will be in the same building as ex-cons
- d. **Pat** – Vital Brooklyn projects are state projects, not ULURP. This request has been moved to the full board, and housing concerns should be addressed in the housing committee.
- e. **Mia** – Dante is trying to organize a meeting with Empire State Development to update the community on this project.
- f. **Alicia** – the racial impact assessment is very similar to other environmental impacts that must be examined.
- g. **Esteban** – the racial impact assessment doesn't have a lot of teeth, but it's a helpful tool.

Meeting adjourned at 8:12 pm.

Next meeting is Dec 13, 2022 at 7 pm.

Minutes submitted by Suki Cheong