



Chairperson, Martha Taylor

*The City of New York
Borough of Queens*

Community Board 8

197-15 Hillside Avenue
Hollis, NY 11423-2126
Telephone: (718) 264-7895
Fax: (718) 264-7910
Qn08@cb.nyc.gov
www.nyc.gov/queenscb8



District Manager, Marie Adam-Ovide

Zoning Committee Meeting:

DATE:

PLACE:

Planning Together Proposal

February 8, 2021

via **Zoom**

ATTENDANCE:

- Steven Konigsberg, Zoning Committee Chair**
- Dilafroz Ahmed, Board Member**
- Edward Chung, Board Member**
- Susan Cleary, Board Member**
- Solomon Davydov, Board Member**
- Maria DeInnocentiis, Board Member**
- Kevin Forrestal, Board Member**
- Michael Hannibal, Board Member**
- James Gallagher, Jr. Board Member**
- Wendy Gennaro, Board Member**
- Mitch Lisker, Board Member**
- Dilip Nath, Board Member**
- Jesse Rosenbuam, Board Member**
- Martha Taylor, Chairperson**
- Douglas Sherman, Board Member**
- James Gennaro, Councilman Elect District-24**
- Annie Levers, NYC City Council**
- Paul Graziano, Urban Planner**
- Izabela Szczepanska, CB8 Staff Member**

Others in attendance:

Purpose: Discuss the proposal “Planning Together”.

Zoning Chairperson Steven Konigsberg called this Public Hearing to order at 7:32 p.m. He introduced himself, Annie Levers, and Paul Graziano who will be presenting at tonight’s meeting. Following their presentations members of the board as well as members of the committee and other invited guests will be able to ask questions. We ask that you wait until we have both presenters spoken. Members of the public can submit comments or questions and specify that they would like someone from the zoning committee to speak on their behalf (*does not mean your question will be necessarily asked*) via the “chat” function. Once the presentation is made, all questions asked, comments and remarks from the public are completed then there will be a motion. In conclusion a roll call vote will be taken. Once the roll call vote is concluded it will end the public hearing. There were five (9) Board Members present; therefore, there was not a quorum. A vote will be taken by the full Board at the Community Board Meeting on Wednesday, February 10, 2021 virtually via Zoom.

Zoning Chairperson Steven Konigsberg welcomed Annie Levers and asked her to begin the presentation. Annie Levers asked Chairperson Steven Konigsberg for the opportunity to answer questions directly after her presentation. Chairperson Steven Konigsberg announced that members of the Committee will be the only ones able to ask questions directly at the conclusion of the presentation.

Annie Levers of the Land Use Division, New York City Council (*screenshared the presentation*) – Ms. Levers introduced herself and announced that their division spearheaded this planning together report and the legislative proposal. She presented the bill that has been introduced to the Council and we will go through the legislative and public hearing process. That includes a public hearing that will be scheduled in the next several months. The council will take further input and move the proposal through the legislative process. It is not like a ULURP application and it does not have a specific clock attached. These are some of the main highlights from the presentation:

- Key Issue Summary – 1. The City’s planning mandates are insufficient, scattered, and confusing. 2. A lack of coordination across City agencies creates inefficiencies. 3. A lack of proactive planning has forced communities into reactionary and defensive positions. 4. The City’s piecemeal approach to planning exacerbates inequality. 5. The City’s long-term budget planning bears very little meaningful relationship to the City’s policy or land use planning. 6. The long-term planning that the City does complete with respect to the capital infrastructure is unrealistic. 7. Budget decisions remain divorced from assessments of capital needs, which are incomplete and insufficient.
- Over the last century, NYC has repeatedly abandoned attempts to mandate comprehensive citywide planning in favor of a piecemeal approach to rezoning, land use, budget decisions.
- Intro 2186-2020 does not make nor require any amendments or changes to the City’s zoning resolution whatsoever. Does not require or trigger requirements for any kind of re-zonings. Does not propose or support the elimination of single-family zoning in NYC. Does not amend or eliminate CB’s role in future rezoning process, all of which would remain subject to ULURP.
- Intro 2186-2020 does require the City to provide CB’s and the public with new resources, data, and analyses to support proactive community-based planning. It does encourage the City to direct new growth or development away from low-lying areas vulnerable to sea-level rise and other displacement risks. It does encourage fine-grain rezoning tools to be more equitably distributed citywide and gives all neighborhoods the opportunity to proactively plan for their futures.
- A new ten-year Comprehensive Planning Cycle would connect disjointed documents, processes and reports already required by the NYC charter to create on citywide strategic framework and vision for the City’s future growth and development.
- The Office of Long-Term Planning and Sustainability (OLTPS) will assess City’s existing conditions in coordination with communities and City Agencies. Based on the data, the City would work in partnership with communities and key stakeholders to determine the City’s long-term needs for housing, jobs, open space, schools, and other critical infrastructure. Through a robust public engagement process, New Yorkers will help decide where and how the City will distribute that critical infrastructure in their neighborhoods over the next 10 years. CB’s and Borough President would be required to adopt preferred land use scenarios. The NYC Council would reconcile recommendations from various stakeholders for each Community District for inclusion in the Final Long-Term Plan. Future rezoning applications (ULURPs) will describe how the action does or does not align with the Final Long-Term Plan. All budget planning documents will reflect the budget priorities identified in the plan.

Zoning Chairperson Steven Konigsberg asked if anyone had any questions.

Kevin Forrestal – Is this PowerPoint going to be made available for viewing to the distribution for the members?

Annie Levers - I can make a request and see if I can send it around after this meeting.

Susan Cleary – Why isn’t the Council addressing only the neighborhoods with decades old needs to revamp?

Annie Levers - It is not at all. Again, that is probably a misunderstanding of the proposal.

Susan Cleary – No, I am sorry. It is not a misunderstanding. It was your presentation.

Annie Levers - No, I have another slide here. I can walk you through on the Budget reforms.

Susan Cleary – I do not want to see this.

Annie Levers - Okay, I will answer your question regardless of whether you want me to or not. The budget reforms are the most subornative reforms that we are making. They are intended to identify and prioritize every

single community district need including city-wide needs for the City. It forces the City to work in partnership with communities and to list and prioritize budget needs regardless of whether the neighborhood is going through rezoning. I truly believe that every single neighborhood in NYC has long standing investment needs that have not been addressed. I am sure that is true here as well. Community Board statement of needs or district statement needs they are not often in the budget process. This would really force more transparency and prioritization of those needs in the budget process over time.

Susan Cleary – Yes, right.

Maria DeInnocentiis – In the presentation you mentioned there are fine grained rezoning tools available. What do you mean by fine grain? I think it was on the first slide. What are fine grain rezoning tools if you are telling us you are not rezoning?

Annie Levers - The recommendation would just inform a land use framework which would then be used to inform your decisions around rezoning actions in the future. We are not rezoning any neighborhoods. We are not proposing any specific rezoning action. Fine grain zoning tools is used to describe any tool that is more effective than the 1961 zoning resolution. It is an extremely blunt tool that encourages a lot of out of context development. It really encourages developers to pull together multiple sites so that they can build a tall of a building as possible. Neighborhoods like yours have gone through rezoning since then. A lot of neighborhoods that have similar conditions were not given that same treatment. All this does is essentially create the new pathway for communities across the city to say we don't want that skyscraper directly next to this tiny short three to four story building. To provide an opportunity for them to advocate for new applications for zoning tools that have been applied in other neighborhoods.

Maria DeInnocentiis – Okay, sounds a little convoluting to me. I want to hear Paul's presentation before I make some other comments.

Edward Chung – Thank you for the presentation. This is a lot of information you have thrown at us. I just want to say one thing about rezoning. Do the people in CB8 decide on our zoning, not the City?

Annie Levers - The CB would have the same role in every single ULURP application that it does right now. It does not give you a binding vote. It really doesn't change the ULURP process at all, but it does provide more resources for you to inform your future decisions. This proposal is not actually a proposal for rezoning any of any kind.

Edward Chung – We live in this neighborhood and we like it the way it is. We do not want developers coming in to say you have your lands not use group property one and build ten story buildings here. We don't want you to touch it. Can we say that?

Annie Levers - You can do as you do now. This neighborhood has gotten a lot of planning attention that is good for the neighborhood that you are supporting. That makes a lot of sense for this neighborhood and context. The point of this proposal is that not every neighborhood got that same treatment. A lot of them are just stuck with old zoning code that doesn't make sense for today's development era. All this does is create a new opportunity for CB's to inform what will be a proactive land use plan and that proactive land use plan could say everything should stay the same. Here are my budget priorities that you should prioritize as future budgets decisions. That would then get sent to the council which would then adapt a final long-term plan. Which again would not be a rezoning it would be a future land use map. Applicants will be required to submit a ULURP application that says I want to build a 10-story building this does not align with the framework in the long-term plan. I think it is appropriate anyway and then you could use that in your deliberations and in talking to council members as they make their final decisions to say this does not align with our final long-term plan.

Chairperson Steven Konigsberg stated that Wendy Gennaro had her hand raised and asked if she had any comments or questions.

Wendy Gennaro – Actually, I am going to hand my question over to my husband.

James Gennaro – I just want to make sure that it is appropriate for me as a Councilmember Elect to ask a question. Is that okay Mr. Chairman?

Steven Konigsberg – We did invite elected members of the public officials to become panelist to participate and have input into our discussion tonight.

James Gennaro – Ms. Levers thank you for your presentation. I will be sworn into council on February 16th. I was the one that created the Office of Long-Term Planning and Sustainability which is an office that no longer

exists. The mayor has split that up into the Office of Sustainability and the Office of Resiliency. I was surprised to see that in the presentation.

Annie Levers - It does exist by the Charter because we passed it in July. You passed it in July. What they did was just drop the long-term planning from their name which demonstrates where their priorities lie right now. What this would do, is reinstate their long-term planning goals. It would significantly expand their responsibilities to put forth a version of the plan NYC reports. Which is in part why the office was created to really address the full range of tools in for our development and our infrastructure investments.

James Gennaro – So we would have to put that office back together again. When the Mayor separated the two offices, I don't think that really compartmentalized with my law. I appreciate that explanation. Some of the people on the panel here are seeing this in a way top down sort of strategy. Like a bottom-up strategy and as you indicated we have a very active CB. We work very well with DCP, the administration, and Council Members who represent this area. They have done a good job in trying to figure out what the long-term needs of this community are. We already had the land use resolution in 1961 and we have been able to work with that. There is some reluctance to you creating a whole new paradigm when there is not complete certainty done here at the grass roots as to how that is going to really work for them. I am not sure if that is a question or a comment.

Susan Cleary – Comment.

James Gennaro – Also you made a reference to irresponsible development something that is as of right. I think we do a pretty good job locally of making sure that the zoning we must live by here in this area works for us. Anything that is done as of right has been something that we can all pretty much live with. If we have difficulty, we change the zoning to what it is that we want. We are trying to wrap our heads around this new proposal.

Annie Levers - There are huge parts of the city that are stuck with 1961 zoning and this is not one of those communities. You are right, you have done a really good job of activating your own planning. It is not true elsewhere. All we are doing is creating an even playing field for every community. We are forcing the city's hand to provide resources and engage in a proactive conversation with neighborhoods that have not been touched since 1961. To say what do you want your futures to look like? What do you like about your neighborhoods? What do you want to preserve? That would apply here as well. We designed this legislation to be in place for many decades to come. There will be many challenges that we will need to face. We really need a city-wide vision with community input, and this does intent to put CB into a position to make a proactive recommendation for what they want to see. In this neighborhood you don't want to change anything, and it works well for us and that would be perfectly fine. That would be allowed under the framework that we designed. This would ensure that every neighborhood is doing the same thing on an ongoing basis. That we are reviewing and updating our zoning code in a cohesive way. It is something that every other city does. The city has never gone back and said we said this will produce an x number of housing units or y number of schools. There is no lookback. There is no review to look at impacts to see what worked well and to see where there was an intended consequence. Recently DCP really did that and looked back for the first time in Williamsburg and found that the rezoning they did there in 2007 generated thousand more units than they expected it would and there was no follow up. This forces the city to proactively review and assess its zoning code in a cohesive way with community input to make recommendations.

James Gennaro – I want to hear from people on the panel. Thank you for the comprehensive answer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Steven Konigsberg announced that to keep the meeting moving along. Currently there are two people with hands raised. Everyone can access the panel at the bottom of the screen and raise your hand. That way you will be recognized. We have Maria and Susan, after we conclude we will be moving to Paul Graziano.

Maria DeInnocentiis – I think there are misstatements in Annie's presentation. First, she congratulates for the work we have done in our community for zoning. Then talks about other areas that have 1961 zoning codes. Every community in the city has a CB that they can go to and make their presence and desires known. If those areas are not changing their zoning it may be that they are happy or agree with the changes that are being made. Annie continues to say that the zoning will not change but it will. We will go to the Borough President along with every CB in Queens and put our plans on the table. Once that goes to the city council the city council will look at everything across the city and pick and choose which they want to put in those three proposals that are going up to vote. The three presentations from what I read in the report go to the city council if they cannot get a majority vote to agree, the decision goes to the committee to make that final decision. You do what you want

to do. Not what the people locally want to do. This takes everything out of the local hands. I really think that the negative impact will be on communities like ours who have tried very hard for the past 50 years to make sure that our neighborhood stays the neighborhood we live in the neighborhood we want. Our homes in Queens are one of the lowest saturated neighborhoods but there are housing units all around us and they are regulated, and we are happy to have them that way. We don't want people from other communities telling us what needs to be in our neighborhoods, and I think that is the big mistake that your whole report is making.

Annie Levers - Even if you think that the long-term plan is not good and even if the council adapts a land use plan that you do not agree with, that is still not a rezoning. It does not rezone your neighborhood. It is a lie that it does. It is a plan that then future rezoning applications would need to be responsive to. The ULURP application would include a statement of alignment that simply states whether the ULURP application aligns with that plans. It would not change any of your current process. It would not automatically impose any of the recommendations in the plan; however, I do want to say there is a very good chance you will like what is in the plan. The process we developed, and our receiving input and we will have a hearing about. You should come and provide testimony. That is the recommendation that is sent to the council. Not the three produced by the city. Those are resources they live and die right there. CB's can then design preferred scenarios of their very own based on the work you already have done for many decades. Send that to the Borough President and the City Council for recommendation. They would adopt that as the preferred scenario in their long-term plan. Even then it is not a rezoning it is just a framework to measure future rezoning actions against. That is all it is. It would be irresponsible to force any kind of rezoning city wide every 10 years. That is too frequent and likely unnecessary. This provides a framework for which communities can participate in to build a proactive vision in their neighborhoods against which you would measure future rezoning measures. The plan could say change absolutely nothing and then you would get a ULURP application that says I want to build something that is not in the current zoning, so I need a rezoning. It would simply say it does not align with the long-term plan because it doesn't fulfill the goals you designed in the long-term plan. You would use that in your deliberation and your recommendation to the council which would still retain its ability to reject the rezoning application. It feels like it is an unnecessary step perhaps for neighborhoods like yours that really have worked really hard and for a long time to ensure that you are supporting the development that you want to see in your neighborhood. It is missing from other neighborhoods.

Susan Cleary – Ms. Annie you are a very good presenter. Who are the long-term stakeholders in this whole scenario?

Annie Levers - All the stakeholders or the long-term planning steering committee?

Susan Cleary – It mentions in your presentation mentions long term stakeholders. I want to know specifically who they are.

Annie Levers - (*screenshared slide 4*)- It is everyone on this slide that I walked you through here.

Susan Cleary – Key stakeholders.

Annie Levers - There is this long-term planning steering committee. I think you may be talking about that will help set citywide goals. Right now, the steering committee does exist, it helps provide input on the plan NYC reports. This would subsume those responsibilities of that long-term planning steering committee and it would be appointed by a diversity of elected officials unlike the current steering committee right now. Four would be appointed by the Mayor, four would be appointed by the city council speaker and then the Borough President would have one appointee. It is a 13-member body would be required to have technical experts that would be able to weigh in on issues of sustainability and resilience. They would look at the full city and say here is the infrastructure we need to fit into our city for the next ten years to support thriving communities and that is where that steering committee would come in.

Susan Cleary – Yea, right.

Chairperson Steven Konigsberg requested that Board Members wait to ask any questions until after Paul Graziano's presentation.

Paul Graziano, Urban Planner (*screenshared the presentation*) – Mr. Graziano summarized the previous presentations against the proposal. He believes that all Community Boards and Elected Officials will lose influence over land use issues and other issues with this bill. There is no question this emphasis on housing of all things is meant to expand housing in the City of NY and not to keep the neighborhood the same. This can potentially eliminate single family zoning in NYC. These are some of the main highlights from the presentation:

- The process of “Comprehensive Planning” as per “Planning Together”:
 - The new Director of the Office of Long-term Planning – who will answer only to the Mayor – will submit a draft Citywide Goals Statement, with a single public meeting in each Borough required.
 - This Statement, while giving lip service to other issues and needs in the city will focus primarily on housing.
 - A final Citywide Goals will be submitted up to 2.5 months later, with a single public meeting in each Borough required. Once this Statement has passed there will be quotative community district level targets that the director finds appropriate to include.
 - The three potential land use scenarios will be submitted by: Community Boards, Borough Presidents, and the newly created Long-Term Planning Steering Committee (4 each from the Mayor/City-Council; 1 from each Borough President). Infrastructure needs will be catalogued but by no means will housing targets and subsequent adoption of land use scenarios be reliant on those needs being met.
 - Within another 5 months, there will be a hearing at the City Council where they will “adopt a single resolution establishing one preferred land use scenario for each community district. If the council fails to adopt a preferred land use scenario for each community district by such date, the director shall select preferred land use scenario’s” along with a written reply as to why.
- PowerPoint slide (4-12) showed images of examples of Comprehensive planning outcome in community board 8.
- In 1998 Mr. Graziano was the co-author of the Boonton Master Plan. The Master plan was for 8, 000 people. It is an old town and has been around for a couple hundred of years. This one the award for the best Master Plan in the State of NJ. A Master Plan provides a long-range vision for the built environment of a community. This is an example of a comprehensive plan and not what is being proposed.

Steven Konigsberg thanked Paul Graziano for his presentation. If anyone has any questions, they can raise their hands in the que.

Paul DiBenedetto – Mr. Graziano I am just curious the way that you see it. You are not against the idea of comprehensive planning, but you think this is not community minded. This is more of an authoritarian minded plan. Is that true?

Paul Graziano – I look at this as a housing and development program, but it is not comprehensive planning. It is very top-heavy. Councilman Gennaro did bring this up. We already have this tremendous beauocroucy with land use. To place an addition level on top of what we already have and to remove the limited power that communities already have it is autocratic. Certainly, less participation and less influence on the process.

Paul DiBenedetto – Right, I said authoritative in the sense that it seems to be driven centrally. I always wished that the community would have more of an influence and planning, although it happened in 2005 when the community was much more involved.

Paul Graziano – Unfortunately, this Mayor did not carry the what Bloomberg had started. If he had then another 40% of the city would have been rezoned. Instead it was halted with an agenda that was stated we will never contextually rezone another neighborhood as long as I am Mayor. He stated that, and his administration kept his word. This is something that if it continued to happen a lot of land use issues throughout the entire city have been dealt with only half of it was done.

Paul DiBenedetto – I just want to say that as far as zoning I have studied 1961. The city finally organized a zoning city wide zoning and the city was zoned for growth. It didn’t really face another major citywide rezoning until the 2000’s. The point being is that the city was zoned for growth in the 1960’s and the growth was in the 2000’s.

Paul Graziano – When they came up with the zoning in 1961, they believed the city was going to have between 16 and 20 million people by the year 2000. Instead there was 8 million in 1961 and today pre COVID as of last year our population fell from 8.5 in 2010 to 8.1 million in 2019 or 2020. This begs the question, what is the rush for pushing through this type of legislation through the middle of a pandemic with a declining population?

Paul DiBenedetto – Right, that is what I was getting at is that if we built out our zoning entirely if nothing has changed since 1960 in 2000s we had some up zonings and down zonings. If nothing has changed, we have plenty of growth already with in the zoning so why are we looking to do this.

Paul Graziano – Just to let everyone know with all the zoning changes that occurred during the Bloomberg administration we did increase capacity overall. So even though huge swaths of the city were down zoned or contextually rezoned there were big areas that were up zoned. The capacity did not go down it went up. We did not lose the ability to develop.

Michael Hannibal – my main question is, and it is really for you Steve. Are we looking to have a vote of whether to move forward or to vote against because I think I am just speaking for myself? I think I have heard enough from both sides for us to decide on how to move forward. I would like to get the take on all members on the call right now.

Steve Konigsberg – I appreciate that for the moment we do have the floor open for being if anyone requires any clarification based upon the two presentations.

Susan Cleary – Since our population has reduced isn't it always a good idea to plan?

Steve Konigsberg – Is that directed to Paul or Annie?

Susan Cleary – Paul.

Paul Graziano – It is always good to plan. This is not planning. I think that is the main issue. Planning is what we did in the 2000s. We did plan, and we remedied or remediated a whole bunch of issues that needed to be addressed that previous administrations refused to do. I think that other neighborhoods should be getting the same treatment. There is a very simple way to do this without creating a process that will backfire terribly. Who knows who will be in charge?

Susan Cleary – Do you have any type of presentation that you can send to the board so we can physically touch it?

Annie Levers – To mail you a physical copy of the presentation that I gave you tonight?

Steve Konigsberg – Email.

Annie Levers - Electronic, yes of course. I do not have a printer. I could email you something. Paul I just wanted to follow up on that one statement. I do want to underscore that this is a legislative proposal. While I do not agree with a lot of the ways that you characterize the legislation, I think you left out a lot of the public participation milestones that we built in. You left out the role of the long-term planning steering committee in setting the citywide goals. This is a legislative process that could go through amendments. I am just curious if you have proposals for improving this process. When you say that there are easier ways to get the contextual rezoning tools applied in other neighborhoods that they need. What are those ways and why haven't we done it over the last 20 years? If it is so easy why hasn't it gotten done and don't you see this as an opportunity to apply those tools in other neighborhoods through an ongoing proactive process?

Paul Graziano – We did get it done. Then we got a new Mayor and the new Mayor shut it off. So that is just wrong, your answer is wrong.

Annie Levers - You got it done in certain neighborhoods. All the other neighborhoods did not get it done.

Paul Graziano – We got it done across huge spots of Queens and not just certain neighborhoods. 80% of SE Queens was rezoned. More than 80% of other parts of Queens were rezoned. It did not matter what their population, demographic, economics they got rezoned and they got rezoned well. There was an enormous amount of community participation. You can speak to the CB's board members who are on this zoom meeting. There was a tremendous amount of community input. I personally designed half of the rezoning in Queens. I sat down and did it for the civic associations and the CB's first then the elected officials all signed on.

Annie Levers - I am aware, and I am talking about all the other neighborhoods throughout the city that did not go through that process.

Paul Graziano – Why didn't they go through the process because we got a new administration. Once this framework goes into the new administration it will be even more difficult.

Annie Levers - What is the easier way that you see to get those neighborhoods the rezoning tools they need?

Paul Graziano – It is not this bill.

Annie Levers - That is fine, but do you have a proposal for improving the legislation?

Paul Graziano – It is not improvising. The legislation doesn't work because it is built on a falsehood. That is the problem. This is what I have said from the beginning. This should not be a debate between the two of us because this is really a community board meeting. Your proposal is built on falsehoods. I have already called them out very clearly. This is very clear that this is not an accurate portrait of what occurred and what is

occurring. What you are proposing and the fact that I am stating what is written in the legislation. I am not cherry picking the legislation and the writing in the legislation nor am I cherry picking what is being said at the press release from Corey Johnson when he put this out.

Annie Levers - I stand by what is said in the press release. I know this is not a debate. I wish that we could have a conversation privately. This is the very beginning of the legislative process and we are having proactive meetings like these to get input. I welcome all that input from everyone.

Paul Graziano – What I recommend is that the council withdraw the bill and start over. That is my recommendation. I talked to communities and to people outside of your very small group of people that came up with this. I talked to the communities instead of trying to create a framework that the communities would never come up with. Come up with an idea where the communities decide their own faith. and I think this is what the community boards and the civics and the neighborhoods want. They want to be able to make sure that they can do what they want. I am happy to talk you offline about this but my recommendation to the CB and other CB's is to reject this legislation. If the speaker wants to start over, he should be reaching out to people prior to introducing something like this and then only engaging almost two months after it has been released into the wild. That is what I have to say, and I thank you for coming and presenting tonight.

Maria DeInnocentis – Annie most of us have been involved in our civics and in the community for many years. I personally started very young. I have lived here for about 50 years and was intimately involved with our re-zoning. Paul did not actually work with us on our rezoning, but we did work very hard on getting ourselves rezoned. The misconception with this whole legislation and the speakers focus is that he took the communities out of the discussion. If you say what is the plan, I think the mistake was going with a small group without talking to groups that have done this before. Instead of looking at Queens and saying that community has done great things in rezoning because we will tell you as of right is a pain in the neck. We would love to see changes in the things that are getting done. We understand that our political tendencies are for real-estate developers to be able to get their way over local communities, but we fought, and we won many times. You want a new plan it is go back to the drawing board and insert the communities. Jim Gennaro is my Councilman now and we will be working with him on any issues that are zoning issues or things we would like to see. I don't know how many members have read the 54-page plan, but I did. I find that many of your comments are responses to details that are in the report that don't say what you are saying in public. That really bothers me because it is more of what they might do not what the bill is saying they want to do. My advice is going back to the drawing board and come and talk to us face to face. As I have said it looks like we are getting beaten up because we work very hard to keep the quality of life in Queens and our land use under control. I cannot talk for other CB's and other communities but instead of telling us we have to conform because they didn't do what they were supposed to do you should be telling them look at Queens and follow their great leadership in redesigning your communities to meet what you want it to be and not want someone on a city planning commission wants it to be.

Annie Levers - Can I just respond to that.

Susan Cleary – No.

Chairperson Steve Konigsberg stated that she did not really ask a question. It is getting late and we will move on. He asked if Kevin Forrestal had any questions or concerns.

Kevin Forrestal – Should the City Council at this point in their last year going out the door with the Mayor be the ones to be making these decisions? Since he has had two charter revisions that failed to address this issue. The beginning of the bill talks about a whole series of goals. One of the things that is missing is that there is the character of the neighborhood. It calls for all sorts of things to be done but for social wonderful things, but it could end up destroying neighborhoods like ours. The process you spoke about why it hasn't continued well we ended up at CB8 sponsoring a rezoning as an applicant because the city planning would not support to that neighborhood to do the rezoning. That got approved and it was an up zoning. There wasn't funding available for it and if you follow the same process you could have had it. I was involved and so was Paul in rezoning in a mixed community and there was very detailed work by the community and by DCP going building by building. I haven't heard that type of interaction between the communities and unfortunately dealing with some of the communities especially poorer one's people are working two to three jobs. They don't have time to spend in that activity. Me and my wife spend hours and hours every week on the Jamaica plan and we were given some resources to another area that is very different from ours. Do we take a vote tonight to decide I urgently request that we do so?

Chairperson Steve Konigsberg asked for a motion to support the speakers plan for planning together.

Kevin Forrestal made motion, seconded by Michael Hannibal.

Steven Konigsberg asked if anyone had any additional comments about the motion on the floor.

Kevin Forrestal – I would strongly oppose the motion for all the reasons that were stated before and I urge all the members to oppose and say no.

Susan Cleary – One side does not fit all.

Steven Konigsberg – I did myself have a few observations about the plan presented. Comparing possible zoning changes or planning and that other cities do and saying that New York should follow their lead. I have not heard any comparisons between what NYC is and what many of these other cities that have followed these types of planning's for their futures are so or say that they are comparable that we should follow them. NYC is like no other city in this country. There is also a question of how it all budgeting would fit into this procure in terms of all the changes that could be envisioned on a citywide plan and why would a citywide plan apply to a particular neighborhood as a goal of planning that wasn't mentioned at all. There were no specific examples given in the beginning on the first slide as many of the reasons as why it is being pushed forward as a citywide plan to now attack this on a citywide basis in order to accomplish these goals but there were no specific examples of somebody short falling but as opposed to generality of where other areas of the city have failed to move their selves forward as well as. There was one slide which was all the things that plan is not going to do and I think many of us were happy to see what is being proposed what is not going to be done by this proposal but the other side slide of all the other things which hopefully could be accomplished through this proposal and my question is could not many of these other thing that are lofty goals which this proposal seems to address could those things not address an all-encompassing plan as opposed to a much more targeting planning to exactly try to remedy those problems which this plan would hopefully be able to accomplish. For all of those reasons the lack of specifically the over generalization the wide brush which with this would cross the entire city wrap everything into one ball the failure of having specificity in terms of the deficits that we are trying to attack and the way in which we could otherwise remedy situations without this all accoupling plan. I will not be voting in favor of the proposal tonight.

Steven Konigsberg asked if anyone had any other comments to the motion. Seeing none he asked for a roll call vote of the members of the Zoning Committee. Currently there are nine members of the committee, a couple of members are general members of the community board that will have the opportunity to have their voices heard when this is brought for the full Board this coming Wednesday, February 10, 2021. He thanked both Annie Levers and Paul Graziano for their presentations tonight. He thanked everyone for coming out and participating.

A roll call vote was taken.

Vote:

0 in favor 9 opposed 0 abstained

Board Members who voted in favor: None.

Board Members who voted against Dilafroz Ahmed, Edward Chung, Susan Cleary, Solomon Davydov, Kevin Forrestal, Michael Hannibal, Steven Konigsberg, Dilip Nath, Jesse Rosenbaum, and Douglas Sherman.

Adjournment

This meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Izabela Szczepanska, CB8 Staff

February 10, 2021