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SHAH ALLY: All right, good evening, so with that being said, I call the meeting to order.

So the announcement was made that translation service is available. We're going to make an announcement again at 8:00, the meeting is called to order at 7:08, around 8:00 p.m., we will make another announcement that anyone who came in after this point that if they need Spanish translation, it's available. If you can help me out, if you see someone, for some reason it comes to your attention that someone needs the translation your neighbor someone sitting next to you, could you please remind them or tell them that the translation is available, and it's over here, the equipment, and the actual translation.

So, if you could help us do that, that would be great.

This is the Executive Committee meeting. I will explain the rules of the Executive Committee meeting. Many folks asked online for an explanation, but we are also having it being transcribed, so that at the end of this meeting, the minutes will be posted on our website and you will have it available for you. So, Jamie is our stenographer. So, for Board members, Executive Committee members, when you speak, if you can, at the initial point, if you remember at each point to identify yourself. We know who you are, I know who is speaking, but for the record, we
want to make sure the record is clear. Just identify yourself. If you forget to, don't be alarmed if I remind you just to state your name. And as the evening goes on, I think Jamie will figure out who's who and we won't be repetitive.

Tonight's the Executive Committee meeting. I will spend two minutes explaining the Executive Committee meeting since folks have had a lot of questions regarding Executive Committee meetings, and I want to tell you, the two-and-a-half years sharing this board, we've never had this kind of turn out at an Executive Committee meeting. So it's rather special to have all of you here tonight. All of you should be here every month when we have the Executive Committee meeting.

The Board has 10 standing committees and those are the subject-matter committees. So I look around the room and I'm pretty sure you've been to either a Land Use Committee meeting, a Licensing Committee meeting. These deal with the subject matter that that committee denotes. And you've seen in the last 60 days, if not more, that each of these that's standing committees, the subject-matter committees have taken on this application and as it relates to their subject matter. If it's a Parks issue, it will go with Parks. Whether it's Public Safety, as such.

The Executive Committee is designed to deal with
procedural, administrative issues of the Board. So we set
the agenda, we set calendars and we deal with other such
issues. If it's a substantive matter and time permits, that
those issues are sent to a committee.

Now, "time permits" is the operative word here. If
for some reason, and if you've ever been to a committee
meeting, where there's a resolution that needed to be passed
and a quorum was not reached in that committee, the
committee cannot take official action. Official action is
needed before a resolution is passed. Those actions come to
these types of committees and this explanation is worth it.
I want everybody to leave here understanding why we are
operating this way. Or if the committee could not meet, and
in this case, the Land Use Committee did not meet because of
the snow storm. That forced cancelations of many meetings,
including the Land Use Committee meeting.

We are on a very tight non-flexible timeframe to
get a resolution passed and submitted under the ULURP
application. If everything worked out in a perfect world,
we would have been reviewing and revising that resolution at
this point. But we still don't have a committee resolution,
so we're under a very tight timeframe.

The most important for everyone who's asked the
question, is not really what does an Executive Committee do,
is why is there no public comments at the Executive
Committee meeting. This is akin to in the best way that our
parliamentarian Jim Berlin, Jim show everyone who you are.
I mean, this is Jim Berlin. The guy just looks wise,
doesn't he? He's a very wise member of the Board and I
asked Jim, you know, what can we do about this? And Jim
reminds me that the Executive Committee is, I think all you
have been to a general meeting, it's like the business
section of the general meeting where public is encouraged to
attend and all of you should attend and be active licensors
in that way. But the business of it is done by the
committee -- Executive Committee and the members of the
Board.

So, it's not -- it's not a choice to stifle or not
hear from you, in fact I think we've heard from a lot of you
from a public hearing, a committee meeting hearing, and in
the sum total a lot of that is a lot of "Community Board 12,
we want you t do this, or Community Board 12, don't do
that". So tonight this our chance to tell you let us do
that work. There is where that work is going to happen.

So tonight we will have -- we will begin with a
discussion on the Inwood rezoning application. As it goes
through the Land Use Committee, there will be a vote tonight
on a committee resolution. It will be an Executive
Committee resolution. That's not a special rule. It just
happens when a particular committee could not meet and to
pass a resolution, it becomes a community resolution with
the caveat it came from this particular committee, it's
coming from the Land Use committee. After that vote, that
becomes the committee vote. That committee vote gets
ratified in some form to the Board's position on March 20th
of 2018. That's the full Board.

So tonight the Executive Committee will be voting
on this matter. We have participation from the Board
members, so just so you understand what we're doing.

Before.

I turn over to the substance of tonight's, or at
least first item we're dealing with, I would like to
introduce the members of your Executive Committee. Most are
sitting at this table. If not, I will look around the room
and make sure I highlight everyone.

First we have our First Vice Chair, Richard Lewis.
A round of applause please. All right. All right. He's
also chair of our Public Safety Committee.

Sitting next to him is Jason Compton, our Treasurer
and Chair of our Business Development.

Sitting next to Jason is Jim Berlin, our Board's
Parliamentarian and one time former Chair of this Board.

Jim Berlin.

I'm going to skip the individual next only because
I have a special word to say about him and his committee.
We have Mitchell Glenn, who is our Board Secretary.

Ebenezer Smith, who's District Manager. And I think everyone of you here had contact with Ebenezer Smith.

We also have Paola Garcia and Ely Silvestre here from our Board.

And then we have Betty Lehmann, who is our assistant secretary. Betty clearly is the fan favorite in the room.

We have Ayisha Oglivie which is our Chair of our Housing committee.

Fern Hertzberg, concerning the Aging committee.

Did I leave any Chairs out?

We have Richard Allman, Chair of the LGBTQ Task Force.

Anyone else? Okay. And now, you know, the issue I think what brought all of us here is a Land Use issue, and we're going to be deal with it now. The Land Use Committee has done a tremendous job. Even folks who have been most critical of this Board have unified in one position and say the Board has done a good job through this application. That's through the Land Use Committee. So, the Land Use Committee members, could you please identify yourselves; either raise your hand, stand. Land Use Committee members. A round of applause please for the work that they've done.

And a special acknowledgment to the head of that
committee who's done a tremendous amount of work drafting the resolution. We will be talking about, I think started by Wayne and drafted in different forms. Wayne has, in the most expert professional courteous way, run that committee and handled this issue. So a big round of applause for Wayne Benjamin for all he's done.

So, I think the stage is set. I think we're all, you know, figuring it out. But I also want to acknowledge the work of the public. A lot of you have given us a lot of work. You've given us data, whether it's written testimony, whether it's through the public hearing, whether it's through alternative plans. And the Board has heard from all of you in that way and there was one, really not just one, but one really impressive presentation that caught my attention at the Land Use meeting that was presented by one of a -- calling out names is a very tough thing to do because you might leave someone out, I don't mean to leave anyone out -- I was just really impressed with the presentation by Paul Epstein, David Tomlin (ph) and Graham Ciraulo.

So, a round of applause for them as well. And really for all of you, and if your name wasn't called, just know that we truly appreciate the level of work that was done by the community as well.

Okay, the lineup is set. Let's play ball. We are
now going to our first agenda item which is, by the way, depending on where we are in the agenda, you see the agenda is full, we have to get through matters. If we get to a point where we cannot, we might move those to the general meeting and adjourn at that point. It's now 7:17. We hope to and endeavor to for the Executive Committee members and the Board members to have a vote on this issue on a motion, whatever the motion is, a vote on this motion by 8:45 p.m., no later than 9:00 p.m.

Drafts of this resolution have been circulated. I trust that you've all read it. It's detailed. It was detailed on purpose, and the subject matter is a very complex one. The resolution reflects that. If there are any questions, I ask the that questions be reflective of the amount of work that's already been done to get it here and Board Members, Executive Board Members, please we don't need any pot stirrer's or devil's advocate. We have enough of those. So, once it gets to the points of questions.

With that being said, we're dealing with the Inwood rezoning application and the analysis and the discussion. I call to the podium, Land Use Chair, Wayne Benjamin.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Thank you, Shah.

For the stenographer, my name is Wayne Benjamin. I'm the Chair of the Land Use Committee. Before I begin, I just want to let Executive Committee, the Land Use and other
Board members understand what this resolution is and is not. You will recall that the ULURP Application and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement were both released statements for --

PUBLIC MEMBER: Can't hear you back here.
PUBLIC MEMBER: Speak closer to the mike.
PUBLIC MEMBER: Closer to the mike.
WAYNE BENJAMIN: Can you say that one more time?
Do you want me to speak closer to the mike?

So, as I was saying, I just wanted to go into a little detail about what this resolution is and is not. The ULURP Application and the draft environmental impact statement were each released at the same time for review, but they're on different clocks. As Shah pointed out, the Community Board's 60 day clock for reviewing and commenting on the ULURP application ends on, I believe, March 25th or the 26th, which is why we moved up the date of the general meeting to the 20th because our general meeting would've happen after the clock ends.

The DEIS application, on the other hand, is not on a 60 day clock. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be subjected to a public hearing that is called by the Department of City Planning once the ULURP application reaches it. To give you a sense of the timing, once the ULURP application is certified, it comes to the Community
Board for 60 days, it then goes to the Borough President for 30 days. After that, it goes to City planning. So basically, 90 days after it's released, it goes to City planning and 10 days, I believe, after it gets to the City planning is when that public hearing is held.

So, the month of March, Community Board 12 is focused on getting a resolution finalized and passed so that we can respond to the ULURP Application. In April we will be focused on a resolution for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement so that when that public hearing is probably early to mid May, we have a document to present to that. So, this resolution does not address in detail the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It mentions that we commented on the scoping. It mentions that we will comment in a separate resolution on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This is focused on the five actions that are of the ULURP application.

I do say the five actions because over the space of more than a year that we have discussed this, as I was drafting this, I realized that most of the actions received very little attention, so what this resolution seeks to do is first layout some of the facts of what's in the application, what it's calling for, and then there was a section that deals with the special zoning district which is doing a lot. It is modifying what is possible in rezoning.
We also did not discuss that in great detail, so you will see where -- what that section pertains to is covered.

In pooling together this resolution, the Land Use Committee will remember that probably in December or January, there was a draft of some of the critical points that we have heard that could form the basis of an initial resolution. So working from that document, working from various comments received from attending committee meetings, working from some of the documents that were submitted to us as, you know, alternate plans and comments from members of the community, this was initially drafted. We then got comments from additional committee chairs.

There were several versions of this. I am sorry it went from nine pages to 14 pages. That's because we keep adding things, because at the end of the day, it is not only a Land Use Committee resolution. The core of it is the Land Use Committee, we've had input from Health and Environment and Housing and Human Services from the Business Development, to Licensing, to Youth and Education. So the rezoning touches many aspects of the community, therefore, so does the resolution.

It's also important to remember and Andrea and I were just talking about that, I often caution resolutions that are responding to ULURP and the BSA applications that stray from the issues that that particular agent has
jurisdiction over. However, in this case, we were advised by EBC and we took that seriously, that it’s not just the ULURP application that we are commenting on. The action plan sets the stage for us to give the City our opinion on how to invest funds over a 10 or 15 year period and we are directed to some of the other communities that the City has agreed to in connection with rezoning. So, there’s a whole section of this resolution that is not focused on modifications or commenting on the rezoning, per se, focusing on programs, probabilities and initiatives that we want the City to focus on over the course of implementing this and say it’s over the course of the next 10 years.

So those programs, projects and initiatives to range from affordable housing to schools and parks and economic development, but I must say, we should not forget that this application began strong focusing on economic development, and as we were crafting this and trying to figure out where to address issues that is pertaining to poverty, I mean, that is not an issue that is focused on developing the affordable housing. It's more, you know, job training, vocational training, attracting businesses, ensuring that local residents have, you know, access to those jobs. So it touches on just about every committee. You will start to see every concern that we have at the Community Board.
What I will not do is read the 14-page resolution, because as I've said, the Land Use Committee's probably had it for, you know, 10 days or more. We made sure, the Executive Committee got it at the beginning of this week because we knew it was absolutely ridiculous for them to get a, you know, 10-12 page document at the meeting and, you know, be able to read that and, you know, since distributing it to the Executive Committee, we've received some additional edits and I think everything received as of, you know, 11:00 last night is, you know, in here. And some of it is massaged because there are some issues that were presented as Housing issues, but when you looked at the resolution, there was economic development jobs and they fit better there. There were some issues that were submitted by multiple committees, so we kind of merged it so we didn't have duplications.

But that's an overview of, you know, what this document represents and so I would ask, you know, the Land Committee members who had have had it for the longest, Executive Committee and Chairs who have commented, if there are particular items, that we need to add, massage.

SHAH ALLY: So, for the record, could you, certainly not read into the record the document, we all have it, but at least give us the first resolve, so that we know --
WAYNE BENJAMIN: Actually, that is an important point and Liz Ritter who is not here, made the observation that we have created a fifth type of resolution. Because in our past meetings, we've discussed that typically with the ULURP or BSA, you know, there are four ways we can respond. We can say we approve it. We can say that we approve it with conditions. We can say that we disprove it, or we can say we disapprove with conditions. This is, to some extent, a fifth version because we're saying that, you know, okay we analyzed the plan. There are aspects of it that we don't like, or aspects of it that we do like. And we're saying not to the EDC, we're saying to Department of City Planning and to the City Council, we're saying that intentionally, because we inquired who has the authority to change the plan, and the two entities that have the authority to change the plan the Department of City Planning and the City counsel.

So, we're saying to them, on the very first resolve is on a page somewhere in here --

PUBLIC MEMBER: Eight.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Eight. Well, it depends on what version you're looking at; right? We're saying CB12 does not support the Zoning Map amendments as proposed and recommended by the City Planning Commission and the City counsel modify the Zoning Amendments as follows: And there
are seven amendments.

- Modify, as needed, R7-A zoning proposed for the Upland Core to address Holy Trinity church's development plans.

- Revise the zoning proposed for the C8-3 area west of Broadway to ensure that maximum building heights do not compete with view corridors to and from The Cloisters and Fort Tryon Park and Inwood Hill Parks and to allow for the adaptive reuse of existing buildings for a mix of commercial, retail, and community facility uses, in addition to new residential development.

- Reduce the maximum building height allowed for new construction in the Commercial U to avoid competing with view corridors in the Cloisters and to relate more sympathetically to existing buildings.

- Reduce the height of buildings in the Upland Wedge between 10 to 12 stories with exceptions of buildings along Broadway between 215th and 218th Street where the maximum building height should be limited to eight stories.

- Revise the zoning proposed for the Upland Wedge to avoid reducing the allowable commercial FAR at 5030 Broadway, and making self-storage businesses nonconforming.

- Reduce the maximum building height of construction in Tip of Manhattan and the Sherman Creeks sections of the rezoning area to relate to the scale of
Dyckman Houses.

- Reduce the maximum height allowed for new construction in the Upland Wedge, Upland Core, Tip of Manhattan to ensure that there is no visual encroachment to or from, or shadowing, the Inwood Hills or Isham Parks.

So that first resolve is dealing with only one of the actions. That is the zoning mapped amendments. There are zoning -- just to go to through the first page -- there are Zoning Map Amendments. There are Zoning Text Amendments. That also include establishing the Special Zone District. There's site disposition authority. There's site acquisition authority, and there's designation for certain sights as Urban Development Action plans.

Those are the five actions. So what we've talked about for the last year or so is the Zoning Map Amendment and we really haven't talked about the four others, so that resolve deals with the Zoning Map Amendment and you will hear from that in every case we are talking about, you know, reducing building heights to avoid conflict of view corridors and also having the new buildings that are allowed and understand that a rezoning is not a development plan. And we point out this rezoning includes a particular development project. For the most part, it is changing the law that governs what can be built where.

So, the Zoning Map Amendments, we are saying that,
you know, we don't really accept those and we want the City Council and the City Planning Commission and change it and change it as we've identified.

In addition to the modification for the Zoning Map Amendments, we want the City to enact legislation that would limit within the rezoning areas the size of new retail establishments, with the exception of the supermarkets, to approximately 3,000 square feet. That was an issue that was important to both, I guess, Licensing and to the Business Development Committee.

We do support the Text Amendment to establish a Waterfront Access Plan. That's something we have been talking about since Sherman Creek. For those of you who remember Sherman Creek. That was probably 10 or 12 years ago.

We support the Text Amendment to establish the Special Zoning District which actually allows a lot of flexibility to modify things, with the exception that any modification to parking, must be subject to a project-specific parking study to assess the impact of reducing that.

We support the Zoning Text Amendment for mandatory inclusionary housing on the condition that the affordable housing developed must be affordable at local affordability levels, and there's an entire paragraph that defines local
affordability. And we do that by not only citing the AMI of Washington Heights and Inwood, but also the income range from those residents who make 30 percent and below, and that's about 28 percent of the population. To those that make 100 percent AMI or more. That's about 27 percent. We constantly hear "affordable to whom". It's an easy question to answer by simply going to the demographic; looking at who lives here, what income they make and saying okay, this is the income range for which affordability in this area makes sense.

We also point out, if you look at the lower 50 percent, that is where there is the greatest need. So we're defining affordability, but we're also saying to air the greatest need is on the lowest tier. That's not to say there isn't need elsewhere. If we're prioritizing the project, we're saying this is where the greatest need is.

What are the other critical things. We're asking for HPD and the Mayor's Office to require that any residential development on City-owned property is a hundred percent affordable in an income range that makes sense for Inwood residents.

Also asking for EDC, HPD and the Mayor's office to require any development built under MIH to use the affordability option. That requires deep affordability.

I will say what's interesting is I attended, some
of you may be aware, the SOMOS conference in Albany. At
that, there was a presentation by the council person
representing the South Bronx and the council person
representing the Jerome Avenue area. Each of those have
just gone through rezoning, and they include MIH, but they
include at the local person's insistence the MIH option, of
3 which there are three, that requires deep affordability.

Also one of the things that I learned in attending
the most recent Housing Human Services Committee meeting,
which was also echoed by the council is, if you have a dowel
under MIH that also uses HP subsidies, you're required to
add an additional 15 percent of the units at permanently
affordable, which really means 40 percent of the units have
to be permanently affordable. So, we're saying City-owned
land is to be a hundred percent affordable. MIH -- we would
want to see the MIH option that requires deep affordability
and we're saying we are encouraging the City have HPD
allocate subsidies to any MIH deal, so that would trigger
the requirement for the additional affordability.

What else are we saying. We support the Site
Disposition and Site Acquisition required to facilitate the
waterfront development.

We do not support the Site Disposition and
Acquisition or the UDAA and UDAAP applications to facilitate
the development the affordable housing.
Basically that is the Inwood Library project. Not saying that we are for or against the project. We're saying all of those actions should be evaluated separate and apart from this rezoning.

On the other hand, we said that a year ago. You probably weren't listening.

We're calling upon EDC and the Mayor's office to engage the Landmarks Preservation Commission. We point that preserving neighborhood character is not just a matter of contextual zoning. It also includes historic designations. This Board has been supportive of that and we have passed a number of resolutions asking Landmarks to look at a number of proposals -- not saying it has to do with one of them -- look at them seriously and pull from those and very strong proposal. Although LPC has done nothing so far as that, you know, I think we want to know who are leading this rezoning to engage Landmarks and have them work on that.

And we also want EDC and the Mayor's office and Landmarks Preservation Commission to give priority attention to both areas of significance of African and Native American heritage. To ensure that working with DOT and others that there's way-finding signage and those spaces are memorialized and they have access to those spaces.

We want the City to engage the MTA so that, you know, MTA, not the City of New York controls the capital
program for the subways and we've identified a number of things we want to happen with that, but we want to have MTA brought into this. For Sherman Creek, there was an interagency task force that needed to be created. MTA needs to be part of that.

We're looking for neighborhood-wide traffic and pedestrian safety study. We're look for neighborhood-wide public health and safety studies. We're asking for the City specifically Department of City planning to, this year, before the end of 2018 to commence the actions to start the rezoning that CB12 asked them to do in 2012 and in 2016. And that was a contextual rezoning of an area that's basically from 181st Street to Academy, so it would overlap this geographic area. And the reason that area was picked is that was the area within which we were receiving multiple, typically BSA applications, for buildings that were two and three times the size as the regular width permitted by zoning.

So we've pointed in the out in the resolution this Inwood rezoning is not something that originated with the committee, but because of that, what we did ask for a contextual zoning in a different geographic area. For specifics reasons, that has not been acted on but, we want that to be acted on, we want the action to begin this year.

We are also, I think I've hit the high points. In
addition to all the rezoning stuff following up on the advice that there are investments to be made. We have listed what are now, I think 35 programs, projects and initiatives that we want to see implemented as far as the Inwood NYC Action Plan.

So, with that, Shah, have I given a sufficient overview of what's in here?

SHAH ALLY: So, let's now -- so for everyone's edification, drafts have been sent out. This is something very important.

PUBLIC MEMBER: We can't hear you, Shah.

SHAH ALLY: But I can hear you. Just for everyone's edification. I'm going to take some question and Wayne will answer them. Or not. There is copies -- the Executive Committee has a copy, members have copy of the draft resolution, Board members have a copy of draft resolution, I think some members of the public have a copy. This is very important: It's not final. Nothing is final until the Board votes on it. It's not even final once I sign it. That's not even final. It's final when the Board ratifies it. If you hold on to a copy a version of it and you say "well, my version is different from what was passed". I'm going to tell you you had a draft.

So, if you have it, just be careful. It happens a lot. Whenever one change is made, that version that change
is made to has now been outdated. So just be careful about
that because folks will hold onto this so if you have a
question, ask. Okay?

Before we get to the questions, I would like to
acknowledge other members of the Executive Committee.
Isidro Medina who is our Second Vice Chair and also chair of
our Licensing Committee. And also thank you to Nancy
Preston for posting on Facebook: "The Licensing Committee
did its business in an efficient way. Less than an hour."
Right, so it wasn't the most articulate way -- can you
strike that from the record please. Work was done.

Anyway, Andrea Kornbluth is representing the Health
and Environment Committee, on behalf of Steve Simon. So
Andrea is here.

Fe Florimón, Youth and Education.

Natalie Espino representing Parks and Cultural
Affairs.

Yahaira Alonzo for Traffic and Transportation.

And equally important are the Boards Members, so
Board members if your name hasn't been called, tell the
public who you are. They deserve a round of applause. I'm
going to ask you to please give them a loud round of
applause because the Executive Members vote on this
resolution now, but come the general meeting on Tuesday
March 20th, and there are calendars with the address on it.
And, please, there is a hundred person capacity, so get there early to get your seat. That doesn't apply for Board members, but you still have to be there. Okay?

Come to the Board meeting on the 20th. We all have the same vote. So the vote of the Chair is the vote of everyone else. If you vote or don't vote, we still have one vote, so, at the time the general meeting, so questions? I will keep a list.

Pursuant to Robert's list we will keep a list. Are there any questions? We will start with the Executive Committee. Going to Board members. Richard Lewis.

RICHARD LEWIS: I'm a little concerned about the --

PUBLIC MEMBER: Speak in the microphone please.

RICHARD LEWIS: It's a great job on the reso, I want to be a little clear on something, and that is in terms of MWBE affordable housing developers. I want to make sure that somehow we are encouraging their participation. They are extremely, very small number, so.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: That's good enough. We will work something out. I will.

RICHARD LEWIS: Okay, so that was an alternative.

SHAH ALLY: Jason Compton.

JASON COMPTON: Again, thank you all. This is about the committee recommendations have been put in. One issue came up with number nine, we were trying to help --
WAYNE BENJAMIN: Number nine in what?

JASON COMPTON: This is page eleven, number nine.

So the idea was we were trying to protect local businesses that might be subject to demolition and construction lease clauses and number nine says to enact legislation to protect them. But we feel like that might be a problem because these landlords -- it is a contractual agreement that they sign initially, so I don't know how legal that may be. But as an alternative, we would propose that possibly we can ask for the apportion of City-owned land allocated for businesses displaced due to --

WAYNE BENJAMIN: I think we asked that question. Is it the land or is it the retail space in the new developments, because the land would be vacant?

JASON COMPTON: New development, because I just enacting legislation for that, I feel like is going to be useless because they are on a contractual agreement when they sign for these construction leases. And these demolitions clauses. You know, they go to court and nothing's going to happen. So I feel if the City can allocate land -- I'm sorry, not land, the new developments, force people that have been displaced due to the demolition clauses. That might be better wording.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Okay.

SHAH ALLY: Anyone else? So Barbara and then
BARBARA FRAZIER: I just wanted to ask about the issue about Holy Trinity church. I guess this would be on page five, is it, or is it page four? And --

WAYNE BENJAMIN: You want to know what the issue is?

BARBARA FRAZIER: Yeah. About some sort of exception on the zoning, or what that was about? I'm just -- please fill us in.

SHAH ALLY: Thank you. For the record, it is Barbara Frazier.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Holy Trinity Church came to the Lands Committee about a year ago to introduce to us their plans for doing development on property in and around there and they pointed out it was going to be a long process. At the last meeting the, I think, interim vigor presented and also sent a letter that currently the site like the area zoned R-72 which has similar residential density as R-7A, but for a community facility, they were looking at it as a mixed use development.

If everything is a blanket R-7A, the same way it is a blanket R-72, that would dramatically reduce their ability to have a mixed used developments. So I guess they were not as involved in discussions and they were not very vocal. I think they are moving at a slower pace. So the idea is to
blanketly apply R-7A.

There needs to be a further thought and further discussion, you know, with them to see what their plans are and what might be a more appropriate contextual zoning district that would allow them to do something that is mixed-use density, but would still fit in. You know we talked about when Community Board 9 did its rezoning and we refer to it as a patchwork quilt, because it too has a blanket R-72 with a build environment that didn't match R-72 zoning. So they tailored the zoning to the existing build forum. So on do you know suit avenue by has landmark brownstones, they down-zone on Riverside Drive, which you know has 12-14 story prewar buildings.

Basically they kept the same density and contextuels. They tinkered on Broadway 145th Street, so there's nothing -- nothing blanket in, in, you know, CB-9. It's really tailored to the individual build forum and we were seeing a little bit of that -- actually a lot more than a little bit of that. I think Andrea also pointed out within that area, you know, individual small private houses that R-7A that would allow or even encourage much bigger buildings, so maybe we want to target something in those areas that is more appropriate.

So we're saying for Holy Trinity because we know about that particular project because it was brought to our
attention, but we also know in terms of building forum. While R-7A works for most the buildings, there are some building that are -- they're not brownstones. They're good size houses, and you want something that's more appropriate.

BARBARA FRAZIER: My issue is that that property is right in the view corridor for the Cloisters. And if you -- if the R-7A does limit height, and if you're talking about a different zoning for that particular property, I would be concerned that that would somehow, especially with community space involved, suddenly that you fighting against 14-15 stories on that.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Well, not necessarily. We're not endorsing any particular project. We have not been presented with any project, although the church I think has been very open with the community and they are, you know, interested in coming back and talking to them about there. Any contextual district will limit heights and I think what actually might be interesting is, as I pointed out, Special Zoning Districts, allow you more flexibility, like, you may be able to cover more site area than normal, so I we think we need to see what is they are proposing by way of mixed-use development. See what that would look like in terms of the bulk and height and see what is an appropriate, you know, Contextual Zoning District that can accommodate that and not do the kind of things that you are saying.
I mean it should be clear from the number of places in the resolution where we are talking about protecting view corridors and not obstructing views, that is something that is of interest and importance to us.

BARBARA FRAZIER: Okay.

SHAH ALLY: Yahaira is next. Before -- Richard has the mike and will walk the mike over, Wayne's presentation of the -- Wayne's presentation of the resolution is the motion to approve it. So we need a second of that motion before we continue with that section.

JAMES BERLIN: I second the motion.

SHAH ALLY: For the record, that's Jim Berlin and Isidro Medina. Now this will continue the discussion as on that motion.

YAHAIIRA ALONZO: So Wayne, I wanted to see if you can elaborate or make clear for me on the second whereas subsection 9.

PUBLIC MEMBER: What page?

YAHAIIRA ALONZO: Second page. Second whereas, Roman numeral nine and 10 and 11. It's particularly 11, because it says reduce off-street parking requirements for residential uses. I don't know. Can you elaborate? I think parking is an issue.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: You will recall that when I went through the be it resolved, that's one of the things that is
permitted or called for in this Special Zoning District. We're saying we are supportive of discussions of zoning the district, however, when it comes to reducing parking, we want there to be a project-specific study to assess the impact of that. So we're not saying out of blanket that it's okay to do that.

YAHAIIRA ALONZO: Okay. Also did you have a chance to look into like residential parking only?

WAYNE BENJAMIN: What does that mean?

YAHAIIRA ALONZO: You know, where only residents of certain area or particular neighborhood can park, street parking?

OSI KAMINER: Can I elaborate on this?

SHAH ALLY: For the record, it's Osi Kaminer.

OSI KAMINER: Osi Kaminer. So, in a section that proposed to be R, R7 having residential parking only six p.m. to 6:00 a.m. --

WAYNE BENJAMIN: On the street you're talking about?

OSI KAMINER: Right. So we had, in 2016 I believe, we had a resolution about MIH and we talked extensively about parking issues. So to address that, having residential parking only in the R-7 area which are not the commercial overlay, will be something very helpful.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: I would point out that would have
been a great suggestion --

PUBLIC MEMBER: Speak up please.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: You're asking if I had the
opportunity to look into that and Land Use would not
necessarily be the one looking into that. We are looking to
the committees to feed their particular recommendations, you
know, into us. So in terms of traffic and transportation,
if that was something that was discussed on a committee and
forwarded as a recommendation, you know, that should've come
up. I mean, you can still type of it up and send it to me,
but no it's not something I looked for to.

SHAH ALLY: So in the queue we have Ayisha.

OSI KAMINER: Can we add it? Can we make a motion?

WAYNE BENJAMIN: We don't need a motion. You can
simply either state or quickly type up what that language is
and send it so we can include it.

YAHaira ALONZO: Okay.

SHAH ALLY: For the record --

AYISHA OGLIVIE: Oh, Ayisha Oglivie, Chair of

Housing and Human Services.

First of all I want to applaud Wayne Benjamin for
putting together a very -- a document that I think
represents the spirit of definitely what comes out of the
Housing Human Services Committee, having all reviewed all of
the dimensions that fall in our purview. However, I wanted
to question on page number 12, where it states on line 20, undertake capital improvement projects to modernize electrical/gas. So basically saying the City does not make capital improvements to the electrical and gas system, that is Con Ed's responsibility.

From my understanding, there are quite a few issues that Con Ed is backlogged, I would say, in addressing in our community and while those matters are their responsibility, where does the city's responsibility come in when they are not in a timely fashion addressing those issues? And how can we basically invoke that?

WAYNE BENJAMIN: I would point out that the next line in red that says the City does not make capital improvements, is actually a comment from a Board member. It's actually not part of number 10. But Richard wanted to say something.

RICHARD LEWIS: The Public Service Commission would handle the enforcement of that with complaints.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: I mean, remember, we are here saying that whether it is the City's -- whether it is directly the City's responsibility or not, this is something that through the office of the mayor they are promoting. They are promoting both the rezoning and the action plan and so the office of the Mayor has the ability to coordinate with Con Ed or whoever needs to be spoken with about not
only planning, but implementing the projects.

AYISHA OGLIVIE: So can we change the language so that it invokes that responsibility?

WAYNE BENJAMIN: What would you like it to say?

AYISHA OGLIVIE: Okay, first of all, it needs to speak to the specifics. My understand -- I understand that there was a lawsuit that was filed --

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Yeah, but.

AYISHA OGLIVIE: So that speaks to the history and what the outstanding issues are, and that they should be addressed in this context of this rezoning so that it's not exacerbated by the rezoning.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Yeah, I thought we said somewhere about being able to take care of demands. We -- maybe you can look into that and send me an update.

RICHARD LEWIS: I will.

SHAH ALLY: Is there anyone else?

SARA FISHER: Hi. On page 10, the second resolved in blue. I don't know if this is included when you say extended to the community entire community district as soon as work in this area is completed. I don't know if I understood.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: I'm not following where you. Page 10.

SARA FISHER: Where it says the resolved as
previously requested.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Okay.

SARA FISHER: The part I don't get about the plan is about the northern triangle and why you point out the Dyckman houses. So I'm just I wanted to ensure when you say extend the entire community district, that it would be extended to include all the area of Inwood, both north -- very tip of Manhattan and the to the east of the Dyckman houses.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Well, if you look at the timing, the Inwood rezoning is happening now. So that's the geographic areas that's currently defined from Dyckman going up. Except the resolution that we passed and then ratified fours years later, covers a slightly overlapping area. It goes from Academy all the way down to 191st Street, and what those resolutions say is and we have to remember the context of this is, this is right after CB-9 completed it's rezoning and Inwood, it was, you know, Community District 12 is very large geographically and it would be difficult if not impossible to do it all at once. So, we were specific. I asked, which is what's annoying, we were specific. I asked to identify the area where the rezoning should begin. As I said, because of the multiple BASA applications in Inwood that were from 181st to Academy, that were building two and three times as much, that's how that geographic area was
established.

So we're saying now okay, you're working on Inwood rezoning. We want, not sometime in the future, we want in 2018, for you to begin working on that and when it's finished, it's not that we want to include -- extend it to the rest of Inwood, we wanted to do the rest of Washington Heights and that was the goal to begin with.

SARA FISHER: I guess my question is why didn't it include certain parts of Inwood, like the properties owned by the Columbia --

WAYNE BENJAMIN: As I said, the reason why the geographic area, and folks like Jim Berlin and Anita Barberis, who said the geographic area where those proposals were coming in, were the geographic areas that decided we're not coming in from the north or from the south. So they're not coming in from that area.

SHAH ALLY: We have Ariel Miranda and Fern Hertzberg.

ARIEL MIRANDA: So, yes, I'm Ariel Miranda, also a member on the Housing Human Services Committee. I wanted to ask a few points. I just, you know, I recently got this so, I'm not aware what's on here, but I wanted today check in. Is there a mention of both the Comptroller, Scott Stringer's, reports for unused lands that is also mentioned in here?
AYISHA OGLIVIE: There is a section about it.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: There isn't a mention of that study per se. What we're saying is what we want done as part of, you know, the programs projects and initiatives, we want and it's about Stringer's study and I think the Borough President, we want a vacant City-owned survey of properties in Washington Heights and Inwood. We just don't want a survey and then look to identify which sites are good development sites and to target those for that are either hundred residential or of mix-used developments. So there is a resolve in the dealings, not just with the surveying the Land, but what we do with to identify it.

AYISHA OGLIVIE: And that's on the bottom of page eleven number 17.

ARIEL MIRANDA: Also just to add here, is there also mention of any properties that are being managed by the City? Not owned, but managed as a result of, you know, a landlord.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: What would you like me to say about that?

ARIEL MIRANDA: So, is there any way to ensure that there is going to be a followup with regards to properties that have been managed by the City but not necessarily being repaired for several years, such as 21 Arden.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: If I'm not mistaken, hasn't CB12
already passed the resolution identifying those specific properties? And it's in here too. So it's like Spaghetti sauce; it's in there.

SHAH ALLY: We're up to Fern, Fern Hertzberg.

FERN HERTZBERG: I'm Fern Hertzberg, I'm assistant Chair of the committee for the Concerns for the Aging and also on Housing and Human Services. This is incredibly impressive, Wayne. I have never in many many years seen a reso like this. I think many of us have said it, I wanted to add my words to that I only have one request because I think you've covered a lot of stuff that was in Inwood United, that was in the MMA proposals and so on. So the only one that I have mentioned in Aging and in Housing that I don't think is included, is a hundred percent universal design accessibility. And I think we can just add it on page 12 in item 24, where you say require all new construction to include sustainable design features and pursue sustainable design retrofits for existing buildings.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: So, universal design --

FERN HERTZBERG: To include it to say require all new construction to include universal design and sustainable design features after pursue both for retrofits as well.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Okay.

FERN HERTZBERG: Thank you.

SHAH ALLY: Anyone else before we vote? All right.
Round of applause please for Wayne Benjamin.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: I would like to thanks the Land Use Committee and om particular Andrea, who is here, and Steve who isn't here and Vivian who is isn't here, and the committee Chairs who provided this because, as I said, it began as a Land Use Committee drafted resolution, but then the other committees added their points of concern and interest so this can address everything that we think is important.

It is -- I was in a meeting yesterday and someone pointed out that some of these rezonings are really once in a generation opportunity to have this kind of impact. So we do need to be able to say a range of things and to cover the waterfront in an intelligent way that isn't just throwing in the kitchen sink but saying, you know, community and economic development means a range of things and here are hear our comments on those range of things.

SHAH ALLY: All right, so to move the agenda along, and so folks if you were here for the vote and you want to move on with your night, we will take the vote now and then we'll continue with the Executive Committee's Business. But I would encourage everyone to stay. The Executive Committee's business can be exciting. You'll know how we set an agenda and why we picked the 20th and not the 21st. And of course, we always the love the question of "did you
ever consider this". This is when we consider those things.

So the motion on the floor is to accept the resolution as explained as amended and the amendments were discussed by Wayne, it was seconded Isidro Medina and Jim Berlin.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Quick question. Who has the executive committees sign-in sheet?

SHAH ALLY: I do. I will call it. There's folks who are representing different committees who are not listed here. So we will do a roll call for the Executive Committee and we will take a show of hands with Board members in the room.

First, Richard Lewis.

RICHARD LEWIS: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: It goes out of line, so pay attention. Stay on your feet, it could be anyone.

Isidro Medina.

ISIDRO MEDINA: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: Jason Compton.

JASON COMPTON: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: Mitchell Glenn.

MITCHELL GLENN: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: Betty Lehmann.

ELIZABETH LEHMANN: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: Jim Berlin.
JAMES BERLIN: Technically I don't get to vote.


RICHARD ALLMAN: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: Now on to the Committees. Yahaira Alonzo, representing Traffic and Transportation.

YAHAIRA ALONZO: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: Fern Hertzberg, representing Concerns with Aging.

FERN HERTZBERG: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: Wayne Benjamin.

WAYNE BENJAMIN: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: Fe Florimón — I'm sorry, Wayne Benjamin representing Land Use.

FE FLORIMÓN: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: We heard from Richard Lewis. Richard is also with Public Safety.

Natalie Espino for Parks and Culture Affairs.

NATALIE ESPINO: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: Isidro Medina already voted. He's with Licensing.

Ayisha Oglivie for Housing.

AYISHA OGLIVIE: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: Jason voted. He is with Business Development.
Andrea Kornbluth for Health and Environment.

ANDREA KORNBLUTH:  Yes.

SHAH ALLY:  And as Chair, I vote yes as well.

Board members in the room, by a show of hands, those in favor.

BARBARA FRAZIER:  Maybe we should stand up.


Board members not in favor.  Wait a minute, I'm not done yet.  Any opposed on that?  Any exception?  No.

All right, so the motion passes unanimously.

So what we have now for the first time in this process, now we have a committee resolution.  As amended, it will be presented at the General Meeting on March 20th.

Please get a calendar.  It is a venue that is a -- it's a venue in Inwood.  It's accessible, it has AV, it has everything you need, except it has a capacity.  And we try very hard to hit every point, and nothing's perfect.  So I would recommend to see this play-out, you get there early.  There will be a public speaker sign-in sheet.  On that day, we will have consideration for opening up a little bit more so folks can speak.  Get there early.

So this resolution now will move to the general meeting.  It could still be modified in the general meeting in the same process we have now.  There will be a vote.

That's when we will have an official vote.
Okay, so with that being said, we're going to move on with the agenda. So those have to continue with their night and wish to leave. Have a good night.

Ayisha?

AYISHA OGLIVIE: I want to make a suggestion that a link to the PDF of this resolution be posted on our Facebook so the community members who are not here are informed.

SHAH ALLY: We will, especially for Board members, they will be voting on this and we'll discuss what, since it's still in a draft form --

AYISHA OGLIVIE: Yeah. Mention it's in draft form but at least the community has access to it.

SHAH ALLY: Okay. All right, we're going to give 60 seconds for folks and then we're going to get back to our meeting.

(Whereupon, a short break was taken)

SHAH ALLY: All right, folks, we are not done yet. I would say maybe another half an hour to go.

Okay, folks, we're going to continue. If you wish to continue the conversation, I know something, you know, we took a vote and something, you know, big happened tonight, so you don't have to leave, if we can just have a little bit of the side conversations could go off to the side. We'll continue our agenda so that the Executive, I think, you know, the Board members can move on with their night as
So the Chair's Report included the discussion on the Inwood rezoning. So now I will consider that Chair's Report. I will say that for anyone remaining in the room, today was a Borough Board and one of the interesting things about Borough Board and the Borough President is advocating for increased funding for community boards. Currently we have an operating budget of 233,000. The increased ask is 400,000. Maybe with that increased ask we'll have two microphones so that we don't have to shuffle back and forth. So, members of the public, if you can help us out and ask for that increase. Or Richard will pass his hat.

This will constitute my Chair's Report. I'm going to move to Ebenezer and the District's Manager's report. Unless there's something that needs to be said by the Secretary of Treasury's report, I'm going to move to Committee reports that have resolutions that would be Business Development, Public Safety, Licensing. And we'll review the calendars and then we'll call it an evening.

(Break in testimony)

So before we go off the record, I don't need the transcription for the remaining of this meeting, but before we go off the record, and we have minutes as well as the transcription, Jim Berlin brought it to my attention -- where is Jim? Jim Berlin did not vote as a Parliamentarian,
but he can certainly vote as a Board member. So his vote would have been yes; is that correct Jim?

JAMES BERLIN: Yes.

SHAH ALLY: Yes, so it's 10 Board members in favor, so that number should change from nine to 10. So our minutes are clear and the record is clear.

(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded)