cc: Reeves Dinerstein
Kapur Lenard
Slatkin

Katharina Kruse-Ramey
330 Wythe Ave
Brooklyn, NY 11211

Robert Dobruskin
Department of City Planning
Environmental Assessment and Review

CC: Howard Slatkin, Dept. of City Planning

RE: Testimony for the EIS for the proposed Domino Sugar Rezoning

Dear Mr. Dobruskin,

As a 16 year long resident of Williamsburg and Community Board 1
I would like to share my concerns regarding CPC's large residential development at the former Domino Sugar factory site.
I commend CPC for their commitment to affordable housing, to involving the Williamsburg community and to preserving the Refinery building as well as most likely the Domino Sugar sign.

I am however very concerned about the scale of the development. The proposed 2,400 units will bring 5,500 or more new residents into the 5 block area without adequate infrastructure and without CPC's offer to build the necessary infrastructure improvements.
A water taxi dock at Grand Street Ferry Park for a $10/ return trip to Manhattan will not transport more than a few hundred of the new residents. New York Water Taxi, just recently, suspended weekend service from Schaeffer Landing due to lack of passengers.

The drastic population increase as well as the out-of-scale high-rises will change the identity of the neighborhood and create pressure on the remaining small industrial businesses in the area. These businesses will be displaced. Several building owners on S. 2nd Street between Wythe and Kent Avenues have already applied for zoning variances.

City Planning promised the Williamsburg/ Greenpoint community a contextual zoning in the upland areas. With the recent 100-140 foot high luxury condominiums springing up everywhere and many more projects applying for zoning variances, like the 22 story Quadriad development, it will be increasingly difficult to retain the low-rise neighborhood character of Williamsburg.

CPC's argument that affordability requires 40 story towers on the waterfront and 14 story buildings on the upland area is unreasonable. I urge City Planning to demand alternative development options in the EIS that would include major reductions in height and density of the planned waterfront as well as upland blocks. The upland height and density bonuses given to CPC will set dangerous precedents for the immediate area.

CPC uses affordability as bait for receiving height and density bonuses which are inconsistent with the 2005 Greenpoint/Williamsburg Rezoning - especially on the upland blocks. It is necessary for City Planning to assure that this project benefits the neighborhood of Greenpoint/Williamsburg and not only CPC as developer and the lucky occupants of the 600 affordable housing units. CPC has cleverly managed to divide the neighborhood along socio-economic lines by pitting low income residents with their demands for affordable housing against middle-class residents who are in favor of preserving the low-rise and mixed industrial character of the neighborhood. Although there is a large need for affordable housing, the character of the neighborhood should be retained.

Furthermore, the Draft Scope does not include a study on the current, highly trafficked, truck route on Kent Avenue. Residents do not pay millions of dollars for luxury condominiums to then have 18-wheeler trucks race by their buildings. The applicant should include a truck traffic study for Kent Avenue.

The proposed scoping area is too limited in its radius. The scope area with a massive project like the "New Domino" should be expanded to the same area as the 2005 Greenpoint/Williamsburg rezoning.

CPC should also assess the visual impact its current design will have on views of the Williamsburg Bridge from nearby streets. While it is wonderful that CPC is planning to open up the view corridors to the East River, the proposed project will significantly impair views of the bridge structure.

City Planning needs to address the adverse effects of this development in relation to the residents of Community Board 1, make provisions to retain the existing industrial uses in the project zone and ensure that the applicant's project will not substantially change the character of our neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

K. Kruse-Ramey

Katharina Kruse-Ramey