Appendix I: Public Comments

A

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Testimony from Atlantic Avenue Rezoning Meeting
Date: Wednesday, October 18, 2023 1:15:27 PM
Attachments: AAMUP Testimony.docx

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

Hello,

I'm reaching out because I attended the zoom meeting yesterday discussing the Atlantic Avenue Rezoning project and wanted to submit written notes and testimony.

Thank you,
Rosy

- **Chi Osse Testimony at appx. 2:49pm EST/SLIDE 45:** Using affordability as a selling point for high density buildings means those buildings should be 50% or more affordable. If they're mostly going to be market housing then the height should be no more than 8-9 stories or **less**. 1
- **Chi Osse Testimony at appx. 2:49pm EST/SLIDE 45:** There's surrounding residential areas all along Atlantic Avenue, not just on the "narrower" western portion of the proposed development section. 2
- **Crystal Hudson Testimony/2:51pm EST:** The western side (closer toward Washington Ave's and The Barclays) can be considered the more expensive and least-diverse side of the development map, there seems to always be a push to develop less where certain demographics live as opposed to the eastern side where the cultural makeup of the neighborhood and income bracket changes greatly. If the effort is to develop Atlantic Avenue the burden of holding high density buildings should not only rely on one side more than the other regardless of how narrow an area is. 3

  A consideration of train stations, lack of public transport service at those train stops, and lack of platform space should be taken into consideration. In 2019, it was impossible to safely stand on the narrow platforms and impossible to squeeze into trains during peak hours. Trains don't run often enough to accommodate the quantity of residents. And considering those were the conditions **before** development, it's important to measure the strain that thousands of new residents will have on already scarce service. 4

- We need more information about how these developments will affect property taxes for homeowners. Historically, the wealthiest neighborhoods in Brooklyn (Park Slope, Brooklyn Heights for example) pay some of the lowest property taxes in the city. The AAMUP proposed zoning area is certainly not Park Slope and residents are not within the same income tax brackets, yet we pay much more taxes than the wealthiest neighborhoods in the city. We need transparency around how this will affect property taxes in our neighborhoods and as the residents here get older, that taxes don't rise at the same pace that rent prices have. Especially if public transit services around us are not going to improve and will only become more congested. 5

- Developers don't care about the effect they have on residents once these projects are approved and we're left to deal with trespassers, people throwing rocks and garbage into our yards, people trespassing on train tracks, etc. These developments effect our electricity, water pressure and other services. The increase of thousands of residents with pets add litter and leave dog poop on the sidewalks and don't clean up after themselves. The streets smell of dog poop and piss all the time. NYC Sanitation doesn't always pick our garbage up when they're supposed to, imagine how much worse that will be with thousands of new residents. The rat infestation is already bad on the eastern side of Atlantic Ave toward Franklin and Nostrand. More people, more feces, and more garbage would not help. NYC already does not clean tree beds or prune trees either resulting in overgrowth, garbage piles, and rat nests. Residents have taken up the job toward keeping our community clean but to be clear we never even asked for these tree beds and its only right that the city be the ones tasked to clean them. 6

- If the plan is to propose high density **affordable** developments there should be thought into free parking spaces or low cost parking spaces for those residents. People are not going to stop owning cars no matter how badly this city wants to force them to. Plenty of families with small children own cars in this neighborhood. This is a **residential first** community and has been since 7

the late 1800s and is a place where people have lived for generations. Therefore, if the plan is to turn it into more of a commercial area, there should be accommodations **within** these LARGE developments to accommodate parking. It should not be a punishment on local residents who are from here to figure out a new way to transport themselves and loved ones on someone else's dime. Especially considering the state of our local train and bus lines and lack of safety on them.

7 cont.

Additionally, CitiBike, which is a privatized service that works in partnership with the City of New York but ultimately is NOT a government run entity, should not take up space and lessen parking on streets that taxpayers pay for. There are plenty of wide sidewalks, due to the manufacturing history of the area, that can accommodate Citi bikes without having residents who live here pay the price for a semi-privatized service owned by one of the biggest banks in the world.

8

- There is a huge lack of green space. Typically, new developments have privatized green spaces for residents but all of these plots that are being proposed for development in theory could be turned into local parks and gardens rather than new buildings. That being said, there needs to be a priority on meeting spaces for locals as well as places that are safe to sit outside. There are only a handful of spaces for people to enjoy the outdoors for free and most of them are playgrounds for children, unaccommodating to adults and elders. We can't continue to build more developments and expect people to stay cooped up in dark and tiny apartments.

9

- There are so many notes and so much feedback that was shared during the workshop sessions and it seems as though none of that feedback is being considered as we chug forward with the AAMUP plans. I urge councilmembers and city officials to review and continue to communicate with us to find a way to push our neighborhoods into the future while keeping the interests of locals and residents who are more familiar with quality of life here in mind.

10

Chan

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comment for Today"s Scoping Meeting AAMUP
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 3:56:52 PM
Attachments: image001.png
image003.png
image004.png
image005.png
image006.png

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

Hello –

I represent the Episcopal Diocese of Long Island in regards to its interest in St. Bartholomew's Church, which is on the edge of the proposed zoning area.

First and foremost, we support the AAMUP goals and upzoning and are very thankful in your work to move this forward. 1

St. Bartholomew's Church is a landmarked property within the map area. Currently, St. Bart's has more floor area than it can use in the northern portion of the lot and, under the rezoning, even more. Unfortunately, the southern part of the lot is in a different district. Using the adjusted floor area ratio, some of that excess floor area can be transferred to the southern portion of the lot. However, the contextual zoning district on the south side of the district boundary line precludes the use of most of that excess floor area. Similarly, shifting that excess floor area east or west within the same zoning district on the northern side of the district boundary or to the south western corner of the block is limited by the contextual zoning. 2



(the red outline depicts the St. Bart's site. We would like to be able to be more readily transfer and use FAR from the newly rezoned north section to build housing in the south section. We'd like to request that bulk waivers to use the landmark TDR to be done by Certification to

streamline the process of activating the floor area opportunity)

What would help the Church is simplification of the process to obtain bulk waivers to use the additional floor area in the height-limited R6A district to the south or the new C6-3A district east and west, especially for affordable housing projects.

Since such waivers will be necessary to utilize the floor area, the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement should study the possibility of transfers to Lots 1-5 and 21, facilitating any future discretionary review.

2 cont.

We also suggest a special provision in the AAMUP that would allow a waiver by Certification for a landmark that will build housing, similar to the existing provisions in ZR § 74-711 but as a Certification. These alternative development scenarios could be reviewed in the EIS for AAMUP, saving the Diocese a substantial amount of time and money, more the creation of affordable housing more accessible. This could serve as a model for future Special Purpose Districts.

3

Thank your time and attention.

[redacted]
Ellen Liu Chan / Asset Manager
[redacted]
Episcopal Diocese of Long Island
[redacted]

Crespo

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Scoping meeting question
Date: Monday, September 18, 2023 4:43:27 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

Hi!

Can you please let me know what the protocols are for the public to deliver verbal testimony at an EIS scoping meeting? e.g., what is the time limit? 1

Thanks,
Paula

PAULA CRESPO
Senior Planner
she/her

Pratt Center for
Community Development

[redacted]

Franchino

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for an AAMUP that Maximizes More Homes
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 7:04:43 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

Hello,

I am writing in qualified support of the AAMUP rezoning. New York faces a dire housing shortage, forcing us renters to fight over scraps while incumbent homeowners live comfortably and profit off the shortage through their astronomical home values. The rezoning area will help ease our shortage of safe, secure, affordable homes by enabling homes to be built in previously industrial areas. As such, we should allow as much density as possible. Higher densities can enable the creation of more market rate and income-restricted homes. We desperately need more market rate homes to stop displacement caused by upper middle class folks like me having no choice but to move to previously lower-income neighborhoods. Likewise, more income-restricted homes can allow for greater socioeconomic and racial integration in America's second most segregated city. 1

The current AAMUP scoping document is a great starting point that I generally support, but I recommend some tweaks that would allow us to build more homes and welcome ore neighbors of all incomes.

- C6-5 and C6-7 zones instead of C6-3A would maximize potential for more homes along mixed use corridors. This neighborhood is incredibly transit rich, so we should build as dense as possible. 2
- There should not be any R6B in the rezoning area, let alone any of Prospect Heights. In practice it limits any new construction to small boutique condos and oversized townhomes. R6B is "snob zoning" that benefits already-wealthy homeowners 3
- Any proposed R6 and R7 re-zoned areas should be amped up to R8, R9, or R10. By allowing for large densities, we can unlock the potential to unlock economies of scale and build more affordable homes. If a 421-a replacement is created, R8-R10 would enable so much income-restricted home building to help poor New Yorkers. 4
- Please limit any mandates for forced manufacturing space. While some folks think we should mandate space set aside for manufacturing, it does not make sense in the current economic environment. With unemployment at a 50 year low, we have a shortage of HOMES, not jobs. Please keep homes at the center of this plan. We need government intervention in home production, not job creation. 5
- While certain significant buildings may be suitable for landmark designation, please say NO to any blanket historic districts. They make housing more expensive and benefit only the wealthy. 6

Thanks for reading this. In a transit rich, home-poor section of the city, AAMUP has the potential to allow tens of thousands of folks to live affordable, car-free, lives with dignity. 7

More homes please!

Warm regards,
Salvatore Franchino

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: Fw: [EXTERNAL] MAS Draft Scope Comments on AAMUP
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 2:21:05 PM
Attachments: [redacted]

From: Thomas Devaney [redacted]
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 1:55 PM
To: Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)[redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MAS Draft Scope Comments on AAMUP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

Hi Stephanie,

I hope you're having a good fall. I know you been crazy busy! Anyway, here's our comments on the AAMUP Scope of Work. Happy to discuss if you have any questions.

Have a good weekend.

Tom

Thomas E. Devaney, AICP, LEED-AP
Senior Director of Land Use & Planning
The Municipal Art Society of New York
[redacted]

The Municipal Art Society of New York
MASNYC

October 27, 2023

Stephanie Shellooe, AICP
Director, Environmental Assessment and Review Division
New York City Department of City Planning
[redacted]

MAS Comments on the Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan Draft Scope of Work (CEQR No. 24DCP019K)

Dear Stephanie,

The Municipal Art Society of New York (MAS) is pleased to provide comments on the Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use Plan. As the first neighborhood rezoning following the COVID-19 pandemic and first under the Adams mayoral administration, MAS recognizes the importance of the AAMUP and its potential to transform the Atlantic Avenue corridor. The rezoning of this area has long been anticipated and MAS has been following Council Member Crystal Hudson's community outreach, area development trends, and the planning process building up to the release of the proposal. Please find our comments below on the Draft Scope of Work.

Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario

The assumptions about soft site development included in the RWCDS are sound and generally consistent with our Site x Site projections based on area development trends. However, for a full disclosure of potential impacts, we recommend the 16 *potential* development sites be evaluated for related impacts as part of the entire development area and not be limited to only site-specific impacts. Our research has shown that many potential sites in neighborhood rezonings tend to get developed and when they do, the City needs to ensure that neighborhoods have the amenities and resources to support the added growth. 1

We also recommend the rezoning build year be extended to 2039, a 15-year analysis period, based on the lag we have seen with other neighborhood rezonings and subsequent development. The additional analysis period would be appropriate given the uncertainties related to the office market, affordable housing delivery, and other factors the city faces in post-Covid New York. 2

We support the stated goals of the proposal in responding to community input and prioritizing the creation of affordable housing and a mix of uses to support a full range of services and local jobs. However, given the low demand for commercial office space in Brooklyn (and in New York as a whole), what is the rationale for the high amount of projected commercial office space (534,542 sf)?[1] As we have seen in Long Island City and Downtown Brooklyn, where rezoning projections for 3

[1] *As an example of the level of density, 1 Willoughby Square, a 36-story office building under construction in Downtown Brooklyn, is 500,000 SF. According to Colliers, Brooklyn's commercial space availability rate (23 percent) continues to increase (-297,805 net absorption during Q2 2023).*

commercial office space did not materialize and what did was largely high-end residential, how will AAMUP address the potential for a repeat of the unintended consequences of those rezonings? 3 cont.

Furthermore, recognizing that zoning and by association MIH are often limited in addressing the nuanced needs of communities, how will the City supplement the rezoning with the needed resources and legal, programmatic, and service-oriented tools to help create and keep jobs in the area? Considering the prevailing pressures to build high-end market-rate residential units, what resources will be used to ensure that the affordable units projected under the proposal are subsidized? 4

In terms of CEQR, we suggest that the DEIS evaluate an alternative development scenario with significantly less commercial office space and more residential units, local retail, and light industrial uses than the preferred action outlined in the DSOW. This would allow at least the potential impacts of these different outcomes to be evaluated. be evaluated. 5

Green House Gas Emissions and Climate Change Impacts

The AAMUP area lacks passenger vehicle traffic volumes that contribute to public health issues. It is no surprise the EAS identified GHG emissions as an area of significant impact to be addressed in the DEIS. Considering the rapidly accelerating threat of climate change and the long-range plan to transform Atlantic Avenue, we urge the City to assess specific urban design solutions that would ensure that the corridor is truly cleaner, greener, and pedestrian friendly. As one of the New York's leading advocates for elevating the importance of the public realm in our planning and land use policy decisions, MAS requests that the DEIS go beyond a standard construction- and transportation-focused GHG emissions evaluation by factoring in new streetscape vegetation and stormwater management improvements, changes to the urban heat island effect, application of LEED or equivalent systems in future development, and other climate-related considerations. 6

Policy

To support the envisioning of AAMUP as an employment hub, the DEIS project description should include specific information about the resources the City plans to draw upon to ensure that jobs will indeed materialize and remain in the area. 7

Data

Starting with the AAMUP rezoning and as a general practice going forward, we urge the City to share the project's study area boundary in shapefile format and include a downloadable, easy-to-read Excel list of projected and potential development sites at the outset of the environmental review process. 8

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Draft Scope of Work. We would be delighted to discuss any of our comments, or the MAS studies alluded to in our suggestions.

Sincerely,



Elizabeth Goldstein

President, The Municipal Art Society of New York

Hudson & Osse

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]

Subject: Re: CMs Hudson & Ossé -- Written Scoping Comments
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 3:38:17 PM
Attachments: AAMUP Scoping Comments CMs Hudson & Osse - FINAL.pdf

---

+ 24DCP019K_DL

Comment letter received.
Thanks all,
Stephanie

Stephanie Shellooe, AICP
Director • Environmental Assessment & Review Division
(she/her)

NYC Department of City Planning
[redacted]

Visit our website | Twitter | Instagram

From: Paul, Brian [redacted]
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 3:28 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: CMs Hudson & Ossé -- Written Scoping Comments

See attached for scoping comments submitted on behalf of Council Members Hudson & Ossé on the Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use Plan

Brian Paul
Deputy Director
[redacted] | New York City Council

[redacted]

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain CONFIDENTIAL or PRIVILEGED material. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. If you are the intended recipient but do not wish to receive communications through this medium, please so advise the sender immediately.

THE COUNCIL OF
THE CITY OF NEW YORK

CITY HALL

NEW YORK, NY 10007

Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use Plan Scoping Comments

Council Members Hudson (D35) and Ossé (D36)

October 2023

Dear Chair Garodnick,

We write today as the New York City Council Members representing the Atlantic Avenue corridor between Flatbush Avenue and Nostrand Avenue and surrounding neighborhoods, with comments on the Draft Scope of Work for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan (AAMUP.)

This milestone represents the culmination of years of community advocacy to transform the landscape of Atlantic Ave and surrounding blocks from vacant lots, self-storage, and gas stations to a vibrant mixed-use neighborhood with deeply affordable housing. We are grateful to the Department of City Planning (DCP) for its work with WXY to produce the Community Vision and Priorities Report and to the hundreds of members of the public who attended workshops to participate in its creation. We especially appreciate the deep, ongoing engagement of the AAMUP Steering Committee and Brooklyn Community Board 8 (CB 8), without whose years of work on "M-CROWN" this plan would not have happened. 1

Overall, the proposal reflects many of the priorities expressed during the community planning process, especially the key goal of building more housing — including more deeply affordable housing for residents at greatest risk of displacement. DCP and the administration are clearly committed to implementing a coordinated area-wide plan with capital and programmatic improvements to infrastructure and services, a vast improvement over prior years of allowing site-by-site private rezonings. 2

However, there is still much progress needed to develop a plan that meets our community's needs and achieves its goals. We must ensure that EIS reflects the full scope of the community vision as articulated 3

in the engagement report, continue public engagement on the draft zoning, and secure the necessary infrastructure and neighborhood investments for further deeply affordable housing, increased investments in the area's local economy, and safer streets. 3 cont.

Summary of areas where more rigorous analysis and action are needed:

- **Affordability and Racial Equity**
  - AAMUP must significantly increase our community's supply of deeply affordable housing, beyond MIH requirements, both through new construction and strengthened preservation investments. DCP's analysis of Census data shows the extensive gentrification and displacement in and around the AAMUP study area over the past 20 years, especially affecting Black residents. Within a quarter mile radius of the AAMUP area, the Black population fell from approximately 72,000 in 2000 to 39,000 in 2020, as housing costs rose steeply, disproportionately impacting Black families. In Brooklyn CB 8, Black-led households have a median income of approximately $50,000 compared to over $130,000 for White-led households. To counteract this trend, we must ensure that new housing generated by this rezoning is accessible to Black households. DCP and its sister agencies, including HPD, must work together with City Hall to create new housing opportunities for those most at risk of displacement. 4
  - The keys to reaching this goal are developing underutilized government-owned sites as deeply affordable housing and revising MIH to require deeper affordability. This community deserves to have every potential publicly owned site examined for maximum development of affordable housing. We have identified four such potential sites: 178 Brooklyn Avenue, 457 Nostrand Avenue, 510 Clermont Avenue, and 1024 Fulton Street. 5
  - In the EIS, DCP should undertake a detailed assessment of indirect residential displacement regardless of whether the proposed actions technically "contribute" to the trend. 6
- **Density on Atlantic Avenue**
  - The proposed C6-3A district for the entirety of the Atlantic Avenue corridor from Vanderbilt Avenue to Nostrand Avenue aligns with the goals of promoting high density housing and commercial space with active ground floors and improved streetscape. However, there is less precedent for this level of density in the eastern portion of the study area, and we have heard from some community stakeholders a desire to have lower heights toward the eastern part of the project area to account for the lower density residential properties in this area. As we move forward with public review, we should thoughtfully consider these tradeoffs. 7
- **Ensuring a truly mixed-use neighborhood**
  - One of AAMUP's primary goals is to ensure a "diverse and vibrant mix of uses including space for jobs, services, local retail like grocery stores, community facilities, creative and cultural uses, and light industrial businesses." To facilitate this goal, DCP should consider revising the proposed mixed-use zoning incentives to more specifically target light industrial, arts, and community facility uses, similar to the existing "Gowanus Mix" tool in the Special Gowanus District. Such a revision should be in scope to consider as we move through public review. 8
  - The DCP draft zoning framework also proposes rezoning numerous multi-story buildings that are currently home to industrial and arts tenants, such as 1000 Dean and GMDC, to 9

allow residential development that could potentially lead to direct displacement of these businesses. We must ensure that it is in-scope to amend the zoning on these sites in order to protect the existing productive uses that already contribute to the mixed-use, walk-to-work goals of this plan.

9 cont.

- **Atlantic Avenue Street Redesign**
    - We cannot add thousands of residential housing units to this stretch of Atlantic Avenue without a concurrent, comprehensive redesign of the corridor, consistent with the Community Vision and Priorities Report. DOT must develop a complete design, in partnership with our community, that improves safety, accessibility, environmental conditions, and amenities for all road users. This component of the plan, though outside of zoning, is indispensable to its success and must be advanced ahead of the Council vote on the rezoning, including a timeline for implementation.

10

- **Equitable Economic Development**
    - The dynamics of inequality and displacement in Central Brooklyn cannot be addressed through housing alone. The AAMUP Community Vision and Priorities report, as well as CB 8's extensive work, prioritizes equitable economic development. DCP must work with partner agencies and EDC on a package of locally targeted policies including job training and placement to expand career pathways that are accessible to existing residents without a college degree, support for M/WBE and Black entrepreneurship, and potential financial incentives for diverse mixed-use development.

11

We look forward to continuing to work with DCP, HPD, DOT and other City agencies to refine the zoning proposal and secure comprehensive investments for equitable growth that fulfills the community's vision for a new Atlantic Avenue.

Sincerely,

C. Hudson

Crystal Hudson
Council Member, 35th District

Chi Ossé
Council Member, 36th District

Below are our detailed comments on the DSOW by section:

- **Proposed Zoning Map Changes and Text Amendments:**

  Overall, the draft zoning framework reflects many important elements of the community's vision as developed over years of engagement. However, we seek additional commitments to ensure that it results in a truly mixed-use neighborhood.

  - Maximize deeply affordable housing: The proposed zoning maps and text amendments still fall short in supporting the community's highest priority goal – to maximize the number of deeply affordable housing units. To that end, we urge DCP, HPD, and all relevant City agencies to commit additional public sites for 100% affordable housing development. We have identified three underutilized Department of Education facilities within ½ mile of the AAMUP study area:
    - 178 Brooklyn Ave (Block 1235, Lot 37)
    - 457 Nostrand Avenue (large parking lot in the rear of the DOE facility) (Block 1844, Lot 1)
    - 510 Clermont Avenue (Block 2008, Lot 1)

    We are pleased that the Dean/Bergen sites have been included in the draft zoning, and urge DCP to include these additional sites as well, with additional density to facilitate deeply affordable housing development.

    In addition, DCP and HPD should work with our State and Federal partners to identify any further publicly owned sites that could be utilized for potential affordable development, including 1024 Fulton Street (Block 2015, Lot 28). Recent New York State and Federal executive orders direct agencies to identify sites for housing development, providing a potential opportunity for further development of deeply affordable housing. 12

  - If MIH affordability requirements are revised Citywide, ensure that deeper affordability requirements are applied to AAMUP area. Speaker Adams has called for the Mayor's "Zoning for Housing Opportunity" text amendment to include revising MIH to create a required deeper affordability option at an average of 40% AMI. Due to the inflation of AMI's in recent years, affordability at or below 40% AMI (vs. the current MIH Option 1's requirement for affordability at an average of 60% AMI) is necessary to reach households in greatest need of affordable housing. 13

  - Strengthen mixed-use zoning incentives for light industrial, arts, and community facility uses: The M1-4/R6A district proposed to cover the mid-blocks south of Atlantic Avenue would be customized by special district text to allow a bonus from 3.9 FAR (for R) or 4 FAR (for C) to 5.0 FAR for a mixed-used building. This additional FAR, a "special mixed-use incentive," would be available for nearly the full range of non-residential uses including commercial office, retail, light industrial, and community facility uses. While this proposed tool is broadly responsive to the community priority of a mixed-use neighborhood, it falls short of supporting "a full range of services and local job opportunities." Unlike in the nearby Special Gowanus Mixed-Use District, this zoning incentive does not specifically target light industrial and arts uses. Indeed, the development scenarios for the projected sites in this area nearly all include commercial 14

office and retail rather than light industrial, arts, or community facility space. We believe this incentive should be adjusted to more narrowly target light industrial, arts, and community facility space in addition to general non-residential space. In addition, the Special District should include a provision to preserve existing significant commercial/industrial properties such as GMDC and 1000 Dean from converting to residential.

14 cont.

- **Analysis Framework / Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario**

  For the EIS to most accurately evaluate the impact of the proposed actions, the DSOW should include the following when defining projected development sites:

  - <u>The RWCDS should be more conservative in defining projected development sites.</u> The RWCDS may underestimate the potential for existing residential buildings to redevelop, especially those on Atlantic Avenue between Washington and Grand Avenue which will be extremely under-utilized under the proposed C6-3A. Lots containing multi-family (6 or more units) residential buildings should not be assumed to be protected by rent-stabilized status.

  - The RWCDS' distinction between projected and potential development sites is not clear, with certain sites deemed "potential" despite having similar likelihood of being redeveloped if the rezoning is passed as the projected sites. These most notably include potential sites G, H, I, L, M, N, O, and P. Recent decades' experience in Central and North Brooklyn, such as in Gowanus and Greenpoint-Williamsburg, suggests that residential redevelopment resulting from a rezoning from M1-1 will be swift and extensive. It is unclear why the RWCDS would consider these sites, which will be highly underutilized if rezoned, many with one-story gas station or auto-body uses, as potential rather than projected development.

    Specifically, Block 1865, Lots 3 (Potential Site N) and 95 (Projected Site 16), a Shell gas station and adjacent parking lot, appear to share the same ownership and should be treated as one projected site assemblage.

  15

  - The projected overall development in the RWCDS also highlights the need for more policy tools to support development of community facility and light industrial space. Less than 100,000 square feet of community facility space and 50,000 square feet of light industrial space (mostly at the actually unlikely to redevelop GMDC Site 49) are projected to result from the rezoning under this RWCDS.

  16

- **Task 1. Project Description and Analytic Framework**
  - No comments

- **Task 2. Land Use, Zoning, and Public Policy**
  - DCP must thoroughly research and prepare the list of other developments in the surrounding study area that are expected to be complete by the 2034 analysis year. It is essential that the EIS accounts for the extensive development in the area that has already taken place and is likely to continue to occur.

  17

- **Task 3. Socioeconomic Conditions** 18
    - Direct Business Displacement: The analysis of direct business and institutional displacement is essential beyond the narrow CEQR determination on a significant adverse impact. This assessment must be comprehensive and up-to-date and will help inform potential public policy regarding relocation assistance programs.
    - Indirect Residential Displacement: According to the current CEQR manual, a detailed analysis of indirect residential displacement will only be conducted if it is determined that the rezoning would *"add substantial new population with different income as compared with the income of the study area population,"* and be large enough to *"affect real estate market conditions."* Considering the extensive gentrification that has taken place in the area over the past 20 years, it is possible that these technical triggers may not be met. However, considering the top policy priority of deeply affordable housing, including preservation of existing affordable housing, DCP should undertake the detailed analysis of indirect residential displacement even if the technical triggers of "Step 1" and/or "Step 2" are not fully met. According to the DSOW, this analysis would involve "*in-depth demographic analysis and field surveys to characterize existing conditions of residents and housing, identify populations at risk of displacement, assess current and future socioeconomic trends that may affect these populations, and examine the effects of the Proposed Actions on prevailing socioeconomic trends and, thus, impacts on the identified populations at risk."* This study is potentially valuable in strengthening planning and policy commitments on affordable housing preservation – even if those commitments are not technically CEQR mitigations. 19
    - In order to ensure the most accurate and responsible analysis of indirect residential displacement, DCP and HPD should also review the status of all affordable housing regulatory agreements in the area and identify any that may be expiring in the next ten years before the 2034 analysis date.
    - Indirect Business Displacement: The analysis for indirect business displacement should include an in-depth survey of the commercial corridors surrounding Atlantic Avenue to identify businesses that may be vulnerable to displacement with a rise in property values and rents. Some of these corridors in Crown Heights and Bedford-Stuyvesant were recently surveyed by a Commercial District Needs Assessment funded by the Department of Small Business Services (SBS) that could be used to help assemble this data. Throughout the planning process, many community members expressed a priority to support locally owned and Black-owned small businesses in the area, and the EIS should undertake a thorough accounting of such businesses to help inform policymaking to support this goal. 20

- **Task 4. Community Facilities and Services** 21
    - For Task 4 and all of the additional topic-specific analysis areas we note that accurate projections are all dependent on the accuracy of the RWCDS and again emphasize the importance of our comments on the RWCDS and analysis framework. We also note that adding additional zoning or financial incentive tools to help increase the amount of community facility space in new developments could help create new spaces for childcare or other community facility uses as identified by this analysis.
    - AAMUP must ensure sufficient school seats for all grade levels. The EIS should consider the needs of existing schools within the study area. 22

- We also note that the Draft Scope does not call for any analysis of access to healthcare, either hospitals/acute care or primary care, reflecting a shortcoming of the current CEQR manual. With over 4,000 projected housing units added to the area, this action should be considered an introduction of "a sizeable new neighborhood" and include analysis of impacts on health care services and infrastructure. The perennially underfunded and overburdened Interfaith Medical Center is the closest hospital to the area and access to hospital and trauma care should be examined as part of the EIS. 23

- **Task 5. Open Space**
  - We are enthusiastic about the City's commitment to fully renovate St. Andrews Park, several blocks outside the AAMUP study area. The AAMUP plan will significantly increase local demand for active and passive open space, which is already limited in our community. 24
  - We support the community's call to create a quality open space at the Lowry Triangle. The EIS should assess all opportunities to increase public open space in the study area, including schoolyard to playground conversions (at the John Hancock Playground, for example) and other possibilities. The City should commit funding to implement these improvements in conjunction with this rezoning plan. 25
  - The EIS will not include a Natural Resources study because it is only required by CEQR if a natural resource is present and at risk of disturbance due to the proposed development. The EAS notes that "the affected area and immediately adjacent areas are substantially devoid of natural resources." AAMUP must strive to remedy this condition in all possible ways. New parks, plantings, landscaping, and green roofs should be planned and maintained to provide habitat and ecological value, in addition to shade and other health benefits for our community.

- **Task 6. Shadows**
  - We look forward to reviewing the shadows analysis for the DEIS that is outlined in the draft scope of work. If potential significant impacts are identified, understanding the impacts of a lower-density alternative would be helpful in analyzing any potential mitigation or response. 26

- **Task 7: Historic and Cultural Resources**
  - The Bedford-Atlantic Armory currently houses a 350-bed men's shelter, whose operation should not be disrupted by this plan. However, there is a large amount of underutilized space in the remainder of the building that could be activated for community facility, cultural, or economic development use. 27
  - There is substantial development potential on the Department of Education (DOE) owned site at 457 Nostrand Ave, which is within the Bedford Historic District. The EIS should study potential density increase to facilitate 100% affordable housing on this site. 28

- **Task 8. Urban Design and Visual Resources**
  - The volume and density of new development along Atlantic Avenue and adjacent streets that this plan would introduce create an important opportunity to reshape the sidewalks, streets, and public realm in important ways. The public engagement process revealed strong consensus around the need for wider sidewalks, increased tree canopy and green landscaping, green infrastructure elements to prevent flooding, and safety improvements in the public right of way. The EIS should thoroughly evaluate deficits in 29

the existing environment and opportunities to improve the public realm on public and private sites.
    - We are calling on DOT to plan and implement a comprehensive redesign of Atlantic Avenue as a part of this neighborhood plan, but streetscape and public realm improvements should be studied and applied on north-south corridors and other streets in the area as well.

29 cont.

- **Task 9. Hazardous Materials**
    - No comments

- **Task 10. Water and Sewer Infrastructure**
    - The EIS should estimate the anticipated additional wastewater volume resulting from new development, assess its impact on local sewer infrastructure (in wet and dry weather), capacity and potential impacts to operations at the Red Hook Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), and anticipated impact on CSO events and water quality at relevant CSO outfalls.
    - The EIS should assess intersections and other locations at high risk for localized flooding and propose green infrastructure and drainage mitigations.
    - The EIS should identify development sites that will be required to meet updated 2021 Unified Stormwater Rule standards for stormwater retention and detention.

30

- **Task 11. Solid Waste and Sanitation Services**
    - AAMUP must include strategies for waste management and containerization. The EIS should ensure that waste containerization requirements on private sites are within scope.

31

- **Task 12. Energy**
    - The EIS should contemplate integration of renewable energy generation and distribution technology in the study area.

32

- **Task 13. Transportation**
    - Mitigations proposed to transportation impacts should consider the full set of tools available for DOT's redesign of Atlantic Avenue, as well as zoning requirements for setbacks and public realm investments on private sites, and address the needs of all road users while prioritizing safety.
    - Analysis of impacts on public transit should include consideration of the MTA's Brooklyn Bus Network Redesign draft plan.

33

34

- **Task 14. Air Quality**
    - No comments

- **Task 15. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change**
    - The EIS should include a detailed discussion of potential impacts of climate change on the study area as well as opportunities to reduce emissions, promote renewable energy, and reduce urban heat island effect through design, technology, and other investments.

35

- **Task 16. Noise**

- We urge DCP to thoroughly study the increase in noise generated by traffic and construction and suggest mitigations that would reduce any additional noise generated. Streets that currently experience significant noise from traffic such as Atlantic Avenue and north-south corridors like Washington Avenue should be looked at especially closely. 36

- **Task 17. Public Health**
  - No comment

- **Task 18. Neighborhood Character**
  - As noted above, deeply affordable housing, attention to socioeconomic diversity, community facilities, open space, historic and cultural resources, and urban design are essential elements for preserving and strengthening neighborhood character, while allowing room for equitable growth.
  - Economic growth in our communities must benefit local residents, especially Black and Hispanic neighbors for whom neighborhood change has often been destabilizing. We urge DCP to work with SBS, EDC, and other agencies to invest in job training and career development resources, as well as support for M/WBE businesses in and around the project area. 37

- **Task 19. Construction**
  - The detailed construction impact analysis proposed in the Draft Scope should consider the potential impacts on important public institutions such as schools, day cares, and senior centers, and ensure that potential mitigation measures are available to help attenuate noise and emissions for both public institutions and existing residents. 38

- **Task 20. Mitigation**
  - We appreciate the collaborative approach that DCP has taken thus far, as well as the deep engagement by the AAMUP Steering Committee, Community Board 8, and other stakeholders to shape the priorities for this plan. We urge DCP to communicate with our offices about proposed mitigations as early and openly as possible so as to develop feasible, thorough, and responsive solutions to the impacts of this proposal. 39

- **Task 21. Alternatives**
  - As noted throughout these comments, we have identified several zoning alternatives which we request be studied in the EIS:
    - Additional density on key public sites to facilitate 100% affordable housing development, including: 40
      - 178 Brooklyn Avenue (DOE-owned)
      - 457 Nostrand Avenue (DOE-owned)
      - 510 Clermont Avenue (DOE-owned)
    - "Gowanus Mix" style tool applied to the M1-4/ R6A district on the mid-blocks south of Atlantic Avenue 41

Kaufman

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] submission for comments on AAMUP scoping
Date: Thursday, October 26, 2023 11:23:09 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted]. Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

26 October 2023

Chair Garodnick and the CPC –

As an active member of the AAMUP Steering Committee, and an apartment owner in the context area, I wish to submit just a few comments for your consideration as part of finalizing the scope for the EIS of the Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan.

Broadly speaking, I'm extremely supportive of the stated rezoning goals of AAMUP, and the Adams administration's drive to generate much more housing overall, with special focus and financial support for more affordable housing units. To continue to thrive as a city, more housing must be created, and steered towards being more affordable for all New Yorkers. The most recent 'City of Yes' proposals that revamp outdated zoning measures that restrict growth and narrow use cases are long overdue, and I only hope you persevere in those substantive changes. 1

Along those lines, my largest concern is that the current scoping agreement omits the consideration of some large public sites that seem quite ripe for additional housing. While no doubt there are always inter-governmental debates over how to best use City land, at this point it seems obvious that our housing crisis (including supportive housing) eclipses nearly all others. (If housing costs drive population lost, a downward cycle begins). These particular lots are under-utilized and should be included in the scope for rezoning potential: 2

- 510 Clermont Avenue – a two story school facility with a parking lot
- 457 Nostrand Avenue (behind the DOE facility)
- 178 Brooklyn Avenue

The Clermont property omission is particularly frustrating -- this was mentioned many times in AAMUP working groups as something that should be folded in for rezoning. More informed members than I indicated the school district in question is actually quite under capacity. There is plenty of precedent for tall buildings all around – a 20-story NYCHA building to the wast, a large rezoned parcel two blocks to the east, and the large Atlantic Yards redevelopment area directly to the south. If the Adams administration is serious about driving more affordable housing, surely these lots must be pursued for better use – starting with picking them up in the study (and the scoping).

My other main concern is ensuring sufficient capital investment planning and capital commitments are made concurrent with this rezoning. With the support of the previous Administration, and concrete funding set aside for capital projects, DCP led many successful integrated neighborhood plans across the five boroughs – delivering cohesive housing plans ALONGSIDE capital projects that ensured the needs of both current and future residents would be met. This meant committing financing for specific projects that would assure the neighborhood grew in 'livability' despite the added population. While the scoping exercise does not directly allocate capital, the EIS findings do summarize the impact, and in many cases the obligatory mitigation required. To that end, I am concerned the agency has been FAR too conservative in defining projected development sites. To my observations, from walking the streets and seeing what has happened in other areas of Brooklyn, 3

at least 8 sites named as 'potential' surely will be fully developed, with the property values being what they are in this part of Brooklyn. (Sites G, H, I, L, M, N, O and P). While many will see this as quibbling over minutiae, but in aggregate these assumptions as is would under-estimate the additional impact in the EIS. Additionally, the EIS findings also often drive/infect the baseline data capital planners in other departments might take in their planning work (eg SCA, DEP).

One last coda to this point – as a result of the Atlantic Yards/Pacific Park buildout, and nearly a decade of spot rezoning for private applicants, in the last 5 years the AAMUP zoning and context area has already had substantial growth. Using DCP's own tools, drawing on DOB permit data, **the area is already on track to add 5,500 housing units by 2025**! The 2020 census of these same tracts indicated 16,274 housing units – implying we are seeing 33% growth in just 5 years … BEFORE this rezoning. I understand the EIS is meant to pick up this growth in its technical execution, but more important for the New Yorkers in this area is that the City is properly planning its infrastructure and service provision to meet the increased demands of all the humans who live here now, and will be moving here soon (hopefully!).

3 cont.

Please do not hesitate to reach out for clarification or discussion of any of the above points.

Thank you for your consideration, and your continued public service for all of us.

Jon Kaufman

AAMUP Steering Committee member

Local apartment owner

[redacted]

Kuhl

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on Scoping for AAMUP
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 3:59:37 PM
Attachments: [redacted]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

Attached,

YOU
ARE
THE
CITY

Kaja Kühl
youarethecity
[redacted]

Re: Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use Plan Scoping

October 2023

Dear Chair Garodnick,

I am writing today as a resident of the study area in Brooklyn considered for rezoning as part of the Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan (AAMUP.) I am also an urban planner and served on the steering committee for the public engagement for this plan earlier this year. I have participated in many sessions and while I see many of the discussions reflected in the proposed zoning, I am dismayed by the absence of a truly interagency effort to advance the many non-zoning priorities that were identified during the process. These investments in infrastructure, open space, safer streets and climate adaptation are needed even without 4,000 additional units. Your agency should take a leadership role in convening a multi-agency task force to advance a coordinated effort to improve the built environment in my neighborhood. New developments and changes to street networks and infrastructure should not be planned in isolation. For instance, a future MX designation on Dean and Bergen with commercial loading and refuse, curb cuts and limited ability to establish a tree canopy may be counter-productive to establishing these streets as bicycle corridors.

1

Similarly, the proposed density and bulk regulation are missing critical input from experts in sustainable architecture. Simply eliminating off-street parking requirements rather than coordinating with DOT, which is reducing on-street parking at the same time, is a missed opportunity to have a coordinated solution that achieves the intended goals where zoning and non-zoning solutions work together, not in parallel universes.

I believe the AAMUP rezoning would benefit from a coordinated multi-agency effort that includes informed leadership at DOT, Parks, DEP, MOCEJ, EDC, SBS, SCA and HPD to name a few.

Below are a few points to address additional considerations to be included in the EIS with an emphasis on open space, streets and decarbonization.

1 cont.

Analysis Framework / Reasonable Worst-Case Development Scenario

2

DCP must thoroughly research and prepare the list of other developments in the surrounding study area that are expected to be complete by the 2034 analysis year. It is essential that the EIS takes into account the extensive development in the area that has already taken place and is likely to continue to occur.

Where mitigation measures are defined by the increment between the proposed action and no action, the EIS should include recently (since 2019) rezoned properties in the RWCDS for analysis purposes and to accurately determine the increment. These private rezonings followed in the footsteps of a framework released by DCP in 2018, but no area-wide rezoning occurred. While the framework was generally treated as guidance for approving these private applications, no analysis of their cumulative impact was undertaken.

Instead, these spot zonings were approved individually, and each individual project did not meet certain thresholds for a detailed analysis and as a result no impact was determined nor mitigated. Together, the nine spot rezonings in the study area that precede this EIS since 2019 account for **2,297 projected residential units as noted in the nine individual EAS' or more than 50% of the projected 4,283 units in the current scope.**

Task 5. Open Space

Open Space Ratio

3

The area is currently severely underserved with open space and only provides less than 0.5 acres of open space per 1,000 residents. **This is far below what city guidelines prescribe as appropriate (2.5 acres with 2.0 active and 0.5 passive) and only 26% of the city average of 1.5 acres.**

The OSR will be worse when accurately calculating both the No Action and the Proposed Action scenario as the recently approved rezonings cumulatively already add more than 2,000 units without any additional open space.

As a public health, climate action and quality of life measure, any increase in density needs to be accompanied by a commitment to increase the ratio of open space to residents significantly with an additional compensation addressed by improving access to regional open space.

Improvements to Lowry Triangle and the adjacent Underhill Plaza are welcome. While lacking in quality, they already exist and will not improve the OSR. Similarly, improvements to other playgrounds are welcome and necessary, but they do not ameliorate the dire need for more open space in walking distance. During public workshop sessions, agency representatives repeatedly said that there was no city-owned land in the study. Atlantic Avenue from Flatbush Ave to Bedford Ave constitutes 19 acres of city-owned land entirely dedicated to vehicles. Converting a fraction of this land into a green corridor would help to increase the Open Space

Ratio, can mitigate increasingly frequent flooding events, reduce urban heat island effect, serve as habitat and provide shade.
DCP, Parks and DOT should explore innovative ways and commit capital spending to increase the OSR. Such explorations should include:

- Converting 20' or **2.5 lanes of Atlantic Avenue** from Flatbush to Nostrand into a green corridor could add up to **4 acres**.
- Converting the **elevated space of the MTA shuttle** into a pedestrian, bike path and E-bus shuttle with adjacent linear park could add **3 acres** and provide a regional connection to Prospect Park.
- Committing to adding **1,000 street trees or bioswales** with an average area of 43 sq ft would roughly add **1 acre**.
- Creating a **plaza at Vanderbilt between Pacific and Atlantic** would add a minimum of **0.25 acres**

3 cont.

<u>Walk/Bike to Park</u>

The EIS should study inclusive walking and biking connections to larger open spaces in the vicinity of the study area. Such study should consider a qualitative approach.
While many agency representatives remarked during the AAMUP engagement process that Prospect Park is near the study area, it is a 20-30 minutes walk from most blocks in the study area for a healthy adult. It is even longer and less attainable for parents with small children, elderly, or people otherwise encumbered.
There are no safe cycle paths for children, and sidewalks on many streets leading from the study area to larger parks are narrow, not well-maintained and make it difficult for families to ride. Identifying safe and inclusive connections and improving these corridors through traffic calming, protected bike lanes, and planting is critical to allowing access to larger open spaces from the study area.

4

Natural Resources

The EIS will not include a Natural Resources study because it is only required by CEQR if a natural resource is present and at risk of disturbance due to the proposed development. The EAS notes that “the affected area and immediately adjacent areas are substantially devoid of natural resources.” AAMUP must strive to remedy this condition in all possible ways. New parks, plantings, landscaping, and green roofs should be planned and maintained to provide habitat and ecological value, in addition to shade and other health benefits for our community. This EIS should study and quantify effective measures to increase the presence of natural resources and propose ways to include requirements for providing such natural resources as part of the Special District rules.

5

Task 6. Shadows

6

The EIS should include an analysis of the impact on existing and potential renewable energy infrastructure on public and private properties and bulk alternatives that would minimize such impact.

New York City and State have goals to be powered by 100% clean energy by 2040. Federal, State and City incentives were put in place for private property owners to install renewable energy systems and create much of the infrastructure to achieve this goal.
Developments with enormous height and density proposed in AAMUP would reduce the effectiveness and viability of several PV installations already present in the neighborhood and limit the viability of new installations, especially on properties north of Atlantic Avenue.

For instance: The proposed bulk for the medium density zones of 125’ maximum height, would allow an additional height of 55’ under “City of Yes for Carbon Neutrality” for permitted obstructions. Reducing the maximum height to 95’, as in the precedent of previously approved rezonings in the study area would only allow 15’ of permitted obstructions. The EIS should discuss how these taller buildings impact the ability of properties nearby to access these incentives and invest in renewable energy.

Task 8. Urban Design



3D Model/ Visualization

DCP should publish a 3D model of the RWCDS in order to better communicate the urban design implications of the projected development. This model should include permitted obstructions in anticipation of the "City of Yes for Carbon Neutrality" zoning rules that will allow for up to 55' of additional height for mechanical space.
Thus far, DCP only gave one online presentation of this proposal, which included a minimal presentation of the physical changes that this neighborhood will undergo. As a result, many members of the public opted to comment on the recent changes to Underhill Avenue, which in comparison are relatively minor, but are much more visible and therefore comprehensible.



Atlantic Avenue

The proposed C6-3A district on the two most western blocks opposite R6B zoning is without precedent. While there are many neighborhoods in the city, where higher density districts meet lower density districts, this lack of a moderation in the center of the blocks presents a unique extreme with impact on light and air for existing residents and many historic buildings in the area. While setbacks are required facing the 115' wide Atlantic Avenue, no additional rear yard setbacks beyond 30 feet are required even though the distance between new development and existing buildings will be much less than on the street side. The EIS should study density and bulk modifications that acknowledge a transition from the Atlantic Avenue to Pacific Street side of the block.

The zoning proposal currently requires buildings on Atlantic Avenue to set back by 5 feet in order to increase pedestrian space. It is important to give ample space to pedestrians on Atlantic Avenue, However, 115 feet between buildings is wide enough to accommodate ample pedestrian space in the already existing public right-of-way.
This rezoning should not proceed without a re-design of Atlantic Avenue, therefore a coordinated approach to this goal will be more useful and the 5-foot rule should be modified to be required only for a portion of the streetwall and/or only for the ground floor.

By creating the 5 feet setback rule, the buildable depth of buildings is effectively reduced to 65 feet only. This limits design options of floor plans on the residential floors – design options that would allow for larger units, cross-ventilation, rear yard setbacks and other sustainable measures.

8 cont.

TASK 12. Energy

The EIS should ensure that studying bulk alternatives (for instance non-contextual) that enable passive energy-efficient designs, including but not limited to promoting cross-ventilation, or passive heating and cooling, are within scope.

9

Task 13. Transportation

Redesigning Atlantic Avenue in the study area was one of the biggest priorities during public workshops to improve pedestrian safety, green infrastructure and quality of life. The administration should initiate an interagency task force to study proposals for an re-designed Atlantic Avenue and this EIS should take into consideration possible changes to traffic lanes, bus networks and bicycle and pedestrian safety. These changes are not limited to Atlantic Avenue and should be studied and implemented as part of a larger framework for streets in the area.

10

Such possible changes include:

- Reducing travel lanes from Flatbush to Nostrand to two lanes in each direction in order to make it consistent with portions West and East of the study area.
- Moving the B65 to Atlantic Avenue in the entire study area. This will allow Bergen and Dean Streets to be designed as bicycle priority corridors with protected bike lanes building on the already strong presence of bicycles on these two streets.
- Create a designated bus lane to ensure a direct connection from the entire study area to Atlantic Terminal and its many subways.
- Convert the current parking lanes into additional sidewalk space and smart curbs which can allow for short term parking, drop-off or delivery zones, bicycle storage, containerized trash, but also other street furniture, rain gardens and tree canopy

10 cont.

<u>Planting/Tree Canopy on Atlantic Avenue</u>

The presence of the LIRR may present challenges to planting, but it should not be treated as a conversation killer to manage expectations as has been the case throughout the public engagement workshops.

11

The EIS should clearly describe the limitations in concrete terms (i.e. in section drawings) and include a qualitative description of opportunities. What tree species can thrive in shallow soil or containers? Can this space become a rain garden that serves as critical stormwater infrastructure with shrubs and grasses with smaller roots? Can the city learn from precedents elsewhere to use planting to delineate bus lanes?
A preliminary analysis of potential solutions is critical to overcome the first hurdle in advancing this conversation.

<u>Transit</u>

12

The EIS should study and describe the true availability, quality and usefulness of public transportation.
While DCP and many other stakeholders continue to claim that the study area is transit-rich, a closer look reveals that the only subway within walking distance for most of the study area is the

C train, a local train with one of the worst overall ratings in the system, frequent delays and lack of cleanliness. The Clinton-Washington and Franklin Ave stops are in poor condition, reek of urine and exits at rush hour are already crowded. Almost all new residents have to cross Atlantic Avenue to reach the C train, which is dangerous and unhealthy with high levels of noise and air pollution.

While many subway lines are available at Atlantic Terminal, it is outside a ½ mile walking radius for all of the study area and the assumption that it adds to the notion of “transit-rich” is not true unless efforts are made to create safe and healthy opportunities to walk, bike or take a bus to Atlantic Terminal.

12 cont.

Parking

A reform of parking requirements has been overdue for a long time and I applaud DCP for recognizing the need for a city-wide reform. However I believe that a blanket waiver of parking minimums is not a very progressive policy tool. DCP is relinquishing its opportunity and responsibility to use zoning as a regulatory tool to encourage and support a sustainable relationship between mobility and development. Arguments for this waiver seem to rely exclusively on car-ownership data and assumptions about commuting patterns.
The extensive work of an EIS should be used to better understand car ownership patterns and potential ways to reduce such. An alternative policy could replace parking requirements with requirements or incentives for offering space for shared mobility or last-mile delivery hubs. The special district designation could make the AAMUP zone a pilot for such provisions for buildings of a certain size.

Studies in other cities have shown how eliminating parking reduces the amount of concrete and thus the embodied carbon associated with development, another potentially positive aspect of reforming parking requirements.
Here, with no requirement to reduce below-grade space in order to reduce concrete and thus embodied carbon, developers choose to replace such below-grade parking with rentable commercial floor area, as is evident in several of the recent spot zonings in the study area.

13

Task 15. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

The EIS should include a quantitative analysis of embodied carbon and propose reduction targets. By 2034, 80% of New York's energy will come from renewable sources. By 2040, 100% of our energy will come from renewable sources. The only GHG emissions from the projected development within their 50-100 year lifespan will be emissions associated with their construction and the materials they contain. It is therefore critical to understand, measure and reduce embodied carbon in order to ensure that these developments will align with our global goal to stay within 1.5 degree global warming. 14

The current description in the scope mentions GHG emissions from construction but does not offer details on how such analysis will include quantitative information on embodied carbon. The final scope should discuss a methodology to quantify embodied carbon and the EIS should discuss targets and methods to reduce such embodied carbon including but not limited to studying bulk alternatives that reduce material or enable the use of more natural material.

The EIS should include a detailed description of already existing climate impacts and their likelihood to increase in the study area such as flash flooding and excessive heat. It should also include detailed opportunities to reduce such impact through design, technology, and other investments.

I look forward to seeing the final scope and following the process.

Sincerely,

Kaja Kühl
youarethecity
[redacted]
[redacted]

Magnani (duplicate)

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Written Statement in Support of AAMUP
Date: Tuesday, October 17, 2023 10:00:55 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from a[redacted] Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

I was hoping to attend tomorrow's scoping session and provide my feedback on the plans, but asking community members to set aside 3 hours of a workday in order to contribute will naturally exclude the voices of workers, students, caretakers, and the majority of Brooklyn residents whose time is scarce. Historically, processes that rely on in-person, or concurrent contributions tend to favor voices that oppose change.

Nonetheless, I want to provide my feedback in written form. Housing is the #1 budget line item for New York residents. The cost keeps us stressed, it makes us work long hours in strenuous conditions. The lack of availability drives us to near madness whenever a lease renewal comes up. Finding new housing is a contact sport in New York, where my wife and I have run into literal lines of people waving money in a broker's face to compete for a place to live. This gives landlords, brokers, and wealthy incumbents too much market power at the expense of renters.

AAMUP is a step in the right direction, my only wish is that it moves faster, more aggressively to generate new housing . Housing supply is the only way to shift power back to tenants' hands. We tend to bicker often about the proportion of units designated towards one use or another, often delaying projects or making them timid where they should be bold. We should be in unison asking for as many housing units as possible, because a policy of housing abundance is the only way out of the mess that is NY real estate. The city should be thinking about approving projects like AAMUP faster, making bolder moves towards high-density neighborhoods, and seeking every opportunity to propagate these initiatives quickly throughout the entire city.

I'm raising a two-year old daughter here, just two blocks from Atlantic Ave. As she grows up, I want her to be able to thrive here. I want her Brookly to remain a diverse and dynamic community, and I want her and those around her to have an abundance of housing when they come of age. I just wish projects like AAMUP aren't bogged down, delayed, and hamstrung by endless bureaucratic processes and instead deliver timely on their premise. If trends continue she may have to join the droves of NYC's economic exiles, as a NIMBY-friendly review process continues to be placed ahead of NYers most basic needs.

Sincerely,

André Livramento Magnani [redacted]

Magnani

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Written Testimony in Support of AAMUP
Date: Monday, October 16, 2023 11:34:26 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

I was hoping to attend tomorrow's scoping session and provide my feedback on the plans, but asking community members to set aside 3 hours of a workday in order to contribute will naturally exclude the voices of workers, students, caretakers, and the majority of Brooklyn residents whose time is scarce. Historically, processes that rely on in-person, or concurrent contributions tend to favor voices that oppose change. 1

Nonetheless, I want to provide my feedback in written form. Housing is the #1 budget line item for New York residents. The cost keeps us stressed, it makes us work long hours in strenuous conditions. The lack of availability drives us to near madness whenever a lease renewal comes up. Finding new housing is a contact sport in New York, where my wife and I have run into literal lines of people waving money in a broker's face to compete for a place to live. This gives landlords, brokers, and wealthy incumbents too much market power at the expense of renters. 2

AAMUP is a step in the right direction, my only wish is that it moves faster, more aggressively to generate new housing . Housing supply is the only way to shift power back to tenants' hands. We tend to bicker often about the proportion of units designated towards one use or another, often delaying projects or making them timid where they should be bold. We should be in unison asking for as many housing units as possible, because a policy of housing abundance is the only way out of the mess that is NY real estate. The city should be thinking about approving projects like AAMUP faster, making bolder moves towards high-density neighborhoods, and seeking every opportunity to propagate these initiatives quickly throughout the entire city.

I'm raising a two-year old daughter here, just two blocks from Atlantic Ave. As she grows up, I want her to be able to thrive here. I want her Brookly to remain a diverse and dynamic community, and I want her and those around her to have an abundance of housing when they come of age. I just wish projects like AAMUP aren't bogged down, delayed, and hamstrung by endless bureaucratic processes and instead deliver timely on their premise. If trends continue she may have to join the droves of NYC's economic exiles, as a NIMBY-friendly review process continues to be placed ahead of NYers most basic needs.

Sincerely,

André Livramento Magnani [redacted]

Meehan

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for Maximal Housing in AAMUP
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 9:20:24 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

To the Department of City Planning:

I am writing as a Prospect Heights resident in full support of the greatest possible rezoning through AAMUP. As a result of past policy decisions by city government and local community boards, many parts of Brooklyn have delivered little new market-rate or affordable housing over the last two decades. The Bloomberg-era downzonings have substantially diminished housing production in Prospect Heights, Crown Heights, and Clinton Hill, only partially offset by state-led development at Pacific Park. This has contributed to the severe housing crisis that forces people into expensive, overcrowded, and subpar apartments, or into homelessness and the shelter system. 1

I am disappointed that the plan calls for Lower densities on Pacific, Dean, and Bergen Streets. Lower density away from the avenues is a large part of how most of the Upper East and Upper West Sides make rents spiral ever upwards. By contrast, the high density corridors of Second Avenue that were up zoned in preparation for the subway extension are relatively affordable for the neighborhood, and have kept rents relatively lower in Yorkville. Similarly, displacement of existing Latino residents in Southside Williamsburg significantly slowed after the waterfront was upzoned. Furthermore, studies from other cities like Los Angeles have shown that "arterial upzoning" a long wide roads causes lower-income residents to face higher levels of pollution than their wealthier neighbors in adjacent, lower-density blocks. With this context, there is no justification for lower density on any corridor. 2

It is good that the plan calls for pedestrian safety improvements to Atlantic Avenue. The road is extremely hazardous and unpleasant, and we should reallocate at least two travel lanes to other uses, whether bus lanes, wider sidewalks, or even bike lanes. These improvements should be referred to DOT and DDC for rapid implementation. I am also pleased to see the elimination of parking minima, and would even suggest that the city implement parking maxima. On-site parking takes up precious space and funding that could be used to build more housing. The costs end up raising rents for all residents, even those who are car-free. Increasing the number of parking spaces also increases congestion and vehicle-miles-traveled, both of which we should be trying to reduce. 3

The AAMUP plan is a necessary but insufficient step towards alleviating the housing crisis. Please increase the allowed densities to make it as strongly beneficial of a measure as possible. 4

William Meehan

Shane

From: [redacted]
To:
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Comments on the Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 10:04:59 AM

Looks like she submitted to the wrong DL

From: Martha Shane [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2023 3:44 PM
To: 24DCP033Y_DL [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on the Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

Hi,

I am a resident of Crown Heights, and I am writing to express my demand that the Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan include a majority of new apartments that meet the standards for *deeply* affordable housing — housing for individuals and families that make under 50% of the area's median income. What we need in this neighborhood is low-income and public housing, not more housing that is primarily accessible to wealthy individuals and families. 1

Thank you so much for taking this under consideration.

Martha Shane

Smith

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] AAMUP Planning Scoping Testimony from GMDC
Date: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 4:55:39 PM
Attachments: [redacted]

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

Attached please find GMDC's written testimony given at the Planning Scoping meeting on October 18, 2023, regarding the Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan.

Thank you,
Cassandra Smith

Cassandra Smith
Senior Project Manager
Greenpoint Manufacturing and Design Center
[redacted]

GMDC

Good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Cassandra Smith, and I am the Senior Project Manager of the Greenpoint Manufacturing and Design Center. We are a non-profit developer of affordable manufacturing space for small businesses. We have developed over 700,000 SF of space in New York City. We own and manage six buildings which are now home to over 125 small businesses and 700 manufacturing jobs, with a seventh building currently being built in Brownsville. That project is mixed-use light manufacturing and affordable and supportive housing in the same building, the first of its kind in New York City.

GMDC owns 1102 Atlantic Avenue which goes block through to 1093 Pacific Street. We purchased and renovated the property in 2013-2014. Previously a dilapidated warehouse where a total of four people worked, the property is now home to eight small manufacturing businesses with 64 workers between them. The jobs these small businesses provide are good, quality jobs that pay a living wage of over $50,000 annually and an average of $20-30,000 more than retail and food service jobs. We also know that the building is a good light industrial neighbor. Our tenants are comparatively clean and quiet, and our off-street loading dock on the Pacific Street side keeps the sidewalk and street clear.

GMDC's building, along with the MTA site next door, is currently planned to be designated as an MX district (M1-5 / R9A) and we agree this is the appropriate designation to promote the possibility of a mixed-use manufacturing and residential building on the same lot, with density on Atlantic that steps down to Pacific. We would like to ask that consideration be given to include an MX designation for the rest of the *Atlantic Avenue frontage* of the block where our building is located, between Franklin and Classon, or that the currently proposed C6-3A district be modified by the special district text to allow light manufacturing uses. Doing so would increase the possibility in the future of a mixed-use project on our block – perhaps opening the door for GMDC to partner with property owners and other developers to create more mixed-use buildings while also not reducing the residential FAR possibilities. 1

GMDC's current mixed-use project in Brownsville will result in 40,000 SF of space for jobs while also delivering 174 units of affordable and supportive housing to the community. We hope to maximize the opportunity for similar developments in this rezoned area, so GMDC can continue to provide long-term homes for quality jobs in Crown Heights.

Thank you for your time.

* For your reference, attached to this submitted written testimony is the list of uses that GMDC and land use counsel used as a guide during ULURP for the mixed-use project at 805 Rockaway Avenue in Brownsville, Brooklyn. Please see attached.

All GMDC's tenants fit into the use groups listed below. The crossed-out uses are those that GMDC would not be willing to lease space to in a mixed-use building. These are uses that do not often inquire about space, and we also do not think they would fit well into the tenant mix of our buildings.

ZR 123-222

Uses permitted with restrictions

The following #uses# from Use Groups 16 and 17 are permitted in #Special Mixed Use Districts# subject to the certification requirements and locational restrictions of this Section:

From Use Group 16A:

~~Animal hospitals or kennels~~

Blacksmith shops

Carpentry, custom woodworking or custom furniture making shops

~~Fuel, oil, or coal sales, open or enclosed, limited to 5,000 square feet of #lot area# per establishment~~

Mirror silvering shops

Sign painting shops, with no limitation on #floor area# per establishment

Silver plating shops, custom

Soldering or welding shops

Tool, die, or pattern-making establishments, or similar small machine shops

~~Trade schools for adults, that use substances in quantities required under the City Right-to-Know Law to file a Risk~~

Management Plan for Extremely Hazardous Substances

From Use Group 17B (Manufacturing Establishments):

Adhesives, excluding manufacture of basic components

Advertising displays Aircraft, including parts

Automobiles, trucks or #trailers#, including parts or rebuilding of engines Beverages, non-alcoholic

Boats less than 200 feet in length, building or repair, open or enclosed, provided that such #use# or portion thereof may be conducted outside a #completely enclosed building# only if located at a distance greater than 200 feet from a #Residence District# boundary, or if effectively screened by a wall or fence at least eight feet in height with no boat building located less than 30 feet from a #Residence District# boundary

Brushes or brooms

Cameras or other photographic equipment, except film

Canvas Carpets

Ceramic products, including pottery, small glazed tile, or similar products

Chemicals, compounding or packaging Cosmetics or toiletries Cotton ginning, or cotton wadding or linters

Electrical appliances, including lighting fixtures, irons, fans, toasters, electric toys, or similar appliances

Electrical equipment assembly, including home radio or television receivers, home movie equipment, or similar products, but not including electrical machinery

Electrical supplies, including wire or cable assembly, switches, lamps, insulation, dry cell batteries, or similar supplies

Film, photographic

Food products, except slaughtering of meat or preparation of fish for packaging

~~Ice, dry~~

~~Ink or inked ribbon~~

~~Laboratories, research, experimental or testing Leather products, including shoes, machine belting, or similar products~~

Luggage Machines, business, including typewriters, accounting machines, calculators, card-counting equipment, or similar products

Machinery, miscellaneous, including washing machines, firearms, refrigerators, air-conditioning, commercial motion picture equipment, or similar products Machine tools, including metal lathes, metal presses, metal stamping machines, woodworking machines, or similar products

Metal finishing, plating, grinding, sharpening, polishing, cleaning, rust-proofing, heat treatment, or similar products

Metal stamping or extrusion, including costume jewelry, pins and needles, razor blades, bottle caps, buttons, kitchen utensils, or similar products

Motorcycles, including parts

Musical instruments, including pianos or organs

Novelty products

Optical equipment, clocks or similar precision instruments

Orthopedic or medical appliances, including artificial limbs, braces, supports, stretchers, or similar appliances

Paper products, including envelopes, stationery, bags, boxes, shipping containers, bulk goods, tubes, wallpaper printing, or similar products

Perfumes or perfumed soaps, compounding only

Pharmaceutical products

Plastic products, including tableware, phonograph records, buttons, or similar products

Printing or publishing, with no limitation on #floor area# per establishment

Rubber products, such as washers, gloves, footwear, bathing caps, atomizers, or similar products, excluding manufacture of natural or synthetic rubber

Silverware, plate or sterling Sporting or athletic equipment, including balls, baskets, cues, gloves, bats, racquets, rods, or similar products

Statuary, mannequins, figurines, or religious art goods, excluding foundry operations

Steel products, miscellaneous fabrication or assembly, including steel cabinets, doors, fencing, metal furniture, or similar products

Textiles, dyeing or printing

~~Tobacco, including curing, or tobacco products~~

Tools or hardware, including bolts, nuts, screws, doorknobs, drills, hand tools or cutlery, hinges, house hardware, locks, non-ferrous metal castings, plumbing appliances, or similar products

Toys Umbrellas Vehicles, children's, including bicycles, scooters, wagons, baby carriages, or similar vehicles Venetian blinds, window shades, or awnings, with no limitation on production or on #floor area# per establishment

Wood products, including furniture, boxes, crates, baskets, pencils, cooperage works, or similar products

Veconi

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on the AAMUP draft scope
Date: Friday, October 27, 2023 4:24:01 PM
Attachments: [redacted]

> Some people who received this message don't often get email from [redacted] Learn why this is important

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Forward suspect email to [redacted] as an attachment (Click the More button, then forward as attachment).

Hello:

Please find attached the comments of the Prospect Heights Neighborhood Development Council on the above-referenced scope of work.

Thanks,

Gib Veconi
Prospect Heights Neighborhood Development Council, Inc.
[redacted]

phndc
Prospect Heights Neighborhood Development Council

[redacted]

October 27, 2023

Dan Garodnick
Director
New York City Department of City Planning
[redacted]

Re: Atlantic Avenue Mixed-Use Plan, 24DCP019K

Dear Mr. Garodnick:

On behalf of the Prospect Heights Neighborhood Development Council, I submit the following comments with respect to the draft zoning framework and scope of work for environmental review of the above-referenced project.

Density and use

The proposed R7D zoning for the areas of Bergen and Dean Streets in Prospect Heights is a significant increase from the current context zoned R6B. We recommend the new zoning be R7A, which would better speak to the context established by the Newswalk building at 535 Dean Street and the Peter F. Reilly storage warehouse at 491 Bergen Street. However, should the planned HPD developments at 542 Dean Street and 516 Bergen Street be developed for 100% deeply affordable housing, we would support zoning of R7D for those lots only. We also recommend the City explore acquiring the lots in the rezoning area to the east of 516 Bergen Street to combine with that lot as 100% deeply affordable housing. 1

We note that the lot at 840 Atlantic Avenue was supported by CB8 and Council Member Laurie Cumbo for a rezoning to C6-3X based upon the developers' commitment to build affordable housing under MIH Option 3, provide space for an arts organization, limit building height, and provide a setback on its Pacific Street lot to better integrate with the existing context. However, those commitments have yet to be memorialized in a binding agreement, so we do not believe the AAMUP rezoning should enshrine this denser zoning without the commitments to which the developers agreed. Instead, this lot should be zoned C6-3A like the rest of its block on Atlantic Avenue. 2

Open space

We note that zoning along Atlantic Avenue is expected to require wider sidewalks. We recommend it also require the sidewalks to include continuous planted areas at the curb which property owners are obligated to maintain. 3

As a function of the rezoning, the City should unify and enhance the open space at Lowry Triangle Park and Underhill Plaza. The City should also establish an ongoing fund for maintenance and programming at the location. 4

To meet the open space needs of a large number of new residents, the City should promote the creation of new open streets in and around the rezoned area, and establish a fund for the maintenance and operations of new and existing open streets capitalized with not less that what would be required for an annual operating expense of $1 million. 5

The City should renovate the astroturf and play equipment at the Dean Playground. 6

Streetscape

Atlantic Avenue is expected to be redesigned for better pedestrian safety and experience. The City should consider including in the rezoning a requirement that new development contribute to a fund for the infrastructure required to implement the new design. 7

Economic development

Final approval of the rezoning of Atlantic Avenue should be conditioned upon an agreement among property owners for the establishment of a Business Improvement District. 8

Thank you for the opportunity to share these comments.

Sincerely,



Gib Veconi
Chair

00:03:04.470 --> 00:03:24.389
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP):

Everyone welcome. Thanks for tuning into the Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use Plan public scoping meeting. We are addressing a few technical issues to make sure that everyone who has registered to speak is able to join the meeting today. So, we will make sure that we are all set and get started in just a few minutes. Thanks everyone for your patience.

Alright. Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome again to the Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use plan public scoping meeting. If you are viewing us on the live stream on YouTube and have registered to speak, we will be reaching out to you with a link to sign in into the zoom if you are registered to speak. We were dealing with a little bit of technical difficulties this afternoon. So, thanks everyone for your patience and for taking time out of your busy day today. Again, if you're tuning into the public scoping meeting for the Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use plan or AAMUP proposal. The City Environmental Quality Review or CEQR number for the application is 24DCP019K.

So, my name is Stephanie Shellooe, I am the Director of the Environmental Assessment and Review Division (EARD) at the New York City Department of City Planning. Evren Ulker-Kacar, who is the Deputy Director of EARD is co-hosting today's meeting, and if there are any technical difficulties on my end, Evren will take over on my behalf. We appreciate everyone's patience, and I do again want to thank everyone for taking time out of your day to attend this remote meeting.

I also want to emphasize that we'll hear from everyone who wishes to speak today, and the meeting will remain open until everyone who wishes to speak has had a chance to do so. We also welcome written comments and testimony. The written comment period will extend through 5 PM on Friday, October 27, 2023, and we provide written comments the same attention and consideration as comments provided live at this meeting.

So, we will now kick off the public scoping meeting for the Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use Plan or AAMUP. Again, the CEQR application number is 24DCP019K. Today's date is October 27, 2023, and the time is approximately 2:06 PM.

Again. My name is Stephanie Shellooe, Director of EARD, at the Department of City Planning, chairing today's meeting, and the Department of City Planning is acting on behalf of the City Planning Commission as Lead Agency for this proposal's Environmental Review. As lead agency, the Department will be responsible for overseeing the preparation and completion of the proposal's Environmental Impact Statement or EIS.

Joining me today are several of my colleagues from the Department of City Planning. Alex Sommer is the Director of the Department's Brooklyn Office; Kerensa Wood, Deputy Director of the Department's Brooklyn Office; as I mentioned, Evren Ulker-Kacar, Deputy Director of EARD; Louise Cafiero, project manager for the AMAUP Proposal and the environmental assessment and review division; Jonah Rogoff, lead planner of the proposal in the Brooklyn office; and Jesse Hirakawa, lead urban designer for the AAMUP proposal in the Brooklyn office. I'll also mention that we are joined by many DCP staff members working in the background to troubleshoot and make sure that this meeting runs smoothly. Thank you. Everyone for your support.

Together, we are here to receive your comments on the draft scope of work for the AAMUP proposal. The draft scope of work identifies the subjects that will be analyzed in the draft

environmental impact statement or DEIS and describes the methodologies that will be used in those analyses. The draft scope of work materials are published on the Department of City Planning's website

The purpose of today's public scoping meeting is to allow for public participation in the preparation of the DEIS at the earliest stage possible in the environmental review process. Specifically, scoping allows the public to help shape the DEIS before it is written. Towards that end the Department as lead agency will receive verbal testimony on the draft scope of work from elected officials, government agencies, representatives of the Local Community Board, and the public. We also welcome written comments on the draft scope of work, and written comments can be submitted through Friday, October 27, 2023, at 5 PM.

At the end of the written comment period, the Department as Lead Agency will review all comments. Those we hear live at this meeting today, as well as any written comments we have received. After carefully reviewing all comments, the Department will decide what changes, if any, need to be made to the draft scope of work, and will issue a final scope of work. It is the final scope of work that serves as the basis for preparing the DEIS.

Today's scoping meeting marks the beginning of the environmental review process in the public comment period for the AAMUP proposal. No decisions will be made today regarding the draft scope of work. Again, the purpose of today's meeting is to allow the public to provide their comments about the draft scope of work and to allow the department to listen to those comments. It's important for all voices to be heard today.

I will now focus on the structure of today's meeting, which will be divided into 3 parts. In the first part, representatives of the Department of City Planning's Brooklyn office will give a brief overview describing the AAMUP proposal. Then Jonathan Carey, a representative of WSP, the environmental consulting firm for the proposed project will provide a short summary of the draft scope of work. During the second part of the meeting, we will receive comments from elected officials, government agencies, and community board representatives. And in the third and final part of the meeting, we will be receiving testimony from members of the general public.

Onto a few logistics for today's meeting. If you wish to speak and plan to access the meeting online, please remember to register through the AAMUP public scoping meeting page of the NYC Engage Portal (www.nyc.gov/NYCEngage). A link to join us and provide testimony will be emailed to you after you've completed the registration process, and you will be added to our speakers list.

When it is your turn to speak, your name will be called, and you will be promoted to panelist. This will allow you to unmute your microphone and the ability to turn on your camera if you wish. There will be a short period where it appears that you're no longer in the meeting, don't be alarmed, you will automatically rejoin the meeting as a panelist. At that time, you will be asked to convey your remarks. And to allow us to hear from everyone who wishes to speak, you will be asked to limit your remarks to 3 minutes. A 3-minute countdown clock will run on the screen if you're participating online, and after 3-minute mark your time will expire, and you will be asked to conclude your remarks. If you choose to turn on your camera, we will be able to see you.

An additional note of instruction for those of you joining us by phone: if you wish to provide testimony via telephone, please select *9 when prompted, listen for me to call out the last three digits of your phone number. At that point you will be given the temporary ability to share your testimony. You must press *6 to unmute your telephone, and we'll be able to hear you speak live at this meeting. When your testimony is complete or your 3 minutes have expired, whichever

comes first, you will press *6 again to mute yourself. Anyone who wishes to dial in, please do register using the dial in participant hotline information that was displayed at the beginning of this meeting. In general, please note that muting and unmuting registered speakers does take a moment so we appreciate your patience.

Another note on time limits, speakers in the general public have 3 minutes to provide their testimony. There are a few exceptions to the 3-minute time limit; elected officials, for example, are given the courtesy of jumping to the front of the queue and are not limited to 3 minutes. For those of you viewing us on live stream and wish to testify, please be mindful of potential background noise during your testimony. Make sure that the live stream is muted to avoid hearing an echo. If anyone's viewing today's presentation but does not wish to speak or provide testimony you can also stream this meeting, using the live stream links on the NYC Engage and City Planning website on DCP's YouTube page.

If you wish to submit written testimony, it can be submitted to the Department of City Planning. Our mailing address is shown here on the screen 120 Broadway, 31st floor, New York, NY 10027, attention Stephanie Shellooe. There's also an email address that is set up for this project. The email address is shown here: 24DCP019K_dl@planning.nyc.gov. This information can all be found after today's meeting on the NYC Engage Portal and the City Planning website. Again, as a reminder, written comments will be accepted by the lead agency through Friday, October 27, 2023, at 5 PM.

Alright, if you missed any of the instructions, please do visit www.NYC.gov/NYCEngage for instructions on how to participate and provide testimony. We will now move to the first part of our meeting, where the Department of City Planning's Brooklyn office will give an overview of the proposed project. This will be followed by the environmental consultant summarizing the draft scope of work. I will now turn it over to Jonah Rogoff.

00:17:24
Jonah Rogoff (DCP, Brooklyn Office)

Thank you, Stephanie. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Jonah Rogoff, and I serve as the lead planner for the Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use Plan or AAMUP. I am also joined by Jesse Harakawa, AAMUP's lead urban designer, who will be co-presenting with me.

Just to start with a little a background on the project. The AAMUP area is located along Atlantic Avenue in Central Brooklyn, in Community Districts 3 and 8 just to the north of Prospect Park, few blocks to north, and situated in an industrially zoned area between Crown Heights, Bedford Center, Bed-Stuy, Fort Green, Clinton Hill, and Prospect Heights.

At 120 feet wide, Atlantic Avenue is one of Brooklyn's most prominent east-west corridors connecting downtown Brooklyn to Queens and Long Island, and traversing many neighborhoods of Brooklyn. As you can see from the photos of the project area, much of Atlantic Avenue and neighboring blocks are characterized by vacant or underutilized lots with open storage and parking; self-storage; and warehouse based uses; as well as many auto-oriented uses, like gas stations or auto repair shops; and block style buildings that contain a mix of nonresidential uses. A large portion of the area is zoned M1-1, which was put in place in 1961, and does not allow new housing, while also limiting the types of uses to industrial and commercial development at a relatively low FAR and a high parking requirement.

So, at a fundamental level, AAMUP is a neighborhood plan with the goal of re-envisioning an industrially zoned area close to public transit and employment nodes to support a mixed use

neighborhood with housing, including substantial amounts of affordable housing and space for jobs.

To break this down a little further, AAMUP is really driven by 4 key objectives. First, to support a vibrant mix of uses and allow for housing growth with permanently affordable housing. Second, to encourage moderate to high density mix of uses with active ground floor uses along corridors and allow for multiple floors of space for jobs. Third, to promote a walk, to work neighborhood with a mix of industrial, commercial and commercial facility uses. Fourth, to strengthen the streetscape along Atlantic Avenue, improve safety, and enhance the pedestrian experience.

Now to share a little background on what's driving the goals of our planning work. We want to spend a few minutes on the citywide and local context. First citywide, as we all know, we are in the midst of a severe housing crisis. The cost of housing is high across the board. We don't have enough available homes of all types, whether they're affordable or market rate. The quality of the existing housing that we do have is often deteriorating, and maintenance costs are further increasing. And then the amount of choices that we have for housing is also limited, especially in Central Brooklyn and the neighborhood surrounding AAMUP.

So, within the community district surrounding AAMUP, there are large percentage of households that are rent burdened, meaning that they're spending more than 30% of their monthly gross income on housing expenses, which is a strong indicator of the need for more affordable housing and more housing in general.

As demand for housing and living in Central Brooklyn has grown tremendously over the past few decades, as you can see in the chart, and the change in population, the area within a quarter mile of AAMUP has experienced major population/demographic changes, including a decrease in the population of black residents, which has been coupled with an increase in the white population, as well as other groups, such as Asian, Hispanic, and mixed race groups.

Many of AAMUP's neighborhood planning goals are guided by citywide plans and initiatives, including the Mayor's Housing Blueprint, released last year, and a citywide zoning text amendment called City of Yes Housing Opportunity, which aims to create a little more housing of all types across the city.

So, now turning our attention to a boroughwide planning lens. The department regards AAMUP as part of a network of walkable, transit-rich areas, including access to both the subway and the Long Island Railroad, which we are also a short ride away from major employment hubs in downtown Brooklyn and Lower Manhattan.

Almost the entire area surrounding AAMUP has been subject to contextual area-wide rezonings over the last few decades, which have the largely preserved the neighborhood character. They've also limited the ability to grow new housing, with the exception of a few key locations and corridors. In addition to these area-wide rezonings, the historic districts within the area have added to these constraints, particularly the ability to accommodate new housing.

And as noted earlier, the land uses within the AAMUP area are predominantly either a mix of vacant parking, different types of light industrial and warehouse-based uses, which stand in stark contrast to the uses within the areas around AAMUP, which are largely residential and commercial. In particular we would call attention to the areas colored in light pink or either gray or black, which denote different types of uses that produce less jobs. Either they're open parking or vacant or other types of warehouse based uses.

So, among the major driving courses for why we are planning for AAMUP, one of the most important, if not the most important, is we are seeking to develop a holistic plan that builds upon the nearly decade of planning work led by Brooklyn's Community Board 8, which included several resolutions and recommendations to re-envision the neighborhood.

In addition to that planning work, AAMUP seeks to develop a holistic plan that brings together many of the recently approved private rezoning applications, both in the area and also directly within a block or two of the area. As well as consider the development that is ongoing throughout the neighborhood, with most prominently at Pacific Park, a multi-phase redevelopment project located to the West and led by the Empire State Development Corporation.

So, to put a finer point on the history of our work here and where we are in the process… A lot of the planning, as I mentioned, began following the contextual rezoning of Crown Heights West in 2013, and the subsequent formation of the M Crown Land Use Committee by Community Board 8. In 2015, the Board issued a resolution to rezone the area, which was followed by an engagement period with DCP, and the release of a land use framework in 2018 to both help guide private rezoning applications and also help build consensus for future planning work.

Following that engagement and additional calls for a neighborhood wide plan over the coming years, Council members, Crystal Hudson, Chi Ossé, along with several elected officials and local stakeholders submitted a formal request for the Administration to advance a plan in early 2022. And then in April of 2022, the City responded with a formal agreement to begin undertaking that process and developing plan. In the spring of this past year, the Department partnered with Council member Hudson and a consultant to host a series of public outreach meetings, which included a total of 9 working group meetings based on 3 topic areas and 3 community planning workshops in addition to 9 steering committee meetings which were comprised of leaders from local community boards and other stakeholders. This past August, we are really excited to release a community vision and priorities report that captures all of the outreach process and the priorities and recommendations. In early September, we held a virtual presentation to share a draft zoning framework. We are currently fleshing out the next phase of outreach over the next few months with the goal of certifying an application or entering a public review in the spring of 2024.

Just to give a little more background on the key priorities mentioned in the Community Vision Report. First and foremost, there was a top priority of creating new permanently deep affordable housing that increases the density along Atlantic Avenue and side streets, while also serving to preserve affordable housing within the larger area. Second, there was a shared goal around instituting zoning that supports mixed use communities; so not just housing, but also promotes and serves access to jobs and services that are within walking distance. Third, there was a goal around a coordinated street plan with a primary goal around a comprehensive redesign of Atlantic Avenue that improves safety, provides and strengthens amenities, and also addresses environmental concerns. Fourth, there was a goal to increase public open space, either through the creation of new green space or recreation opportunities or by improving existing parks within the surrounding area. Fifth, there was a goal around job training and business development to expand career pathways that are accessible to residents within the area, especially those without a college degree and lack the skills, or prioritizing black-owned MWBE businesses that pay a living wage and can help people thrive as new development comes online. And then, lastly, there is a city owned lot housed by the Bedford Atlantic Armory which came up as an opportunity for better utilizing that space, which is currently a homeless shelter, but has opportunities to be renovated and serve other types of community benefits.

So, that concludes the background portion of the presentation. I will now turn it over to Jesse to cover the land use and zoning portion. Thank you.

00:30:55
Jesse Hirakawa (DCP Brooklyn Office)

Thank you so much Jonah. As a response to the outcome of the Community Vision and Priorities report that Jonah was just speaking to, a revision of the 2018 framework was necessary. So, you will notice the five colors on this diagram represents different sub areas. Running along the Atlantic Avenue, the area in red is identified as the Atlantic Avenue mixed-used subarea, where we believe and heard from workshops that given it is a wide major corridor, it should have the highest density of commercial and residential uses with ground floor activation. The yellow and purple striped, hatched area in the middle there, between Brand and Franklin, is a direct response actually to the previous framework that was prohibiting the development of housing here. So, this updated framework suggests a transitional area into a special excuse area to allow and incentivize a variety of uses and not just a focus on commercial and industrial uses, but to allow residential as well. Basically, we should not be restricting residential uses anywhere. In the darker yellow, the north-south avenues will focus on moderate density with mixed use developments; while in the lighter yellow, this will be a residential-only subarea to facilitate new infill housing opportunities. Lastly, the purple area identified around the armory is to maintain compliance and provide flexibility for future potential renovations. You can read more about the responses to this framework and the thinking behind it in the Community Vision and Priorities report and the draft zoning presentation from last month. Both are available on the New York city Department of City Planning website.

We call this the affected area, which is an area where at least one or more land use actions will be proposed. This area is an approximate 20-block area in the northwest Crown Heights and Southern Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhoods of Brooklyn Community Districts 3 and 8. The Project Area is generally bounded by Vanderbilt Avenue to the West, Nostrand Avenue to the east, Herkimer Street to the north, and Bergen Street to the south, covering an existing M1-1 zoning district. In addition, a noncontiguous area located on a portion of two blocks in Prospect Heights, where 2 sites owned by the city are also in the affected area. Extending the entire length of the affected area, Atlantic Avenue is a prominent East and West Corridor. Other secondary corridors running north and south within the affected area are Vanderbilt Avenue, Grand Avenue, Classon Avenue, Franklin Avenue, and Northridge Avenue.

The purpose of need for the proposed land use actions would support the community-based goals, re-envisioning an industrially zoned area to spur the growth of jobs and housing and a walkable transit-rich area driven by approximately 10 years of outreach and engagement with the local community boards, elected officials, and various stakeholders. All building upon the past M-Crown planning efforts, and the 2023 AAMUP Community Vision and Priorities report, all of which Jonah had mentioned before.

Additional needs include updating the current M1-1 industrial zoning to reflect the current vision and goals of the surrounding neighborhoods, encouraging a mix of uses that allow for housing growth, active ground floors, job rendering uses, and permanently affordable housing. Lastly, strengthening the quality of the Atlantic Avenue streetscape for all and additional users, stormwater and ecological improvements, and safety concerns.

The set of land use actions proposed consists of a zoning map amendments to rezone the approximate existing zoning districts to better accommodate the land use objectives. For example, the existing zoning district M1-1 does not allow the creation of new housing. The other

Zoning Map Amendments is to map a Special Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use District, largely co-terminus with the rezoning area, which I will go into more detail about in future slides.

Accompanying those is a zoning text amendment to modify Appendix F for the purpose of establishing the area as a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) Area. Basically, applying the MIH program to require a share of the new buildings to be permanently affordable where significant new housing capacity would be created. Other land use actions include the designation of an Urban Development Action Area Project (UDAAP) approval of an urban development action area project, and the acquisition and or disposition of the city-owned property within the Project Area. For example, there are two parcels owned and managed by the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development (HPD) that were subject of an RFP and community visioning process, where one of those sites, the city is seeking to rezone and designate to facilitate 100% affordable housing developments for older adults and families, as well as provide onsite services and amenities for residents and other community facility uses. The last action as part of the proposal is a site selection and/or acquisitions selection related to the potential acquisition of land by the city for the purpose of establishing publicly accessible open space.

This is a map of the proposed draft zoning. The affected area will be rezoned from the existing zoning, where housing was prohibited, to the following districts to better meet the goals of the proposal. For example, proposing a higher density along Atlantic Avenue in the red, the C6-3A district will allow a residential floor area ratio, or FAR of 9, a non-residential FAR of 7.5, with a maximum base height of 135 feet or 13 stories, and restricting the overall building heights at 185 feet or 18 stories, which you can see in the red. Looking to the north of Atlantic Avenue, we are proposing a set of districts that are more kind of the transitional height districts like the C4-3A, D4-5D, and R6-B, which is to respond to the existing context to the north toward Bed-Stuy. These districts have maximum building heights that range from 65 to 125 feet or 6 to 12 stories, depending if the building is used for housing or job generating uses. Also looking to pair districts like M1-4 and R6-A which are in the orange to incentivize and allow mixed use developments and flexible envelopes to allow unique, interesting architecture, while also restricting buildings to 125 feet, which can result in buildings 8 to 12 stories, depending on if it's used for housing or job center uses as well.

In addition to the rezoning area, a special district is being proposed coterminous to the rezoning area for several reasons. The first one, to promote the growth of housing and employment centers around transit and foster an adequate range of services and amenities for residents, workers, and visitors. Second, to ensure a lively and attractive streetscape along Atlantic Avenue and other major corridors. Third, to support a mix of residential, commercial, community facility, and light industrial uses.

So, to achieve this, a series of modifications to the underlying zoning will be proposed. For example, sending back buildings along Atlantic Avenue to improve sidewalk conditions, or providing bulk, envelope flexibility within the zoning envelope to allow for interesting architecture while also enhancing facade and articulation treatment measures. Additionally, the special district will mandate nonresidential uses like grocery stores, day cares, or places of employment on the ground floor along major corridors to activate the sidewalk, and then in strategic locations to incentivize nonresidential uses, with residential above to continue incentivizing mixed use buildings. Lastly, to name a few, we also are proposing to reduce parking and reduce curve cut requirements within this area as well.

That concludes the portion from the Department of City Planning and the Brooklyn office on the proposed project overview of AAMUP. Thank you so much, and I appreciate you all for following along so far. I am going to now pass the virtual mic over to our environmental consultant, Jonathan Carey at WSP, who will give an overview of the draft scope of work. Thank you.

00:40:28
Jonathan Carey (WSP)

Thank you, Jesse. Hi, everyone, I am Jonathan Carey from WSP. WSP is leading a consultant team to assist the City with the City Environmental Quality Review (CEQR).

A CEQR is a disclosure process by which decision makers evaluate potential environmental consequences before they approve discretionary actions. The disclosure is also to the public and other agencies and the discretionary actions are, as Jesse listed earlier. So, that's a zoning map amendment, zoning text amendment, and other actions. Under CEQR, the City Planning Department will compare the No-Action Condition with the future, With-Action Condition through their developed, Reasonable Worst Case Development Scenario (RWCDS). That RWCDS analyzes the incremental changes that could be reasonably expected to occur if those actions are adopted. So, the public comments that you provide today as well as written comments received by City Planning will be incorporated into the final scope of work, and then a draft Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared in accordance with that final scope of work and published for public review. Another public hearing will be held on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, and comments received during that hearing, as well as written comments received during that public review period, will be incorporated into the final Environmental Impact Statement.

This project has a build year of 2034, and that is part of the analysis framework for the reasonable worst case, and it compares the No-Action and With-Action Conditions. So, under the No-Action Condition, you can generally think of continuation of existing conditions over the next 10 years and what would be likely to occur in the Project Area over those next 10 years. Under the With-Action Condition, there are new uses that would be built at higher densities, including residential, retail, and community facility uses, and in some industrial uses would remain. The Department of City Planning has identified 51 projected development sites where development is expected to occur within that 10-year period, as well as 16 potential development sites where development is not expected to occur but they are analyzed for their site specific environmental impacts. The criteria by which the Department of City Planning selected each of these sites is detailed in the draft scope of work.

This is the RWCDS in the year 2034. This table breaks down the uses under the No-Action Condition in 2034, the With-Action Condition in 2034, and the increment between them. As noted, there is an increase in residential uses as well as most commercial uses. However, there's a decrease in automotive related uses. In general, there's a decrease in industrial uses, although some do remain and there are increases in both medical office and other community facility uses. The redevelopment will occupy spaces that are occupied by existing parking lots; therefore, parking spaces will decrease under the With-Action Condition and this redevelopment will result in almost 10,000 new residents and almost 3,000 new workers in the Project Area.

The draft scope of work describes the Department of City Planning's approach to analyzing the Proposed Project. According to all of these technical areas. These include site specific technical topics, such as historic and cultural resources and hazardous materials, as well as density-related topics such as transportation, air quality, and noise. The Environmental Impact Statement will address all of these topics as well as include other chapters. Specifically, there will be a

mitigation chapter. If any significant environmental impacts are identified in any of the chapters, a mitigation will be identified to the extent practical to reduce or eliminate those impacts.

In addition, the Department of City Planning will analyze alternatives, including both a no-action alternative and a no unmitigated impact alternative, which is generally a smaller version of the proposed rezoning. A final EIS will include the chapters listed there (summary chapters), and unavoidable adverse impacts are those that cannot be mitigated and no mitigation could be identified that would fully mitigate those impacts; as well as secondary growth deducing impacts, and any other irretrievable or irreversible commitment of resources. I would note that natural resources are not proposed to be included in the Environmental Impact Statement, given the fully built-out nature of the Project Area.

You can access the Environmental Assessment Statement and draft scope of work at this link (https://zap.planning.nyc.gov/projects/2022K0436) as well as in the other information that Department of City Planning has provided. I'll now turn it back over to EARD to complete the presentation.

00:45
Stephanie Shellooe

Thank you, Jonathan, and Jonah and Jesse for the presentation.

We will now move on to part 2 of the meeting, where we will receive testimony from elected officials, community board leaders, and government agencies. When it is your turn to speak, your name will be called and you will be promoted to panelists, which will allow you to unmute your microphone and the ability to turn on your camera if you wish. There will be a period where it appears that you're no longer in the meeting, but you will automatically rejoin the zoom as a panelist. If anyone experiences technical issues that prevent you from sharing your testimony, we are going to pause, move to our next speaker to allow for troubleshooting to happen in the background. Please note, we also do have How-To guides on the New York City Engage website for assistance, as well as you can dial in our helpline, information shown here. So that's at the bottom of the screen. This meeting ID will link you to someone who can help you troubleshoot if you're having any technical difficulties.

We will start with our registered speakers: our elected officials, government agencies, and Community Board representatives, the first of which is Council Member Crystal Hudson. So, councilmember Crystal Hudson, not seeing you in the zoom, but I know you are joining shortly. So, while we wait for councilmember Hudson to join, we will move to our next elected official who is registered to speak, which is Council Member Chi Ossé. You will be promoted to panelists and given the opportunity to share your testimony.

00:47
Councilmember Chi Ossé (District 36)

Hello! Good afternoon, everybody. Can you hear me? Yes. Oh, thank you very much. So, thank you again for having me here to testify. My name is Council Member Chi Ossé and I represent the 36 District in Brooklyn, which includes the neighborhoods of Bed-Stuy and Crown Heights. I am here today to provide comments on the draft scope of work for the environmental impact study for the Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use plan. The eastern portion of which is in my district. I will also address community priorities outside of the zoning proposal that must be addressed for this plan to succeed.

I am grateful for the work of the Department of City Planning, WSP, and the AAMUP Steering Committee, and hundreds of community members who have contributed countless hours in recent months to develop the Community Vision and Priorities report released in August of this year. We are also indebted to the years of community advocacy and planning which laid the groundwork for a strong planning process.

While the draft zoning and draft scope of work address the majority of the needs and goals of the community. I agree that there are still concerns that exist within this draft. Because Council Member Hudson is going to bring many of these concerns to you, I will mainly focus on issues that concern District 36 constituents.

First, the rezoning plan must prioritize and maximize deeply affordable housing similar to District 35, District 36 is seeing a mass exodus of black residents due to rising rents and lack of affordable housing. Therefore, the aim of rezoning must facilitate significant investments in deeply affordable housing, and District 36 through both new development and preservation of existing affordable units in our area. Ossé-1

Councilmember Hudson and I are aligned our position that additional public sites for 100 affordable development must be secured for this rezoning to advance. We urge DCP to ensure that additional density on the following publicly owned District 36 sites is studied and in scope, and the EIS: 1024 Fulton Street, which is currently a State-owned property will be in Council Member Hudson's District in 2024; and 178 Brooklyn Avenue, which is a Department of Education building as well as 457 Notion Avenue, which is another DOE building. These sites hold the greatest potential to increase affordability in my district, and DCP must work closely with DOE and other agencies to make use of this opportunity. Deeply affordable housing is essential to ensure that longtime residents are able to remain in their communities. Ossé-2

We also urge DCP to work with HPD to maximize affordable units and potential private developments. The agencies should prioritize term sheet development on large private sites where owners are amenable. We have discussed the need for an HPD term sheet to facilitate 50% affordable housing and private developments and continue to support HPD's efforts towards making that available. Ossé-3

Finally, I strongly support deepening the affordability levels required through MIH or Mandatory Inclusionary Housing. Speaker Adams has called for MIH to be revised as part of the mayor's Zoning for Housing Opportunity text amendment to allow for the deep affordability option to be required through zoning. If this is achieved through the citywide text amendment, we must ensure that it applies to AAMUP. Even if AAMUP is on a slightly faster timeline. Ossé-4

Second, consider reducing density along the eastern portion of Atlantic Avenue. As councilmember Hudson expressed in her letter, and as residents have consistently expressed the density in the eastern part of Atlantic Avenue may be higher than what is appropriate for this stretch. Generally, the density on Atlantic Avenue and surrounding streets tapers down from its height at the Pacific part development, as one moves eastward into District 36. At present the areas around the eastern portion of the proposed Atlantic Avenue zoning are mainly zoned at R6A, 6 to 8 stories and R6B, 4 to 5 stories. I am concerned about the stark contrast between the density and the proposed C6-3A zoning for Atlantic Avenue, which would allow buildings up to 18 stories. We must ensure an appropriate transition from higher density along Atlantic Avenue to the surrounding residential areas. Ossé-5

Third, the city must work creatively to identify new opportunities for open space and commit to additional investments. The Franklin Avenue station is in District 36 and is frequented by residents and visitors of both districts. This is the MTA station. We ask that DCP work with the MTA to improve the station area as a public amenity and commit resources to specific specified improvements. Excuse me, as well as additional sanitation services which are sorely needed. The EIS should assess all opportunities to increase public open space in the study area, including design and capital improvements at the John Hancock playground. The city should commit funding to implement these improvements in conjunction with this rezoning. Ossé-6

Finally, and I promise, finally, the EIS should include a comprehensive study of access to healthcare in our community. The draft scope does not call for any analysis of the access to health care, either hospitals and acute care or primary care reflecting a shortcoming of the current CEQR manual. With over 4,000 projected housing units added to the area, this action should be considered an introduction of a sizable new neighborhood and include analysis of impacts on healthcare services and infrastructure. The perennial underfunded and overburdened Interface Medical Center is the closest hospital to the area. Then access to hospital and trauma care should be examined as part of the EIS. Councilmember Hudson and I will submit our complete scoping comments and writing with detailed feedback on the draft scope of work. Ossé-7

We look forward to continuing to work with DCP and the Adams Administration to address these concerns and develop the strongest possible application in advance of ULURP. I look forward to hearing from you and your office soon, and I look forward to partnership. Sorry if I went over time councilmember.

00:53
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

All right. I do see that councilmember Hudson has joined the meeting. Thank you for being here, so our next speaker will be Councilmember Crystal Hudson. We will promote you to a panelist, and it will be your opportunity to provide your testimony.

00:54
Councilmember Crystal Hudson (District 35)

Hi, there! Good afternoon. Thank you so much. Sorry, I am just getting it together. Okay, my name is Crystal Hudson. I am the Councilmember for District 35 in Brooklyn which encompasses the majority of the Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use Plan area. I am joined here today by my colleague, Councilmember Chi Ossé, who represents the remainder of the planning area and District 36, whom you've just heard from. Each of our districts is unique, but our community share history, challenges, and priorities that must be reflected in this plan. This milestone represents the culmination of years of community advocacy to transform the landscape of Atlantic Avenue and surrounding blocks from vacant lots, self-storage, and gas stations to a vibrant mixed use neighborhood with deeply affordable housing. The proposal reflects many of the priorities expressed during the community planning process, especially the key goal of building, more housing, including more deeply affordable housing for residents at greatest risk of displacement. But there's still much progress needed to develop a plan that meets our community's needs and achieves its goals. In short, we must 1) ensure the EIS reflects the full scope of the community vision as articulated in the engagement report, 2) continue public engagement on the draft zoning and 3) secure the necessary infrastructure and neighborhood investments for further deeply affordable housing, increased investments in the area's local economy, and safer streets.

First AAMUP must significantly increase our community supply of deeply affordable housing beyond Mandatory Inclusionary Housing or MIH requirements, both through new construction and strengthened preservation investments. The displacement of black families in Central Brooklyn is well documented, with the black population within the AAMUP study area dropping by half over the past two decades due to rising housing costs, predatory real estate practices, and race-based income inequality. AAMUP cannot reinforce this trend. We must ensure new housing generated by this rezoning is accessible to black households, many of which have called this area home for generations. The proposed zoning and text amendments are insufficient, and additional commitments for 100% affordable housing development are necessary. To that end, we urge all relevant city agencies to commit additional public sites for 100% affordable housing development. We have identified three underutilized Department of Education facilities within half a mile of the AAMUP study area that must be included in the draft zoning for study in the EIS: 178 Brooklyn Avenue, 457 Nostrand Avenue, large parking lot in the rear of the DOE facility, and 500 and Claremont Avenue. Similarly, we urge DCP and the administration to work with our State and Federal partners to secure additional State-owned sites that could be utilized for affordable development. Hudson-1

Additionally, I support the speakers call for revision of MIH to require deeper affordability as a part of the upcoming Zoning for Housing Opportunity text amendment. I call on DCP to ensure that, should that occur, the deeper affordability requirement can be applied to the AAMUP study area retroactively. Hudson-2

Second, while the proposed C6-3A zoning for Atlantic Avenue aligns with many of AAMUP's goals, there is a stronger precedent for this level of density on the western portion of the rezoning area. Many community members have expressed a desire for lower heights on the eastern side of the Project Area to ensure an appropriate transition to adjacent lower density residential areas. As we move forward with public review, we should thoughtfully consider these tradeoffs. Hudson-3

Third, we must strengthen mixed use zoning incentives for light industrial arts and community facility uses. One of AAMUP's primary goals is to ensure a “diverse and vibrant mix of uses, including space for jobs, services, local retail at grocery stores, community facilities, creative and cultural uses and light industrial businesses.” Unlike the nearby Special Gowanus Mixed Use District, AAMUP currently lacks tools to achieve this, while modifying all or part of Special Mixed Use incentive to more narrowly target the aforementioned uses would appear to be in scope. DCP should ensure and confirm it is. Hudson-4

DCP must also confirm it would be in scope to add a provision to the special district to preserve existing significant commercial industrial properties, such as GMDC and 1000 Dean from converting to residential. Hudson-5

Councilmember Ossé and I will submit our detailed comments on the draft scope of work in writing. It is essential that the EIS facilitate the best possible outcome for this plan, and we will collaborate with DCP to ensure that our comments are integrated in a timely and thorough manner.

However, I'd like to reiterate that this zoning plan cannot advance without substantial commitments from DCP's sister agencies and this administration. One, a comprehensive redesign of the Atlantic Avenue corridor, consistent with the Community Vision and Priorities report that is advanced ahead of the council vote on the rezoning, including an implementation, timeline; and two, a package of locally targeted policies, including job training and placement to expand career pathways that are accessible to existing residents without a college degree,

support for MWBE and black entrepreneurship, and potential financial incentives for diverse mixed-use development.

I look forward to continuing to work with DCP on securing these comprehensive investments for equitable growth that fulfills the community's vision for a new Atlantic Avenue. Thank you so much for allowing me to provide my testimony today.

00:59
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you so much, Councilmember Hudson, for being here and providing your detailed comments, and we look forward to both Councilmembers written testimony, so that we may provide full responses. Thank you very much for being here.

We will now move to folks that registered to speak on behalf of government agencies or local Community Boards of which there is only one registered Speaker, Karen Gray, on behalf of Brooklyn Community Board 8. We are not seeing Karen Gray in the zoom room at the moment. If you are joining in the YouTube, please switch over to zoom via the login link. At this point we will move to our members of the general public (part 3 of the public scoping meeting), where we will ask members of the general public to speak for up to up to 3 minutes as you saw at the time tracker will display when you start, start your testimony. So, we'll move to that slide now.

Again, just as a reminder when your name is called, you will be promoted to panelists, and given the ability to unmute your microphone and turn on your camera. There will be a short period that it appears that you're no longer in the meeting, but you will automatically rejoin as a panelist. When your 3 minutes have expired, you will be asked to conclude your remarks and if anyone again experiences technical issues, we'll move on to our next speaker. But note that if you do resolve the technical issues, we'll be able to hear your testimony.

So, we are moving to our speakers. Our first speaker in this group will be Cassandra Smith, to be followed by Nicole Laemmle, to be followed by Mimi Mitchell. Cassandra Smith, who is our first speaker in this group. We are not seeing in the zoom here. But we do see someone else associated with the same facility as Cassandra Smith, Brenda Lau.

Hi. Are you speaking on behalf of Cassandra Smith? Yes, sorry, this is Cassandra. We will promote you to a panelist in just a moment so that we are able to give you the ability to turn on your camera if you wish. If you can go ahead and promote the speaker listed here as Brenda Lau, but who is Cassandra Smith to a panelist.

01:02
Cassandra Smith/Brenda Lau (Greenpoint Manufacturing and Design Center)

Okay, one more. Okay. Sorry. So, thank you. My name is Cassandra Smith. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I am the senior project manager of the Greenpoint Manufacturing and Design Center. We are a nonprofit developer of affordable manufacturing space for small businesses. We have developed over 700,000 square feet of space in New York City. We own and manage six buildings which are now home to over 125 businesses and 700 manufacturing jobs. We have a seventh building currently being built in Brownsville. That project is a mixed use, manufacturing and affordable and supportive housing in the same building, the first of its kind in New York City.

So, GMDC owns 1102 Atlantic Avenue which goes block through to 1093 Pacific Street, between Franklin and Glasson. We purchased and renovated the property in 2013-2014. Previously a dilapidated warehouse where a total of 4 people worked, the property is now home to 8 small manufacturing businesses with 64 workers between them. The jobs that these businesses provide are good quality jobs that pay a living wage of over $50,000 average annually, and that number is an average of 20 to 30,000 more than retail and food service jobs. We also know that our building is a good, light industrial neighbor. We think that our tenants operate their businesses in a way that is comparatively clean and quiet, and our off street loading dock on the Pacific Street side keeps the sidewalk in the street clear.

GMDC's building, along with the MTA site next door is currently planned to be designated as a MX Special District (M15R9A), and we agree that this is the appropriate designation to promote the possibility of a mixed use manufacturing and residential building on the same lot at the MTA location with the density on Atlantic Avenue that steps down to an appropriate density on Pacific Stream. We would like to ask that consideration be given to include an MX designation for the rest of the Atlantic Avenue frontage of the block where our building is located, between Franklin and Glasson, or that the currently proposed C6-3A district be modified by the special district text to allow manufacturing uses on that block as well. This is for the frontage on Atlantic Avenue, as the Pacific Street side already has an MX designation planned for it. Doing so would increase the possibility in the future of a mixed use project on that block, perhaps opening the door for GMDC to partner with property owners and other developers to create more mixed use buildings while also not reducing the residential FAR possibilities in that area. Smith-1

01:06
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you. Your time is up. If you could just conclude your remarks, and if you could unmute Cassandra just for her last sentence.

01:06
Cassandra Smith/Brenda Lau (Greenpoint Manufacturing and Design Center)

Sorry. So, I just want to note our current mixed use project that's underway in Brownsville will result in 40,000 square feet of manufacturing space and 174 units of affordable and supportive housing for that community, and that is the type of project that we would seek to have in Crown Heights. Thank you.

01:06
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you. Thank you very much, and we welcome your written testimony if you're planning to submit that as well. We will also correct the record, so that your name is reflected. In our in our records.

Thank you. Our next speaker is Nicole Laemmle, and sorry if I am mispronouncing anyone's name to be followed by Mimi Mitchell, to be followed by Edwin Alvarez. Nicole Laemmle, you are next speaker. You will be promoted to panelists in just a moment.

01:07
Jack Robinson/ Nicole Laemmle

Hello! This is actually Jack Robinson, Nicole’s husband. I am on her zoom.

Robinson-1

So, our main concern is definitely affordability. I don't know. I know it's been considered a lot in this presentation, but I don't think that it's gone far enough.

And I think, Chi Ossé and his idea of more thought about hospitals and healthcare as this neighborhood grows and grows older.

Robinson-2

And that's about all I have to say. Affordability is my main point.

01:08
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Okay, thank you for your comments. If you could send your contact information to our distribution list so that we can get your name correct in our in our records, that would be great. Thank you.

Our next speaker is Mimi Mitchell, to be followed by Edwin Alvarez, to be followed by Rosie Alvarez. Mimi Mitchell is our next speaker, will be promoted to panelists and invited to speak in just a moment.

Good afternoon. Hi! Welcome!

01:08
Mimi Mitchell

Hi! Thanks for having me. My name is Mimi Mitchell. I am a member of Community Board 8, which is one of the direct areas affected by this, and I am also a member of Crown Heights Tenant Union.

Mitchell-1

I couldn't agree more than with what Mr. Ossé had to say. We participated and I participated in every single AAMUP presentation in regard to the land use issues. What came out of that was a call for deep, deep, deep affordable housing, not what we call affordable housing now, but deeper affordable housing, and that would mean housing that would be under 50 AMI limits. That is something that that we heard that I heard at every table, and the other thing that I heard was about the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing, and how those that break down the options that have been presented are just not enough, and they are just not doing enough for our community. What we were hoping to see after all of this time and after all of this research is that there would be a commitment to a change to making affordable housing more accessible, and to possibly even changing the MIH.

I think that this is a really unique opportunity that we have here with AAMUP. And I think it's a unique opportunity to sort of set a precedent going forward as to what we can do, and how we can really take care of a community, and how a community can come together to actually make it affordable for the people who work here to actually be able to live here. I think it's really sad that the people who work, like the people who work jobs in here, whether it's your cashier, your waiter, your barista, etc., they cannot afford to live in this neighborhood. And I would urge AAMUP to actually take this opportunity to set a precedent, and to really show us what deeply affordable housing can do and how it can work. We have crunched the numbers. It's all possible. So, for DCP not to do it, I think you'd be sending a really big message, and the wrong message. So, I am hoping that I, along with many others, are hoping that you can make your commitment to deep affordable housing more than just a talking point, but an actual physical statement in the way that this neighborhood is going to be shaped.

Mitchell-2

Thank you very much.

01:11
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you very much for being here, and for your testimony and your participation in the planning process. Our next speaker will be Edwin Alvarez, to be followed by Rosie Alvarez, to be followed by Elizabeth Dennis. Just to note all the comments received today will be summarized and responded to in our final scope of work, as was mentioned by our environmental consultant. After we, the Department, has had a chance to digest and understand all of the comments heard today.

Edwin Alvarez, you are our next speaker.

01:12
Edwin Alvarez

Hello! Hi! Thank you. Thank you for receiving me. Thank you for the time.

My name is Edwin Alvarez. I live on 546 Franklin Avenue, around the corner of Atlantic Avenue, on the north side, three doors down from the proposed up zoning. My neighbors on Lefferts Place attended the AAMUP meetings, and I want to express my concerns as well as theirs about the up zoning.

We are against the high density buildings in our immediate area. Right? My neighbors and I don't want to live under the shadows of tall buildings or let the neighbor feel like we are living on the bottom of a canyon. We are talking about 25-20, maybe even 15 stories. South side of Atlantic has 3 or 4 blocks of deep industrial land, Right? I cannot see why this area was not taken into account to be up zoned into higher density. Developers ignore the concerns from us, the homeowners. To date my neighbors at Lefferts Place are still having issues with the developer at 1045 Atlantic. Alvarez-1

I am not against development either. I understand the need for growth and housing. For example, I can back up a project like Chestnut Commons on Cypress Hills, which is 100% affordable. I ask all the decision makers to please reconsider your plans to up zone the north portion of Atlantic Avenue from Classon to maybe North Strand, or even at least up to Bedford Avenue.

I would like to invite councilmembers, Ossé and Hudson, and the city planner to our next community meeting at Lefferts Place. My number is (929) 351-1673. Again, we are not against development, right? As long as it's reasonable and it doesn't-… It’s gonna impact our area a lot. Parking is very difficult. Residents still have cars. It's safer than the trains. If we are going to bring a lot of influx of residents, our area is going to need friendlier parking rules and more adamancies. Thank you for your time.

01:14
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you for your testimony and for being here today. Thank you, Edwin our next speaker is Rosie Alvarez, to be followed by Elizabeth Dennis, to be followed by Darrell Nathan. Rosie Alvarez, you are our next speaker. You will be promoted to panelists in just a moment.

01:15
Rosy Alvarez

Hi! Good afternoon. Thank you for having me and having the other panelists here to share our thoughts and opinions.

Alvarez R-1

I just wanted to basically piggyback and add on to the last two speakers. I think one thing that has also slipped under the radar when it comes to development, and like the 10-year perspective of thousands of residents moving in, is the capacity of public transportation. In 2019, it was already very difficult to wait for the trains during peak hours, to safely stand on the platforms. There are people on the edge of the platform because it just wasn't space. It was very difficult to get on a train and get to work on time, because the trains would be packed. This is like, outside of relying on congestion pricing, like considering that in the 10 Year Plan there are thousands of people who are going to be moving in. That's also thousands of tax dollars. And there needs to be consideration into a public transport and just space on the trains, how often they run, safety, etc.

As previous speakers mentioned, a lot of people do drive in the area, and a lot of people like don't work in the city, but still live in… Like they work, you know, in Queens or Long Island, or wherever; and they live in Bed-Stuy or they live in Crown Heights, etc., and yeah. When trains aren't reliable, when buses aren't reliable, when those systems aren't safe, people drive. So, I know, like, this is a public transport city, not against high rise buildings, not against more housing, but if we are going to build higher density buildings, it very much needs to be deeply affordable, like 50% or more, but ideally more, if not the whole thing.

And yeah, just honestly like just facing a big emphasis on train safety as someone who was also just recently groped on the train. We can't. We just can't, like, we need safer ways of transporting, especially as the public population rises. There is also a homeless shelter that I think could use improved services. As the council members mentioned. There is a housing crisis. There is a homelessness crisis and people need help. And it's not just about developing for market rate departments, it's actually helping communities.

So, that's it for me, but thank you for the time.

01:17
Stephanie Shellooe(DCP)

Thank you very much for your comments and your testimony, and for being here today. Thank you. Our next speaker is Elizabeth Denys, to be followed by a Darrell Nathan, to be followed by Seth Rosenblum. Elizabeth Denys, you will be our next speaker.

01:18
Elizabeth Denys

Hello! My name is Elizabeth Denys. I currently live just a neighborhood outside of this effective area in Flatbush. I live car free there, and I also used to live in the affected area for the rezoning car free. I think it's a great place to create new housing opportunities that have really, really good access to transit and jobs both in Manhattan and in downtown Brooklyn where there's been a huge amount of job growth. I am also an open New York member leader for the Mid Brooklyn Chapter.

And I am, you know, really worried about my, you know myself, everyone, my friends, my former neighbors in the area, being forced to leave because of the rapidly rising cost of living throughout the city. But especially in this specific zone, and I am really excited about this plan and wanted to thank DCP, Councilmember Hudson, and everyone for leading this process.

Above everything else, I really want to focus on the need for this plan to generate lots of new homes. We need to create as much mixed income homes as possible to allow for the deepest possible affordability levels. I heard that so many times talking to people generally, but also throughout the AAMUP process, there's a been a huge call for deep affordability over the next decade. If we want to stop curb the displacement that's been discussed, and hopefully create opportunities for people who have been displaced to come back to their homes.

The proposed scope for AAMUP is a great start, but I am worried that it's not aggressive enough to support the most housing possible, especially hearing a desire from some people to make the eastern end of this project have even lower density. With how much, you know, the proposed… With the cross construction where it is, really high interest rates, no support from Albany, it's, you know, it's really hard to build new housing. Especially the kind of mixed income homes we need with deeply affordable homes, both to, you know, help integrate neighborhoods, but also to make sure we are building those deeply affordable homes that we keep hearing we need, and we need to do everything we can to build this. Denys-1

I think that a lot of the projects that have been approved recently on Atlantic Avenue and Pacific Street are going to allow for a denser development that gives even more homes and more deeply affordable homes than what's been proposed in this draft scope. So, I am hoping that DCP will explore the strongest possible changes. Making dense housing is so important for all the issues we've already lined up and have been discussed at this meeting, but also as we are moving towards a future where climate change is more and more imminent and more and more affecting our ability to need to live together so that we can be sustainable. I really hope that DCP will explore thinking about more density, so that there can be even more mixed income projects that would support those deeply affordable homes.

Thank you so so much for the time to testify today.

01:21
Stephanie Shellooe

Thank you. Perfect timing and thank you for being here today and your participation. Our next speaker will be Darrell Nathan, to be followed by Seth Rosenblum, to be followed by Vishnu Reddy. Apologies. Darrell Nathan, you will be our next speaker. You will be promoted to a panelist in just a moment and given the opportunity to share your testimony.

01:21
Darrell Nathan

Yes. Hello! Alright! Well, thank you for the opportunity to speak here. I am just pretty much bucking up along / piggybacking off what Mr. Alvarez said, about the high density buildings. I am also a resident of Leftist Place Block Association, and treasurer, and 4 year resident from the block.

And our main concern is just that the high density buildings they want to put up around the corner from my house where we already have issues with one of these buildings is going up that's on Atlantic Avenue right now where all these homeowners on that side of Atlantic Avenue are affected by these high density buildings. So, you know, that's our main concern right now is putting up these other buildings up there and the affordable housing, of course, that everybody's been speaking about. Nathan-1

That's pretty much it, you know, in our transportation system, you know, to be able to handle all these other people coming into the location, and the higher the buildings are, the more people that's going to be there.

So that's also a big concern. That's pretty much it. So pretty much on Mr. Alvarez covered a lot of stuff that I have to say. So, I am not going to be repetitious about it. Thank you.

01:23
Stephanie Shellooe

Thank you. Thanks for your testimony and for being here today. Our next speaker will be Seth Rosenblum, to be followed by Vishnu Reddy, ready to be followed by Thomas Huzi. Seth Rosenblum will be our next speaker. He'll be promoted to panelists in just a moment and given the opportunity to provide your testimony.

01:23
Seth Rosenblum

Hi! My name is Seth Rosenblum. I am a resident of Lefferts Place.

Rosenblum-1

I live directly adjacent to the AAMUP area and I wanted to touch on transit vastly, specifically around the Franklin Avenue Subway station. The C Stop on Franklin Avenue is currently limited by only having one stairway on each side for entrance and egress and that frequently leads to bottlenecks and lots of pedestrian traffic as is much less without adding, you know, 10,000 new people to the neighborhood over the next 10 years. As a potential mitigation in 2015, the MTA did a comprehensive line review of the A and C Subway lines, and one of their recommendations was to reopen the closed subway entrances that exist at Classon Avenue and Fulton Street. I wanted to, since that seems like an amazing mitigation for adding lots more people to the neighborhood, I wanted to urge DCP and the councilmembers to work with the MTA and with the State to secure funding and potentially push forward on reopening those subway entrances to allow for all these new residents and visitors, possibly having the same effect that, reopening the entrance on Bedford Avenue to the Nostrum Station had just a few years ago.

That's all. Thank you very much for your time.

01:25
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Great. Thank you for being here, and for that very specific recommendation our next speaker is Vishnu Reddy to be followed by Thomas Huzi, to be followed by Albert Gonzales. Vishnu Reddy, you are our next speaker. You will be promoted to panelists in just a moment. Hello! Hi! Welcome!

01:25
Vishnu Reddy

Hi! My name is Vishnu Reddy, and I am a resident of Brooklyn and a member of Open New York. I am excited about this plan and want to thank Councilmember Hudson and the Department of City Planning for their leadership on this process.

I am really concerned about our housing affordability crisis which results from our severe shortage of homes. I would love to spend the rest of my life in Brooklyn, but I am in my twenties, and I am very concerned that I'll not have a future in this city because of the unconscionable cost of living here. We need this plan to generate lots of new opportunities to create homes. Reddy-1

The proposed scope is a good start, but I am worried it's not enough to meet the moment we are in. I'd like to see this rezoning create the most mixed income housing possible with the deepest possible affordability levels. The high cost of construction, difficult interest rate environment, and lack of help from Albany has made affordable housing construction difficult. I believe that we can allow for more denser development than what has been proposed, and I urge the DCP to consider changes to maximize the opportunities for new homes in the area. This is especially important in this difficult environment for new residential construction, and it would increase the likelihood of more deeply affordable homes being built. Reddy-2

That's all my comments and thank you for your time.

01:27
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you. Thanks. Thanks for your testimony. We will move on to our next speaker, which is Thomas Huzi, to be followed by Albert Gonzales to be followed by Toby Hyde.

01:27
Thomas Huzi

Hello. Thank you. My name is Thomas Huzi and I am a lifelong New Yorker and resident of Brooklyn community District 2. I am very optimistic about the outcomes we can achieve for our community with AAMUP, and I would like to thank Councilmember Hudson for engaging with DCP to envision a sustainable future for the neighborhood.

I am speaking for myself and my family today, but I also have the privilege of serving on Brooklyn Community Board 2. Our board hears from a diverse set of voices in the community, but they're all unified on the critical need to address the housing affordability crisis in Brooklyn.

Every year, affordable housing tops the list of pressing issues facing the community district that we identify in our ledger process. We know that Community District 2 and the surrounding districts need to do everything in our power to create as much opportunity for new housing at all levels of affordability, especially at the deepest levels. We need to address the fundamental housing shortage that we've inherited. So, we can pass down a more affordable New York to our children, and preserve the beautiful and diverse New York City that I had the privilege of growing up in. Huzi-1

I believe the plan drafted by DCP as a positive start but will not go far enough to incentivize the creation of the deepest levels of affordability for existing and new residents of the area. We need to create as much mixed income housing as we can and the EIS should study what the highest level of density that is feasible for the area is.

Additionally, the EIS should study and identify what levels of density would maximize the potential for construction of mixed income housing and create that deepest level of affordability.

Thank you.

01:29
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you. Thank you for your testimony and for being here today. Our next set of speakers, Albert Gonzalez, to be followed by Toby Hyde followed by Andre Parker. Albert Gonzales, you are our next speaker. Hi welcome.

01:30
Albert Gonzalez (Local 79 Representative)

How are you doing? Look, my name is Albert Gonzales. I am a Local 79 organizer. I represent over 10,000 people, construction workers, a thousand who live in the area of which is being affected right now by this rezoning. You know, as an organizer right now, I am set up in in the Gowanus area, where there's a lot of construction going on with no wage standards. So, what that means is a lot of people working there are not making enough to, you know, survive for New York City. It's a city that, you know, the rising cost keeps going up and up and up but the wages are not going up with it.

Gonzalez-1

So, me as a representative Local 79, and representing all these workers that live in the district, we want to make sure that $40 minimum an hour is attached to all this construction work that's going on, and that will be going on in the rezoning because it is important, because I we always talk about you know what's going to happen 10-20 years from now, when people have to retire, when they become elderly. Are they going to have a good retirement? Are they going to have, you know, health benefits forever? Are they going to have, you know, enough savings in their accounts to keep living, you know. And the way I've seen, what happened in Juan is, you know, none of this thing is on… Most of these workers are not going to have these cause, you know, if you're getting paid $20-$25 an hour, what are you really coming home with after you have to pay your taxes after you have to pay healthcare, childcare, you know. rents are going up.

Gonzalez-2

There's not enough affordable housing in in the area. That's what we are doing to rezoning, you know, to bring more affordable housing. But until it does, rents are still sky rocketing, you know. There are more market rate apartments than affordable housing right now, and people just can't live off $20-$25 an hour.

So, it is imperative for our communities to have access to jobs that are paying them a minimum of $40 an hour, you know. We are not just talking, you know, letting contractors and developers say, Hey, you know, my staff is getting over $40 an hour. No, the construction workers have to be making $40 an hour. Because those are the people in this community that live in these communities that sometimes are being displaced, you know. They have to be making this money they cause anywhere they go. They have to be able to survive, you know, and $40 an hour minimum, is that number to be able to live in New York City and stay in the neighborhoods that that keep going up.

Gonzalez-3

That's it for today.

01:32
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you very much for your testimony and for being here today. Our next speaker is Toby Hyde to be followed by Andre Parker, to be followed by Gib Veconi. Toby Hyde, you are our next speaker.

01:33
Toby Hyde (Open New York Member/ Resident)

Good afternoon. This is Toby Hyde. Can you hear me? Yes. Great. Thank you. My name is Toby Hyde, I live in Crown Heights, immediately south of the AAMUP area and happily and safely within the big circle of the affected area. I am an Open New York member. I've lived in Brooklyn for 4 years and New York City for 25 years of my 41 or so, maybe 30 years of my 41 lost count.

I am here today because I am worried. I am sick of my friends leaving this part of Brooklyn. I am sick of my friends leaving the city and forced out because they can't afford to live here, sick of my seeing my friends have children and move to Westchester, move to Jersey City, move further away, because that's where they can afford housing. So, I am pretty excited about the Atlantic Avenue plan. I want to thank Councilmember Hudson and the Department of City Planning for leading this long process and getting us to this point.

And again, I just want to emphasize. I want to see this plan develop as much housing as possible, given its existing footprint. And it needs to develop new housing opportunities for all kinds of people. The proposed scope is an outstanding start, but I think we can make it more aggressive to create the most housing possible in this area. We wanted to create the most mixed income housing, the deepest affordability levels of the next decade. There's a lot of new development in this neighborhood now. You walk down Classon Street, you walk down Grand, you walk down Pacific, and some of those buildings already seem, I think, are denser than the density allowed in the AAMUP plan, and that doesn't make any sense. Hyde-1

So, we are already falling behind. In a sense, the contextual zoning that is that is coming to the neighborhood. So that suggests to me that that this area can support increased density. It has wonderful subway access, you can walk to the 2, the 3, the 4, the 5, the 6—Sorry not the 6th. The C, the Q Subway lines all in ten minutes. Wonderful subway access. So, I hope the DCP will explore the strongest possible housing elements to this plan and keep the existing density rather than lower it, or even, or even increase the density across the plan. The discrepancy between mid-block and avenues, I don't think is all that necessary and it's just lowering the number of units in the plan.

Emphasize again both an echo that both counselors call for increased streetscape safety, just south of the plan area, and then actually intersecting the plan. The city has reneged on some of its commitments to Underhill. So, we do need those and other improvements in this area as well.

Thank you very much for your time this afternoon.

01:36
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you. Thanks for your testimony and for being here today. Our next speaker is Andre Parker, who we are not seeing in the zoom room. Andre Parker, if you are watching on the YouTube live stream, feel free to pop over to the zoom. Not seeing Andre Parker, so we will go to our next speaker Gib Veconi to be followed by Andre Magnani and then we'll continue on with our registered speakers. So, Gib Veconi you are our next speaker. We will promote you to panelists and you will have the opportunity to share your testimony.

01:37
Gibralti Veconi (Community Member)

Thanks very much for the opportunity to testify this afternoon. My name is Gib Veconi. For the last 9 years, I've worked with Community Board aid, facilitating the M-Crown process that has been mentioned earlier. However, today I am just speaking for myself as a community member.

I appreciate the kind words that were made about Community Board 8 actions over the last 9 years to get us to this point. I would say that the best way to demonstrate that appreciation is to include in the proposed zoning what is the cornerstone of the M Crown plan, which is space set aside for light industrial community facilities and arts uses. The proposed zoning that we are that we are discussing now has no such set aside, so virtually all of the nonresidential space that will be created in the proposed buildings is going to be used for commercial retail and other uses that are not of the job creating character that is desired by the Community Board. So, I would like to amplify the calls from councilmembers Hudson and Osse to make sure a study of tailored uses is in scope for the EIS. Veconi-1

I would also like to echo their call that more needs to be done in terms of developing deeply affordable housing. The proposed zoning includes my MIH options, 1, 2, and 3; but in that in that environment, basically all developers would choose Option 2, which is not particularly affordable and certainly would not meet the needs of people in Community District 8 that are seeking affordable housing and are at risk of displacement today. Veconi-2

There's a significant amount of residential density that's going to be added to the neighborhood as a function of this project, and the neighborhood is already under served by open space in terms of the CEQR standards. So, I would like the EIS to consider how to provide additional open space, including potentially temporary public open space through the use of programs like open streets. Veconi-3

Finally, the proposed zoning also includes, or would enshrine the C6-3X zoning for 840 Atlantic Avenue. That zoning was approved earlier in a private rezoning contingent on commitments from its applicants to develop deeply affordable housing under MIH Option 3, to provide space for an arts organization and to provide height and setback limits. All of those agreements were supposed to be enshrined in a CBA that never happened. And so, I do not believe that this zoning should basically let the developers off the hook by enshrining the C6-3X zoning there. Instead, that zoning should be C6-3A like the rest of the frontage on Atlantic Avenue on that block. Veconi-4

I see my time is almost up, so thank you all very much.

01:40
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you. Thanks for your testimony, and if you have other comments, of course we welcome the written comments from anyone who spoke or did not have the opportunity to speak today. We will continue on with our speakers list with our next speaker, Andre Magnani, to be followed by Gino Murillo, to be followed by Ellen Liu Chan. Andre Magnani, you are our next speaker.

01:40
Gibralti Veconi

Hi! This is Gib again. Somebody is unmuting me. Not, Mr. Magnani. Maybe while you're waiting, I'll get in one more comment, which is that that the zoning that is proposed can be future proof against other changes in MIH that potentially will make more deeply affordable housing possible.

01:40
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

If that has concluded thanks, we'll go to our next speaker and Andre Magnani, it looks like you are unmuted. If you're able to share your testimony.

01:41
Andre Magnani (Community Member/Resident)

Hi! Can you hear me okay? Sorry. I was kicked out while joining. Hi, everyone. I am Andre Magnani. I am a member of Open NYC, but I am really here representing the interest of my family, and specifically my 2 year old daughter who I am raising in Brooklyn just 2 blocks from Atlantic Avenue. And my main concern, for her, for my family, for my community around me is that of affordability. And really, the way to drive that is to have ambitious projects. Right? And I think AAMUP is a step in the right direction. It's a fantastic initiative, and I applaud everybody here for engaging in it.

I wish it were more aggressive. Right? I wish we are shooting for greater density, more housing, and quicker approval of this project. Because really, that's the main concern of New Yorkers. Everyone I talk to is completely underwater in terms of like the amount of their budgets that they're they spend on rent. Ownership is a myth for my entire generation, and it's a dream that's out of reach for most. And really the main culprit of that is the fact that New York has not kept up with the demands that our vibrant economy and our community generates for housing. Right?

So that's my only request of everyone involved here is that we be ambitious about the speed at which we approve these projects, that more projects like AAMUP get approved quickly through these processes.

Magnani-1

That we hopefully together set aside most of our differences in terms of the specific wishes that we want for things, but rather focus on the number of housing units that we are generating for New Yorkers like myself, like my daughter, who I really wish is able to stay in her community when she grows up. That her friends are able to stay here, and that she doesn't have to join the millions of economic exiles that New York generates because of its high housing cost.

So, I really appreciate your time, and I'll yield back a few seconds.

01:44
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you. Thanks for your testimony and for being here today. Our next speaker is Gino Murillo, to be followed by Ellen Liu Chan, to be followed by Sarah Lazur. Gino Murillo, you will be our next speaker. We'll promote you to panelists in just a moment.

01:44
Gino Murillo (Local 79)

Hello! Hey! How are you guys doing? My name is Gino Murillo. I'm an organizer with Local 79. I am just here on behalf of all the members in that district.

Murillo-1

We would like to see this project be a 100 percent union. Also, when you guys speak about affordable housing to make it actually affordable housing. Local hiring is a real big plus. We want to see more people from the community working in the community and hopefully living in the community, stay living in the community.

Another issue is we want to make sure that all workers on construction job sites in New York City are paid $40 an hour, including their benefits. I can express how important it is for construction workers to have benefits. We are in one of the most dangerous industries out there and basically, that's it. I just want to make sure this project is a 100 percent union. Also, that you guys do local hiring. Get on board with this Construction Justice Act, which includes the $40 an hour plus benefits for construction workers in city.

That's pretty much it. Thank you and hope to see the project go up.

01:46
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you. Thanks for your testimony, and for being here. Our next speaker is Ellen Liu Chan, to be followed by Sarah Lazur, to be followed by our last registered speaker at the moment, Mark Facel. Ellen, we will promote you to panelists in just a moment, and you will be given the opportunity to share your testimony. For everyone who is considering wants to speak, please sign in on the registration page on NYC Engage at this time. Thank you.

01:46
Ellen Liu Chan (Saint Bartholomew's Church)

Hi, everyone. My name is Ellen Liu Chan. I am the asset manager at the Episcopal Diocese of Long Island. So, I represent the Episcopal Diocese interest on behalf of Saint Bartholomew's church, which is a through lot property that's on the edge of the map area.

Before I jump in, I just want to say that we are very excited about this effort, and you know we've stood by through the previous iterations of this. And you know we are very eager and optimistic that this has the kind of ammunition behind it at the hype around it, to really get through.

Specifically on Saint Bartholomew, as I mentioned that it's a through lot. It is also only on March property. Currently in its current state because it's landmark St Marks, it's more floor area than it can use in the northern portion of the lot, and under the rezoning it will have even more FAR. However, because it's already built in the Landmark, we can't use it and the southern part portion of our lot is in a different district. So, using the adjusted floor area ratio, some of that excess floor area can be transferred to the southern portion, but because it's a conceptual zoning district on the south side of the district ground or line, we are not able to use that excess floor area, either. It's the same issue transferring the excess floor area east or west. So, we are faced with this issue where you know, you guys are doing all this work, but we can't actually manifest it into more housing. So, what we are asking is for you all to consider a simplification in the process of obtaining bulk waivers, so that in that contextual district, those neighboring lots are able to use our landmark FAR, just both into east and to the west. So that we can really access and be able to create affordable housing projects. Since such waivers will be necessary to utilize floor area, we are asking that the scope of the EIS to study the possibility of the transfers to lots 1-5 and lots 21 on our block.

Chan-5

We are also suggesting a special provision in the AAMUP that would allow waiver by certification for the landmark that will build housing similar to existing provisions in the 47-711, but as a certification the alternative development scenarios that could be reviewed in the EIS for AAMUP would save the diocese a substantial amount of time and money and make it more accessible for us to be able to create that housing that we are all talking about here. This could potentially serve as a model for future special purpose districts as well. And I'm done. Chan-6

01:49
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Right at the buzzer. Thank you. Thank you for providing that testimony and those recommendations. I think that would be very helpful to have in writing, so that we can understand exactly what the recommendation is. But of course, we welcome all written comments. Our next speaker is Sarah Lazur, to be followed by Mark Facel, to be followed by another registered speaker, Kurtis Weatherford, who is now our last registered speaker. Sarah Lazur, you are our next speaker, we will promote you to panelist and give you the opportunity to share your testimony.

01:50
Sarah Lazur (Crown Heights Tenant Union/ Community Board 8 Member)

Hi! Good afternoon. Hi, my name is Sarah Lazur. I am a member of Crown Heights Tenant Union and a member of the Community Board 8.

So, if DCP Approves a neighborhood rezoning under existing MIH, which is the framework in the report, you are putting a target on the backs of all the low- and moderate-income tenants in this neighborhood, both rent stabilized and unregulated. This area has already seen lots of MIH rezoning apps and CHTU has seen an all-out assault on tenants in the vicinity. Landlords harassing and neglecting rent-stabilized tenants out with the goal of deregulating, and since 2019 they've continued, but with mass deregulation, through substantial rehabilitation, demolition plans, and also a lot of fraudulent market rate leases. Lazur-1

Unregulated tenants of which there are more and more ever since Atlantic Yards, In this particular area, they have no protection when the landlord wants a rent hike, and the landlord always cites the high rents nearby.

So, you know, I would recommend that this these displacement factors be substantially studied for the environmental impact statement or study, and I also recommend that you study rent burdens in the area and arrears, for example, I think it would be a good idea to requisition info from HRA who, you know, processes all sorts of applications for people who are at risk of losing their housing, people who are in housing court. Because tenants are hanging on by a thread, and I think a lot of our elected officials and the Department of City Planning would be astounded to see the rent burdens that tenants in this area are already dealing with, how tenuous their future ability to pay their rent already is, and just how much displacement risk they are currently facing.

It is intense in this area and when tenants in this area were invited to participate in the AAMUP process, we were told this is the way that we get housing that we can all afford, you know, housing that makes sense for you if you are actually potentially going to get pushed out of the neighborhood. This neighborhood has already, you know, the last census showed that 19,000 black people have been pushed out of this neighborhood, and it's not just people choosing to leave, it is because people been pushed out and tenants of color are the people who face the most intense pressure from their landlords and it is just something that we've observed, and there are ways to see it in statistics, and that I would urge the Department of City Planning to really dig into data that's going to show the true picture of displacement. And that's not always going to be obvious, when you are just looking at average incomes, because, as we know, the new buildings tend to be just affordable to people who don't currently live here. If you want to have this be a neighborhood where we are not getting pushed out, you need to build housing that we could potentially move into. Lazur-2

So that's all that I have to say. Thank you for listening to me. Thank you.

01:53
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you very much for your recommendations and your testimony today. Alright to our next speaker is Mark Facel to be followed by Kurtis Weatherford. Mark Facel, not seeing that person in our speakers list at the moment. Mark, if you are in the YouTube and interested in speaking, still, please switch over to the zoom. We will proceed with our next speaker, Kurtis Weatherford. Kurtis will promote you to panelists, and you will be given the opportunity to share your testimony.

01:54
Kurtis Weatherford (Resident)

Hi, there! Thank you for hosting this event. Today I just wanted to provide a quick testimony as a resident of this area just south of Atlantic Parkway. I walk through this area all the time. I am also struggling with having to pay far more than 30% of my income on rent and would love to see this area redeveloped into something that I could see myself walking around in, and I could be introduced to many new neighbors through. Weatherford-1

I am totally in favor of the high density mixed use planning along Atlantic Avenue and also very interested in some of the measures that have been proposed for redesigning that corridor.

Specifically, I often find when I am walking to and from the Nostrum stop on the A/C train, that roadway feels very, very dangerous. There are cars moving very fast on it, because it's just a canyon of warehouses and parking lots. There's no real reason for a driver to feel like they have to slow down. There are many times when I felt unsafe trying to cross that road, and some of the new traffic calming things proposed in this would be welcome and would make that area feel a lot safer, and also a lot more vibrant and warm and welcoming. So excited to see that happen, and very excited to see many, many more new housing units built in in this neighborhood. Thank you.

01:56
Stephanie Shellooe (DCP)

Thank you. Thanks for your testimony. And for being here today. That brings us to the end of our registered speakers list. So, if anyone is watching on YouTube, or any other way, and wishes to speak at this time, and you have not yet registered to speak. Please register online now, at this

time on our on the webpage, www.nyc.gov/NYCEngage. If we can go to the next slide, I believe we have a slide reiterating all of our sign-in protocols.

So, at this time, if you have not yet registered to speak, or if you had any technical difficulties that prevented you from speaking at this meeting. Please at this time dial into one of these toll free numbers and use the meeting ID and participant ID at the bottom of the screen. For assistance, or if you have not yet registered to speak and wish to please go ahead and take the opportunity to visit the upcoming meetings page on www.nyc.gov/NYCEngage to register to speak to this meeting. We will now take approximately 5 minute break to give the opportunity for anyone to call in and register or register through NYC Engage before we close out the meeting. So, we'll take a 5 minute break at this time, and reconvene at 4 PM. To hear from any new registered speakers. We'll see you all in a few minutes at 4 PM.

[5 Minute Break]

Alright, good afternoon and welcome back you are tuning into the remote public scoping meeting for the Atlantic Avenue Mixed Use Plan or AAMUP for the record. Again, the project CEQR number or City Environmental Quality Review number is 24 DCP 019K.

My name is Stephanie Shellooe, the director of the New York City Department of City Planning, Environmental Assessment and Review Division. We are currently on part 3 of the meeting where members of the public are invited to speak for up to 3 minutes and we were holding a 5 minute break to see if anyone who did not have the opportunity to register, to speak to have the opportunity to do so. In our break, we did not receive any new speaker registrants or anyone else join the meeting? So, at this time, if no one else wishes to speak, we will move ahead to close the public scoping meeting

For anyone who had difficulty providing testimony today, you are more than welcome to submit written testimony online by navigating to the public meeting page, www.nyc.gov/NYCEngage. If we can go to the next slide, I believe we have. This a reminder on how to submit comments. So again, email or mail to the addresses shown here 24DCP019K_dl@planning.nyc.gov or the mailing address shown here (attention to Stephanie Shellooe): 120, Broadway, 31st Floor, New York, New York, 10271. The deadline as a reminder for submitting comments is Friday, October 27, 2023, at 5 PM. It is currently 4:02 PM and this public scoping meeting is now closed. Thank you so much for everyone participating today and for taking time out of your busy day. Thank you.