



Motion to approve made by Jerry Armer, seconded by David Briggs:

- To extend the variance
- To eliminate the term
- To include the amendments to the variance
- To waive the boards rules due to the late filing

David Briggs adds a friendly amendment: motion contingent on removal of the C of O violation  
Approved unanimously: 14-0-0

**Presentation and review of a Certificate of Appropriateness application submitted to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for the renovation of an existing 2-story rear yard extension at 249 Clinton Street (between Verandah Pl/Warren St), Cobble Hill Historic District.**

Presented by Clay Miller from Bergen Street Studio

Some committee questions and comments on the fenestration, rear deck/fire escape, and railings.

No community members in attendance.

Motion to approve as presented by Jerry Armer and seconded by Bill Blum.

Approved 14-0-1 without cause (late arrival)

**Presentation and review of a proposal by the Department of City Planning on the department's Zoning for Quality and Affordability text amendment proposal (ULURP No. N 160049 ZRY), targeted changes to zoning regulations that would address the needs of affordable housing, aid efficient use of housing subsidies, and encourage higher-quality residential buildings in the city's medium- and high-density neighborhoods.**

Six representatives from Department of City Planning made a thorough presentation of a powerpoint deck and explained that a few small changes had been made as a result of comments and criticisms to their earlier (Spring 2015) presentation.

This proposal is intended to increase flexibility of design in order to improve building quality (design) and allow for more senior and affordable housing to be built in existing contextually zoned (most of our neighborhoods) districts. This will be done with a 5-foot bonus for all zoning designations as long as the additional height is used to create a better ground floor retail space or residential facade.

Additional height will also be allowed within certain zoning designations (R6A and R7A in our neighborhoods) if it is used to fit the allowable floor area for senior and affordable housing.

Many questions were raised by committee and a few community members regarding the following:

- Additional Building Height - how are benefits mandated?
- Easing or removal of parking requirements
- Red Hook as a "Transit Zone" questioned

Community member states that this proposal is a giveaway to the real estate industry which will provide little if any benefit to our communities since the goals are "allowed" but not mandated.

Board member Glenn Kelly states that these two zoning proposals could do more harm than good since the details are still being worked out and the real estate industry will find ways to subvert the benefits in their quest to maximize their profits.

Motion to approve as presented by Bill Blum and seconded by Mark Shames

An amendment was added to modify the Red Hook transit zone to reflect the unique circumstances which limit access to transit.

Approved 13-2-0

**Presentation and review of a proposal by the Department of City Planning on the Mandatory Inclusionary Housing text amendment proposal (ULURP No. N 160051 ZRY), to promote neighborhood economic diversity in locations where land use actions create substantial new housing opportunities.**

This is a new zoning text amendment which intends to promote the building of more affordable housing in newly rezoned areas of the city. East New York is the first of 15 neighborhoods targeted. This does not presently affect our area except at the Toll Brothers/Lightstone project which is an example of how it would work. This will only apply to future zoning changes (Fourth Avenue, Gowanus, Red Hook?) which create this new designation.

There was considerable skepticism expressed by the committee members and a few community members about the following:

- AMI (Area Median Income) is provided by the Federal government and must be used although it does not accurately reflect income in the presently targeted areas. This could lead to displacement of some lower income people this amendment is intended to help.
- Payment in Lieu of Participation allows projects of between 11 and 25 units to "opt out" by payments to HPD to be used for affordable housing in the same area. We questioned how these payments were calculated and were told that the formulas were still being worked out.
- BSA variances are allowed if a developer can prove hardship - DCP states that this will be difficult to prove given the bonuses and incentives provided by the new MIH plan.

Motion to support proposal made by Jerry Armer and seconded by Debra Scotto.

Friendly amendment added by Allison Reeves: Payment in Lieu of Participation program details must be clarified.

Friendly amendment added by Daniel Kummer: Payment in Lieu of Participation program should consider the present value of projected profits.

Approved 14-1-0

Minutes submitted October 23, 2015 by Glenn Kelly.