

MEETING OF ZONING COMMITTEE - JUNE 11, 1959

Chairman Felt, Vice-Chairman Bloustein, Commissioner Orton,

Richard K. Bernstein, Norman Williams, Jr., Jack C. Smith,

Samuel Joroff, Nathan Ginsberg, Vita O. Weiss

1. EFFECTIVE DATE OF ZONING RESOLUTION

Jack C. Smith presented the staff recommendations for establishing a reasonable transition from the existing to the new zoning resolution in terms of both time period and method. The alternatives were either a long period of deferred effective date coupled with stringent standards for obtaining vested rights on the cut-off date as proposed in the consultant's report, or a shorter period tied to a more relaxed vested rights provision.

Consensus of the Committee was reached with respect to the following aspects of the proposed grace period: (1) Different treatment should be given to the rights of developers affected by the initial adoption of the zoning resolution as contrasted with amendments subsequently adopted; (2) the concurrent application of the existing and proposed resolution was considered to create too many legal and administrative difficulties; (3) the new resolution should become effective 12 months after the date of its enactment by the Board of Estimate but, in any event, not earlier than July 1, 1959.

It was agreed that an owner or a party in interest acting with the consent of the owner (but excluding a person with options to purchase all or part of the land) may acquire a vested right either by obtaining a building permit based on submission of final plans for the entire building or obtaining a tentative FHA commitment. He will thereafter be permitted to continue construction for a period of two years under the provisions of the existing resolution. (To avoid placing the onus on the developer for any administrative delays caused by the Department of Buildings, where plans were filed within a specified period prior to the effective date and the Building Department subsequently approved the plans, the permit would be deemed issued prior to the effective date).

At the end of the two-year period, it was agreed that in exceptional cases a limited time extension for a single building nearing completion may be granted by an administrative agency to be specified. Special consideration will be given to large-scale developments - where completion within the two year period is not feasible. Machinery will be established to authorize extending the period, where the developer can establish that he has taken definitive action to proceed with the project as a unified development. Standards, to be incorporated in the resolution, will fix such definitive action by the developer.

The Chairman will submit these recommendations to the Commission at Executive Session on Tuesday, June 16. If the Commission agrees, an early public announcement will be made stating these provisions, which will be incorporated in the Commission's zoning proposal. It was determined that Jack C. Smith will draft a brief statement of the Zoning Committee's recommendations on the grace period for submission to the Commission on June 16.

The Committee determined that the following questions should be given further consideration: (1) the exact period within which filing of plans would be treated as the equivalent of issuance of building permit. (2) The appropriate machinery to extend the two-year period for single buildings or large-scale developments. (3) The criteria to guide such extensions.

## 2. WORK SCHEDULE FOR FUTURE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

A brief discussion was held as to the proposed work schedule for the staff as well as future Committee meetings. A written outline of a proposed work schedule will be prepared by Jack C. Smith and will be the subject of the Committee's meeting on Tuesday, June 16.

*J. Ashworth*

MEETING OF ZONING COMMITTEE - JUNE 18, 1959

Chairman Felt, Commissioner Orton, Richard K. Bernstein,  
Irving Ashworth, Norman Williams, Jr.,  
Jack C. Smith, Nathan Ginsberg, Samuel Joroff

Jack C. Smith explained the content of the attached work schedule. The structure of the use districts, bulk districts, and the general policies to be followed in revising the zoning maps were proposed as first items on the agenda to allow time for the necessary field work and the redrafting of the zoning maps. The review of the proposed modification of the zoning maps for each of the five boroughs is to begin with the Manhattan maps on August 13 and continue for five weeks, concluding with the Brooklyn maps on September 10. The schedule will give adequate time for completing the redrafting of the maps by October 15. The review of changes in the text of the proposed resolution follows the general order of 1) use regulations, 2) bulk regulations, and 3) parking regulations, with necessary departures from this order to permit maximum staff analysis of difficult problems as well as to allow for vacations. The last meeting is scheduled for September 18, leaving one month for final drafting of text and maps for delivery to the printer on October 15.

The system of classifying and filing all recommended changes in the text as well as the zoning maps of the proposed resolution was next explained. All text changes proposed by the public, including those changes proposed in the Informal Hearings, staff conferences with the public, speeches, and letters, have been

indexed and filed by subject matter for staff analysis. Each recommended map change has been plotted on the proposed zoning maps at the scale of 600 feet to the inch and has been given an index number referring to the file containing the prepared statements, letters, and other documents which give the specific recommendations.

Agreement was reached on the following points:

1. Work Schedule - The work schedule as proposed was accepted.

2. Role of Zoning Committee - The Chairman stated that the primary objectives of the zoning effort were: 1) to pass a new zoning resolution; 2) to pass as good a resolution as possible; 3) to avoid proposing a resolution so perfect that it becomes impossible to get it enacted. It was agreed that within the proposed time limits the only feasible work program is a modification of the Voorhees Walker Smith and Smith proposal rather than an attempt at either a drastic revision or a new resolution.

3. Procedure During Committee Meetings - The following procedure will be followed: 1) a 10-15 minute explanation of the agenda for the next week's meeting; 2) the full presentation of the staff recommendations with no committee discussion; 3) discussion by the committee and the "hammering-out" of the committee's decisions.

4. Prior Submission of Recommendations - In order to give adequate time for staff analysis, the recommendations of any member of the committee on a given topic should be submitted to Jack Smith two weeks prior to the scheduled discussion of the topic by the committee.

5. Time of Meeting - To give maximum time to the full agenda proposed, all future meetings will start at 1:00 p.m.

6. Scale of Zoning Maps - A committee of I. Ashworth, S. Caporaso, and S. Mann was appointed to examine the problem of the proper scale of zoning maps in the Planning Commission's zoning proposal and submit a recommendation to the Zoning Committee in the near future. The Chairman stressed the importance of readable maps.

MEETING OF ZONING COMMITTEE - JUNE 25, 1959

Chairman Felt, Commissioner Orton, Richard K. Bernstein,  
Irving Ashworth, Norman Williams, Jr., Jack C.  
Smith, Nathan Ginsberg, Samuel Joroff, Astrid  
Monson, Millard Humstone, Alfred Shapiro

Use District Structure

Jack C. Smith reviewed the use district structure and the system of use groups related thereto. He reported that the public has voiced no major criticism of the proposed district structure. On review the staff is well satisfied with the structure and recommends no basic changes.

With the exception of possible addition of a two-family district, which will be discussed at the July 9 meeting, it was agreed by the Committee that the basic use district structure should remain as proposed.

Use Group System

The system of use groups was discussed particularly as applied in the commercial districts. Logic, clarity and simplified packaging of use regulations were cited as major advantages.

It was agreed that the use group system should be retained as proposed.

Performance Standards

For the manufacturing districts, performance standards were supported as a logical control device and a rational basis for distinguishing the three districts.

It was agreed that performance standards should be retained in the proposed resolution. However, since they have drawn some opposition, though less than expected, it was agreed that they should be studied further with a view to simplification of the substantive provisions and their administration. It was also agreed that an alternative set of regulations should be prepared in the event it should be necessary to abandon performance standards to get the resolution passed. The latter course would involve only minor adjustment, if any, in the use district structure.

### Residential Use Regulations

Jack C. Smith reviewed the issues affecting residential use regulations. These include the following:

1. Whether to exclude some types of institutions from the uses permitted in R1 and R2 districts.
2. The restrictions on home occupations.
3. The regulations affecting accessory uses.
4. Restrictions on clubs and activities carried on at clubs.
5. The exclusion of hotels from residence districts.

He also reported the views of Commissioner Bloustein in respect to the above. The following decisions were reached:

The exclusion of transient hotels from residence districts should stand as proposed.

Rather than making definitive decisions on the question of just what types of institutions, home occupations, clubs, etc. to permit in one-family districts, it was agreed that it would be advantageous to make these matters a subject of negotiations, since home-owners groups have expressed strong views on them. It was also agreed to extend consideration of these matters to other low density residence districts as well.

The language affecting accessory uses and the conditions and standards under which home occupations are permitted need to be tightened up.

## Commercial and Manufacturing Use Regulations

Jack C. Smith then reviewed issues and staff thinking affecting the commercial and manufacturing use regulations. Agreement was reached on the following:

Eating and drinking establishments should be removed from the list of uses permitted as of right in C3.

Commercial parking garages should be removed from the list of uses permitted as of right in C5.

Gasoline service stations require further study in the light of issues raised by the petroleum industry. As of now the committee is inclined to permit them in C7 but not in C2.

Printing establishments as a possible use to be permitted in C5 and C6 require further study in the light of data being assembled by the printing industry and a discussion of needs with industry representatives. Some adjustment of the mapping or the use regulations is indicated.

The commercial uses subject to floor area restrictions should be discussed with the Building Department from the standpoint of administrative problems.

Ground floor restrictions in the C5 district should be discussed with the Fifth Avenue Association to ascertain their reaction.

Ground floor restrictions in the C4 district should be retained, while we see if any pressure develops.

Enclosure requirements in the commercial districts should be reviewed with attention to the special problem of open front stores.

The limitation of commercial uses in C1 and C2 to two floors with restrictions against occupancy of upper floors in mixed buildings was approved.

The size limitation on lumber yards in M1 is unduly restrictive and should be raised from 5,000 to 20,000 square feet.

Newspaper publishing should be studied as part of the printing industry problem.

Storage of petroleum products with a high flash point is properly permitted in M1.

The required enclosure of operations conducted in M1 districts should not apply to existing uses.



Ashworth

MEETING OF ZONING COMMITTEE - JULY 9, 1959

PRESENT: Chairman Felt, Commissioner Bloustein, Richard K. Bernstein, Irving Ashworth, Norman Williams, Jr., Jack C. Smith, Samuel Joroff, Millard Humstone, Vita W. King, Astrid Monson

1. RESIDENTIAL BULK DISTRICT STRUCTURE

A. Possible New Residential District between R8 and R9

It was agreed to postpone discussion of this item until July 16.

B. Single-Family Detached District, Minimum 10,000 Square Foot Lot

It was decided not to add such a district.

C. Two-Family District

It was decided, in view of the small number of remaining groups whose request for such a district could not be satisfied by R2 mapping, to work with each such group and try to find an acceptable district within the existing district structure. Should these efforts fail, or should future public hearings disclose continued or widespread demand for a two-family district, it was agreed that a plan would be prepared involving an announcement at the general hearing that such a district would be set up. The staff was directed to write language setting up such a district and proposals for its mapping, should it become necessary to have one.

2. COMMERCIAL AND MANUFACTURING BULK DISTRICT STRUCTURE

A. The C61 District

It was agreed that a new C6 District would be added permitting residential buildings to have an FAR of 450. It was also agreed that each C6-1 district would be reviewed and that the permitted residential bulk of each would be handled in one of the following ways as appropriate:

- 1) Some areas would be remapped C6-2, with R9 residential bulk.
- 2) Some areas would be remapped R9 (or R8) with C1 or C2 for the commercial strips.
- 3) Some areas would be remapped in the new C6 district permitting R8 bulks.
- 4) Some areas would remain in the present C6-1 which permits R7 residential bulks.

B. Commercial bulk in C1

A review is being made of C1 bulks and it was tentatively agreed that C1, when mapped in R1, R2, or R3, should have a higher bulk than its present

FAR of 50. The new FAR levels being considered bulk will be an 80 and 100.

### 3. COMMERCIAL AND MANUFACTURING MAPPING POLICY

The several types of mapping problems that might require policy decisions were reviewed. Agreement was reached on the following:

#### A. Small M1 Districts

Small areas of mixed industrial and heavy commercial use mapped M1 by the consultants should be reviewed individually to determine which of these areas should remain M1 and which should be remapped C8. It was agreed that no general policy can be set for these areas since a wide variety of situations are involved. In each case, the desirability of limiting excessive scatter of manufacturing uses should be considered in the light of reasonable restrictions in the particular situation.

#### B. Declining Residential Areas

Old and declining residential areas surrounded or partially surrounded by industrial development should be considered, each case on its own merits. Areas which have been mapped "residence" by the consultants should remain probably in this classification even though the Plan of Future Land Use indicates "industrial" as the ultimate desirable land use. Where such areas have been mapped "manufacturing" by the consultants and strong opposition to this designation has been voiced by local residents, each area should be carefully reviewed with due attention to both long and short run considerations, and any doubts should be resolved in favor of a "residence" designation.

#### C. Depth of Central Commercial Districts

Mapped depths of 100 feet for high bulk central commercial districts backing on lower bulk districts should generally be increased so that these districts can adequately accommodate large buildings requiring large sites.

#### D. Depth of C3 Districts

All C3 districts should be checked to make sure that adequate depth is provided for off street parking and that, where surrounding areas are now largely developed for residential use, consideration be given to restricting C3 to the areas presently developed for C3 uses.

#### E. Elimination of Over-Refinement

Some of the consultants' mapping is over-refined because the district boundaries follow existing land use too closely. This results in too many distinctions in the regulation of frontage along some streets. The mapping will be reviewed to eliminate such over-refinement.

#### F. Wider Mapping of M2 and M3

The mapping of less restrictive manufacturing districts can be extended. This includes wider mapping of M2 and M3 and also the extension of the higher bulk manufacturing districts in older areas of the city.

G. Public Utilities

Power plants and incinerators must be mapped M3 but the more modern sewage treatment plants with comparatively high levels of performance should be changed from M3 to M2.

H. Industrial Areas near Bridge Crossings

As a general policy waterfront industrial areas near bridge crossings should be mapped M1 or M2 rather than M3 to reduce fire and explosion hazards.

4. RESIDENTIAL BULK MAPPING POLICY

A. Extension of R9 Mapping

It was agreed to postpone discussion of this item until July 16.

B. Requests for Lower Bulks on Narrow Streets

It was agreed that such requests would be handled sympathetically.

The Chairman indicated that in his opinion R6 was probably too restrictive anywhere in Manhattan. It was decided that each such request would be handled on its merits.

C. Extension of R7 Mapping in Outer Boroughs.

It was agreed that an attempt would be made to find suitable spots on the fringe of existing R7 growth areas, where additional amounts of R7 could appropriately be mapped. Studies of land costs in such areas will be made as a part of this review process.

D. Extension of R5 Mapping

It was agreed that an attempt would be made to find additional areas suitable for two-family row house construction in such sections as Canarsie and the Northern Bronx, and to re-map them to R5 where appropriate.

E. Re-examination of Areas Presently Zoned E-1.

It was agreed to review all E-1 areas now zoned R4 or R5 and to remap them to R3 where appropriate, or when requests for R2 have been made to rezone to R2 if such areas are developed, almost entirely with single-family detached homes.

F. Requests for Remapping to R1 and R2.

It was agreed that where existing development was of the type permitted in these districts, such requests should be granted where possible.

G. Request for R6 Along Staten Island - South-East Shore

It was agreed that Jack C. Smith would confer with Mr. Schirano of the

Richmond Borough President's office to get the Borough President's ideas as to suitable areas to be proposed for R6.

H. R6 for Public and Aided Housing

It was agreed that an attempt would be made to find suitable and appropriate areas for such developments in low-cost areas, older sections of the City, either vacant or developed at low density and that if such areas were found and could be justifiably mapped R6, this would be done.

5. ADMINISTRATION - ARTICLE VII

- A. It was decided that although the Planning Commission should not attempt to dictate to the Building Department, the precise kind of administrative machinery it should set up to enforce the Zoning Resolution, it was agreed that it is the responsibility of the Planning Commission to strongly recommend what should be done.

It was agreed that the powers and duties of the Department of Buildings as proposed on page 244 of the Consultants' report would not be changed. These proposed duties including such functions as maintaining public records of all zoning certificates and certificates of occupancy and of non-conforming uses subject to termination imply a modest but much-needed increase in centralized zoning administration.

It was agreed that Jack Smith would arrange a meeting with Commissioner Reidy to discuss the new administrative problems, such as performance standards, involved in the new resolution and suggest to him that it would be to his great advantage to have in his office a zoning staff, specially trained to handle these and the other technical matters involved in the resolution. Though the actual enforcement machinery is up to the Building Department, it was agreed that the machinery the Planning Commission feels is necessary for adequate enforcement should be outlined at such a meeting.

B. SECTION 72 - 02. VARIANCE PROCEDURE

The possible change in language in Section 72-02, relating to the use of the Board of Standards and Appeals' own expert knowledge was discussed and it was agreed that this matter will be reviewed with the office of the Corporation Counsel.

C. SECTION 72-22. FINDINGS OF THE BOARD

It was agreed that the staff will give consideration to whether a distinction can be made between the criteria and, if so, to try to work out appropriate standards and criteria.

D. SECTION 72-10.

It was agreed that the language would be changed so as to give the Board of Standards & Appeals power to review decisions made by all City Departments, (including the Department of Marine and Aviation) but without naming them. For this required charter amendment as well as all other charter amendments, the staff will prepare the necessary language and also any amendments needed

to the Building Code, the Multiple Dwelling Code, and the like. Jack C. Smith will review this material with the Vice Chairman.

E.. SECTION 73-21.

It was agreed that the language would be tightened up and that the term "pending" would be tied down to projects legally pending before the Planning Commission or the Board of Estimate. In addition, it was agreed that a time limit would be placed as to when the Planning Commission must make its required certification.

F. SECTION 73-31.

It was agreed to narrow the proposed powers granted to the Department of Traffic. It was further agreed to revert to the present language specifying the required distance of such uses as gas stations from schools, to list specifically the uses in question, to define "schools" and "parks", and to place a time limit on the Planning Commission's required certification.

G. SECTION 73-40.

It was agreed to tighten up the language of this section and to add a required performance bond as a part of the rehabilitation of sand, gravel, and clay pits.

H. TERM PERMITS (SPECIAL PERMITS)

It was agreed that the Board of Standards and Appeals should be empowered to place a time limit on future special permits granted to a few outdoor uses such as amusement parks, outdoor theatres, and commercial beaches. The solution to the problem of existing term permits which have been granted by the Board to such uses as gas stations will be decided after additional analysis of the location of such uses as related to the proposed zoning maps. The petroleum companies have made an analysis of gas stations which have received term permits as related to the proposed zoning maps.

~~F. De Filippo~~  
IF Ashworth  
see page 3

MEETING OF ZONING COMMITTEE July 16, 1959

PRESENT: Chairman Felt, Vice Chairman Bloustein, Commissioner Orton, Richard K. Bernstein, Norman Williams, Jr., Frank DeFilippo, Jack C. Smith, Samuel Joroff, Astrid Monson. Also present: - Perry Coke Smith and Joseph Klein, Voorhees Walker Smith and Smith.

It was agreed that the day's discussion would include the question of the setting up of a new district between R8 and R9, mapping policy for extending the R9 district in Manhattan, and proposed changes in the R1 to R5 Districts. Discussion of the bulk levels of the R6 to R9 Districts, and of the general inter-relationship between the floor area ratio, open space ratio, and density controls will take place at a later meeting. As a necessary background to the mapping policy decisions, it was agreed that a summary explanation of proposed changes in R8 and R9 would be made but not discussed in detail.

1. District between R8 and R9

It was proposed and agreed that a new district be set up with a bulk level between the present R8 and R9, and be tentatively mapped in areas where R8 represents too low a bulk but where R9 would be excessive. Such a district would have a floor area ratio of 650 which, with a 5 to 1 plaza bonus, could go to 750. It would not have an open space ratio. It will be mapped only in Manhattan. Appropriate density, set-back, and related regulations will be established. It was agreed that this district be named "R9", and the old R9 would be re-numbered R10.

Chairman Felt pointed out that such a district could be used to reduce bulks in some areas presently mapped R9 as well as to increase some R8 areas. Mr. Bernstein felt that it would be inadvisable to have a great deal of this area presently mapped R8 mapped to the new district.

It was agreed that such a district would be mapped judiciously and determination could then be made as to whether it was really needed.

11. R8 and R9 changes

Before going into a discussion of mapping policy, Mr. Smith outlined the following changes in R8 and R9 which will be recommended and discussed at a later meeting:

A. R8 changes

The basic floor area ratio to be changed to 480 with a required open space ratio of 8. This will allow 8-story buildings at 60% coverage. With bonuses, this district's maximum floor area ratio will be about 600. Densities will be adjusted accordingly.

B. R9 changes

1) Plaza bonus to be changed to 5 to 1, and density bonus adjusted proportionately.

2) Rear set back to be provided at 120 or 125 feet, resulting in an FAR of about 850 on interior lots.

3) No rear yard or rear set back for corner lots.

C. All districts

Lot areas per dwelling unit to be reduced for 2-room and 3-room units to allow for adjustment for exclusion of kitchens from the room count. The permitted increase in density will amount to approximately 10% for 2-room and 5% for 3-room units.

It was agreed that the recommended changes sounded reasonable and that mapping policy would be discussed with these as background.

III. Mapping Policy

Extension of R10 and Mapping of New R9 in Manhattan

Mr. Smith explained that a study was being made of recent sales prices of parcels in R8, C6-1, C4-4, C4-5, C4-6, and some R9 areas to get land values per square foot. These will be considered as related to bulks and rents as one guide to the mapping of R8, R9, and R10 Districts in Manhattan.

Chairman Felt stated that we should not assume that a high speculative price is a basis of justifying excessive bulk, that we cannot tie the ordinance down to this. He felt that we had to be alert to deny that we have to gear permitted floor area ratios to speculative values.

Mr. Smith agreed, and pointed out the other considerations involved - community facilities, transit planning, etc. He recommended that we re-examine the Manhattan mapping to see which areas might have to be raised to the new R9 or R10 Districts in the light of all these considerations, the economic factor being just one.


Vice Chairman Bloustein pointed out that this had been done before by the Commission, naming the DD district as an example.

#### IV. Bulk Levels-R1 to R5 districts

Mr. Smith stated that no significant complaints had been received in connection with the bulk levels of the R1 to R4 districts. Builders of two-family row houses alleged that they could not build in these districts, a fact which is recognized and was so intended. The R5 district was set up for this type of construction. Builders complain that the 45% coverage permitted in R5 is too low, and that including basement space in floor area ratio is too restrictive. These complaints were reviewed and found to have some merit. Accordingly, the following recommendations were made and accepted by the Committee:

- 1) In R1 to R5 inclusive, eliminate basements from floor area ratio for residential buildings of two stories or less. (Such basements to be defined as a story with at least 30% of its height below curb level).
- 2) Required open space ratio in R5 to be reduced to 50, with bonus system based on an OSR 50 instead of 60 as previously proposed. This will permit a floor area ratio of 100 at 2 stories, or a coverage of 50%.
- 3) An attempt will be made to find some R3 or R4 areas which can be appropriately mapped R5.

#### V. Miscellaneous

- 
1. It was agreed that Mr. Ashworth will keep Mr. Smith currently informed of all projects pending before the Commission which involve requests for rezoning, such as Sailors' Snug Harbor in Richmond.



2. It was agreed that a conference would be held with Max Foley to try to arrange with him not to make use of Section 7-E of the present resolution pending the new resolutions becoming effective. The Chairman suggested that a month after the new resolution was passed by the Board of Estimate, we might move to strike out Section 7-E. Mr. Clancy would be informed of this time table.

Vice Chairman Bloustein suggested that it be made clear to Mr. Foley that if he did not agree to stop using Section 7-E we would move to strike it from the existing resolution.

3. It was agreed that Mr. Klein of Voorhees Walker Smith and Smith would submit recommended changes in the Multiple Dwelling Law, such as the elimination of New York City from the applicability of Section 26, and that Chairman Felt would start processing the recommended changes.

MEETING OF ZONING COMMITTEE - JULY 30, 1959

Chairman Felt, Vice-Chairman Bloustein, Irving Ashworth, Norman Williams, Jr.,

Jack C. Smith, Samuel Joroff, Sidney Frigand, Vita King, Allan Sloan

It was agreed that the agenda for this meeting as well as the agendas for the next few meetings would be modified for the following reasons: (1) to give the staff time to review the "Latham Squire Report" prior to the second meeting on residential FAR, OSR, and density levels; (2) to dispose of parking and airport height regulations prior to Allen Sloan's departure; (3) to make up the time lost due to the cancellation of the July 23 meeting because of the illness of Jack C. Smith. It is anticipated that the second meeting on residential bulk will take place either on August 6 or August 13. It was further agreed that the agenda for today's meeting would be as follows:

- 1) Article V, Non-conforming uses and Non-complying buildings.
- 2) Residential Parking Regulations.
- 3) Article VI, Special Height Regulations Applying Around Major Airports.

Non-Conformity

It was agreed that the following modifications of the consultants' proposals on non-conformity would be made.

Change of Use Provisions

The regulation of open uses will be clarified, and the change of uses provisions in residential buildings will be stricter. In addition, manufacturing uses in Residence Districts will be permitted to change to all types of commercial uses with the exception of large commercial amusement uses (Use Group 12, 13 and 15).

Discontinuance

After some discussion, it was decided that the period for measuring discontinuance

should be extended from one to two years on grounds that a one year limitation greatly increased the following problems:

- a. the owner is placed in too great difficulty in lease negotiations because of necessity to rent vacant premises.
- b. the complexity in ownership (e. g., the settlement of estates)
- c. the reuse of taxpayer commercial buildings located between other such buildings.

Commissioner Bloustein suggested conferring with Building Department and Mr. Smith agreed to arrange such meeting. Commissioner Bloustein explained that this issue had arisen previously in Building Department in connection with abandonment cases, citing the instance where demolition of buildings with ground floor retail stores in residence district constituted abandonment of such non-conforming retail uses even though there was intent to rebuild a comparable mixed building.

It was further determined that the discontinuance of one of several non-conforming uses on a piecemeal basis within a building would not constitute discontinuance. In addition, a clause listing the factors outside the control of owner which would not constitute discontinuance would be added to take care of criticism of Petroleum Industries and others.

#### Damage and Destruction

In response to the many criticisms that had arisen within the staff, as well as from the outside public, it was proposed that the provisions with respect to measuring the extent of damage would be altered. Instead of providing for comparative assessed valuations requiring measurement of damage by the Tax Department after the event (with the inherent difficulties of evaluating such damaged building as well as amending the Charter to permit this delegation of power to the Tax Department, it was agreed that:

1. Floor area for buildings (volume for structures be used as an easy measure for enforcement by Building Department.
2. When the chief value of a building may be unevenly distributed throughout its floor area, to permit an appeal to the Board of Standards and Appeals on the basis of costs of rebuilding the damaged portion in relation to the

costs of reconstructing the building in its entirety.

3. It was agreed that the breakpoint should be 25% in the case of residential buildings used for a non-conforming use (also for non-conforming use of land) and 50% for other buildings and structures.

#### Enlargements and Extensions

It was recommended that: (1) Use Group 9 be added to the other groups of non-conforming commercial uses which the consultants proposed be permitted to enlarge or extend in C1 districts; and (2) manufacturing uses be permitted to enlarge in C6 Districts. Expansion would be permitted for manufacturing uses subject to M1 performance standards and would afford relief to printing establishments as well as garment manufacturers in loft buildings.

This recommendation was accepted and it was further agreed that:

1. enlargements would be limited in size (25% expansion permitted)
2. enlargements would not exceed the applicable bulk regulations for each district

#### Repairs and Alterations

It was recommended and accepted that the term "repairs" be defined so as to permit all necessary repairs whether to structural portions of buildings or not, and that Section 51-62 be modified to permit interior or minor structural alterations necessary to permit the change of uses.

#### Compliance with Performance Standards

The consultants' proposed 15 year period for bringing non-conforming industrial and related uses in Commercial and Manufacturing Districts into compliance with performance standards was reviewed and accepted.

#### Termination of Industrial Uses in Residence Districts

Mr. Smith proposed three changes:

1. Termination of signs should be confined to advertising signs, thus meeting the protests from certain groups including the Petroleum Industry.

2. The "amortization period" will take into account major additions to industrial plants by means of a formula to be worked out. When the cost of a major addition constitutes an appreciable proportion of the cost of the present plant, the termination period will begin with the date of the major addition.

The Chairman suggested that the Board be given additional power to extend term in excess of three year and further examination of this question is necessary. The Vice-Chairman pointed out that the right to obtain a variance should apply in the case of an application for a variance with respect to a vacant parcel. He was assured that the rights would be the same and a variance could be obtained in either case provided that the criteria for hardship could be met.

#### Review of Residential Parking Requirements

The parking requirements proposed by the consultants were accepted in districts R1 through R7. It was proposed to create a new district with R7 bulks and densities but with a 50% requirement instead of a 60% requirement to be mapped in Manhattan and a few selected spots in The Bronx. It was further proposed that the 50% requirement in the R8 district be lowered to 40% and that the remaining high density districts (the new R9 and the new R10) have their parking requirement set at 40%.

#### Reduction of Requirements for Small Lots

Under the consultants proposal lots of 10,000 sq. ft. or less are given a reduced parking requirement in R6, R7, R8 and R9 districts. It was proposed that the 10,000 sq. ft. breakpoint remain in R6 and R7 but that this breakpoint be moved up to 15,000 sq. ft. in R7-A (Manhattan) R8, R9 and R10, but with no change in the percentage of dwelling units requiring parking. This would effectively provide most small lots in Manhattan with the same requirements as provided in the present resolution.

#### Number of Parking Spaces Exempted

The consultants proposed that required parking for 5 spaces or less be waived in R6, R7, R8 and R9 districts. It was proposed and agreed to keep the 5 spaces waiver in R6 and R7 but move the waiver up to 10 spaces in R7-A, R8, R9, and R10.

#### Requirements for Conversions

The consultants proposed that the parking requirements apply in all residence districts to the additional dwelling units added by conversions.

It was proposed and agreed that requirements should apply to the additional dwelling units added by conversions in R1 through R7 but should not apply in R7-A, R8, R9, and R10.

#### Public Housing Requirements

The consultants proposed that fully subsidized public housing projects be permitted to provide only 50% of the normal parking requirement initially as long as open space was available to provide the remaining 50% when needed. It was proposed that in the R1, through R7 districts, the initial requirement be reduced to 50% with the remaining 50% in reserved open space as proposed by the consultants, but that in the R7-A, R8, R9 and R10 districts, the initial requirement be reduced to 33% of the normal requirement with the remaining 70% in reserved open space. In addition, it was proposed that upon application, the Planning Commission could reduce the amount of open space needed to be reserved for parking in such cases where such reservation may not be desirable.

#### Off-Site Accessory Facilities

The consultants proposed that off-site parking facilities be permitted within 600 ft. of the development in all districts. It was proposed and agreed that the 600 ft. distance remain as applied in R1 through R7 districts but be extended to 1000 ft. in R7-A, R8, R9 and R10 districts.

#### Maximum Permitted Parking Facilities

It was proposed that the consultants recommendations regarding the maximum size of group parking facilities and the "density" limitation on residential parking facilities requiring administration approval be kept as proposed.

#### Airport Height Restrictions

It was decided that the system of height limitations proposed by the consultants remain unchanged, but that minor changes in the maps be instituted to conform to the latest runway patterns at LaGuardia and Idlewild. The suggestion of the Federal Aviation Agency for more rigid limitations with administrative approval by the Board and the FAA was not accepted. The Port Authority has accepted unofficially the consultants position on airport zoning but will not take any official stand.

*Mr. Ashworth*

MEETING OF ZONING COMMITTEE - August 6, 1959

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN FELT, Vice Chairman Bloustein, Commissioner Orton, Richard K. Bernstein, Irving Ashworth, Norman Williams, Jack C. Smith, Samuel Joroff, Louis Roberti, Millard Humstone, Allan Sloan, Miriam Strong.

---

1. Commercial Parking Requirements - Distinctions by Use

A: Parking Requirement Categories, A, B, and C

In view of the frequent changes in tenancy of commercial buildings sometimes involving the replacement of low traffic generator tenants by high generator tenants, it was agreed that the regulations should be revised so as to make the parking requirements for "A" category (high generator) uses apply to "B" and "C" category uses as well. A provision will be inserted to allow application for a permit to be issued by the Board of Standards and Appeals, which would allow parking requirements for the "B" and "C" category uses to be met at the lower levels presently stipulated for these categories.

B: Categories D and E

It was agreed that Category "D" (small places of assembly) should be combined with Category "E" (large places of assembly).

C: Reclassification of some "C" Category Uses

It was agreed that some of the "C" category uses such as travel bureaus should be shifted to category "B". Others such as laundries and carpet cleaning establishments in Use Group 16 should be shifted to category "G" and treated as light manufacturing uses.



2. Exempt and Low Requirement Commercial Districts

A: Northern Boundary of Exempt Districts

It was agreed that the present northern boundary of the exempt commercial districts in Manhattan should remain at 110th Street.

B: New Very Low Requirement Districts

It was agreed that a new set of commercial districts should be established with very low parking requirements. In these districts, only the very large retail stores with more than 40,000 or 50,000 square feet of floor area, large hotels, office buildings, arenas, and other high traffic generator uses will be required to provide parking. These districts will be mapped in Manhattan north of 110th Street and in the Bronx, generally west of the Bronx River excluding Riverdale.

3. Parking Requirements for Community Facilities

A: Consistency of Requirements in Commercial and Residence Districts

It was agreed that the parking requirements for community facilities in commercial and residence districts should be revised so as to minimize inconsistencies between commercial and residence districts typically mapped adjacent to one another. A medium requirement will be established for residence districts R1 to R5 and for the high and medium requirement commercial districts. A low requirement will be established for R6 and R7 Districts, and for the low requirement commercial districts. Most community facilities will be exempt from parking requirements in the R7-A, R8, R9, and R10 Districts, and in the very low requirement and exempt commercial districts.

B: Requirements for Community Facilities in High Density Areas

It was agreed that hospitals should be required to provide minimal accessory parking in the high density districts including Central Business Districts. Medical centers should be required to provide minimal parking north of 110th Street, Manhattan. All other community facilities will be exempt in the high density districts subject to a final review by the staff.

C: Exemption of Schools

It was agreed that schools should remain exempt from parking requirements.

4. Additional Manufacturing Districts

Consideration was given to the possibility of adding new manufacturing districts to eliminate the inconsistency of medium parking requirements for commercial and community facility uses in manufacturing districts with the exempt and very low requirements for these same uses in nearby residence and commercial districts. It was agreed not to add any new manufacturing districts unless this inconsistency becomes a serious problem.

5. Commercial Parking Facilities

A: Commercial Garages in Residence Districts

It was agreed that commercial garages should not be permitted in Residence Districts.

B: Accessory Parking for Residential Buildings

It was agreed that the renting out of excess accessory parking spaces to outsiders in residence districts should be permitted with administrative approval, but only on a weekly basis (not daily or hourly). In commercial districts where commercial garages are not permitted as of

right (C1 and C5), it was agreed that renting out of excess parking spaces accessory to residential uses on a daily or hourly basis should be allowed only by special permit. In all other commercial districts, where commercial garages are permitted as of right, renting out of excess spaces should be permitted by right. The word "excess" means excess over required accessory spaces whether used or not. It was agreed that the definition of "excess" spaces will be discussed with the building department.

C: Commercial Garages in Commercial Districts

The question was raised whether small commercial garages (under 150 spaces) should be permitted in any of the commercial districts. It was agreed that small garages are a problem only in Manhattan, and that the staff would review the C6 mapping with this problem in mind. In addition, further analysis will be given to the problem of attempting to prevent the over-development of certain areas of Manhattan by small garages.

6. Mapping Depths in Low Requirement Commercial Districts

It was agreed that the standard mapping depths in low requirement commercial districts where boundaries extend parallel to the short dimension of the block should be changed from 100 to 150 feet.

MEETING OF ZONING COMMITTEE - August 13, 1959

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN FELT, Vice Chairman Bloustein, Commissioner Orton, Richard K. Bernstein, Norman Williams, Jr., Nathan Ginsberg, Jack C. Smith, Astrid Monson; Mr. Perry Coke Smith of Voorhees Walker Smith, Smith, and Haines was also present.

---

Mr. Smith reported that the preliminary report on bulk prepared by Latham Squire had been received two hours before the meeting. Preliminary analysis showed several apparent misconceptions and errors. The report will be further analyzed by the staff.

The agenda for the meeting was outlined to include the following three aspects of the residential bulk controls.

a) Explanation of the three basic regulations -- floor area ratio, open space ratio, and lot area per dwelling unit -- and how they operate.

b) Review of the criticisms of the Consultants' proposal and the various special problems of luxury housing, Mitchell-Lama projects, public housing, etc.

c) Review of the various standards proposed and suggested changes.

A. The Devices and How They Operate

Mr. Smith explained the three basic controls, of which he cited the density controls as the most important and the floor area ratio as least necessary. It was agreed that the floor area ratio control alone was inadequate, and that the density control was necessary. It was further agreed that full documentation should be prepared showing the effect of density on the need for schools, playgrounds, transit, parking, stores, and other public facilities.

The open space ratio was explained as being set by the floor area ratio at any given number of stories. Its advantages over a coverage control were explained, as well as its usefulness as a device for the giving of bonuses for better open space standards.

In view of the complaints of some architects that having several separate controls

made for complications, it was suggested that consideration be given to dropping the floor area ratio as a separate control, since it could be adequately handled through the density and open space ratio controls.

Mrs. Monson explained, for the R7 District, the way the three inter-related controls operate. Mr. Smith reported that a simpler method of setting up the requirements in the resolution has been developed, and may possibly be further simplified. It was agreed that this simplification, in conjunction with recommended modifications in the density standards for 2- and 3-room units, as well as modifications of the rate of density bonus, have done much to improve the internal consistency and effective operation of the controls.

#### B. Criticisms and Problems

Mr. Smith summarized the criticisms and problems of the various types of builders - - the luxury high-bulk buildings in the R10 District, the six-story builders, aided middle-income projects, and public housing. It was agreed that the proposed controls, as revised, could operate satisfactorily in these various situations. In the case of aided or public housing or other special situations such as vest pocket projects, where the proposed development would not be permitted by the zoning, judicious re-mapping would be preferable to a general raising of bulk levels throughout the City. It was agreed that zoning could not have one bulk standard for aided or public housing and another for private housing. In the case of the outlying parts of the City, Mr. Smith pointed out, low land costs made the maintenance of good standards possible with, at worst, a rent-per-room-per-month increase of \$.50 to \$1.00.

It was agreed that the staff would meet with the Housing Authority staff to go over the revised standards and see whether all problems could be resolved. The staff discussions will be followed by a meeting of the Commissioners of both agencies.

It was also agreed that the staff would meet with Sam Ratensky to investigate the problems of "vest pocket" projects proposed for the West Side Urban Renewal area.

C. Suggested Changes in Bulk Levels

The following changes were recommended and accepted by the Committee:

- 1) The standards for the R7 District to be changed to permit a floor area ratio of 290 (OSR 18) at six stories instead of the original 275 (OSR 20).
- 2) The standards for the R8 District to be changed to permit 8 story buildings at 60% (OSR 8 and FAR 480 instead of OSR 10 and FAR 450). With bonus, buildings in the R8 District will be permitted to go up to FAR 600.
- 3) A new district, R9, to permit FAR's from 650 to 750, with required OSR ranging from 4.2 at 9 stories to 7.8 at 18 stories.
- 4) In R10 (the former R9 District at FAR 1000), a plaza bonus of 5 to 1 instead of 3 to 1.
- 5) It was agreed that the R10 District should have an absolute top FAR limit of 1200 even with a maximum plaza bonus.
- 6) Revised density standards including a lower lot area requirement for 2- and 3-room units, and a more rapidly rising density bonus ratio.

*M. Ashworth*

MEETING OF ZONING COMMITTEE - August 20, 1959

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN FELT, Vice Chairman Bloustein, Richard K. Bernstein, Norman Williams, Jr., Nathan Ginsberg, Jack C. Smith, Sidney Frigand, Astrid Monson. Mr. Perry Coke Smith and George Raymond, Consultants, were also present.

---

Mr. J. Smith outlined the agenda to include:

- 1) Architectural bulk problems
- 2) Queens maps

I. Architectural bulk problems

George Raymond introduced the subject by saying that many of the criticisms made of the proposed architectural controls - setbacks, sky exposure planes, courts, etc. - do not take into consideration the proposed maximum floor area ratio and building envelope. Under this envelope many of the contortions now practiced to squeeze the greatest possible bulk into the existing envelope will be unnecessary. Architects and builders who do not understand this may tend to cling to their old habits and continue to design dormers, narrow, deep, courts, zig-sag setbacks, etc., which are no longer necessary and make no sense under the proposal.

Mr. Raymond suggested that the answers to many of these criticisms could not be made at a public hearing but should be discussed in informal working sessions between staff members and architects or builders.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Raymond presented recommendations on the following points:

1 - Rear yards in corner lots in Residence Districts

The Voorhees Walker proposal was not clear on whether rear yards are required for corner lots in Residence Districts. It was explained that they are not. If a builder puts in an open area in the rear of a corner lot so that he can have legal windows opening on it, the open area is an inner court and therefore must be at least 30x40 feet. Corner lots in R10 can achieve FAR's of 1000 (or up to 1200 with plaza bonus) whereas interior lots can get only FAR 810. This compares with about 1300 and 750, respectively, under the present Resolution.

2. Waiver for small lots in R10

It was agreed that corner lots in R10 smaller than 100x100 feet would be allowed to have a 20' open area across an entire lot line in the rear of the building (instead of a 30'x40' court) and that legal windows opening on such open areas would be exempt from the minimum 30' requirement of Section 23-89.

3. Ventilation of block at corners

It was agreed that no requirement for an alleyway or opening to the street on corner lots will be included in the proposed resolution. Mr. P. C. Smith pointed out that this type of requirement is not needed for interior block ventilation and actually lets in carbon monoxide.

4. Lower height of front wall before required setback on narrow streets

It was agreed that the maximum height before the required setback be kept at 85' instead of being reduced to 60'. The main reason for this determination was the problem which would result on a corner lot from an 85' requirement on one side and 60' on another. It was pointed out that under the alternate sky exposure plane, buildings could set back 15 feet from the street and could then rise sheer for 140 feet, needing no setbacks and resulting in a 90 foot open space from wall to wall if both sides of the street elect the alternate.

5. Rear setback on interior lots in R9 and R10.

It was agreed that a rear setback of 20 feet from the rear yard line could be required in R9 and R10 above a height of 125 feet.

6. Inclusion of open area at rear of lot in plaza definition

It was agreed that open area at the rear of a lot would not be included in the plaza definition because it is not accessible to the public and does not benefit the street aspect as does a front plaza. (Obviously, an open space at least 100' wide and extending from front to rear of the lot would be included in the existing plaza definition).



7. Commercial plaza bonus

It was agreed that the floor area bonus for a plaza in Commercial and Manufacturing Districts would be increased as follows:

For a plaza with area up to

20% of lot:	5 to 1 floor area bonus
next 6%	6 to 1 " " "
next 6%	7 to 1 " " "
next 6%	8 to 1 " " "
next 6%	9 to 1 " " "
next 6%	10 to 1 " " "

Thus, a 50% plaza in highest bulk districts would result in an FAR of 1840.

The question was raised as to whether the maximum bonus would be achieved on a 200x100 lot. It was agreed that Mr. Joe Klein would be asked to work this out in terms of minimum economic floor lay-outs.

8. Front yard requirement in R6 and R7

It was agreed that no such requirement be proposed, as it was felt that the required open space should be located as flexibly as possible to be of the maximum usefulness on any given lot.

9. Special setback regulations for buildings set at angle to street

It was agreed that the only time this problem exists, such as in large housing projects, the sites are large enough to make possible a site plan keeping all buildings back 20' from the street line, and that no special regulations are necessary.

10. Permitting entire area of closed streets to be counted as lot area

It was agreed that the present proposal that only only help such area be counted should remain unchanged, as a density increase of 25% to 40% was felt to be too heavy a neighborhood burden.

11. Floor area bonus for arcades

It was agreed that no such bonus be proposed.

12. Increased tower coverage for small lots

It was agreed that no increase in the 40% tower limitation be proposed for small lots.

13. Increased length of wall in R4 and R5.

It was agreed that the 170' limitation in Section 23-463 be increased to 185 feet.

14. Court and legal window modifications in Districts other than R10

It was agreed to keep the 30'x40' minimum inner court dimensions (Section 23-87); the 30' minimum distance from a legal window to a wall or lot line (Section 23-89); and the 2 to 1 ratio for narrow outer courts (Section 23-84) and outer court recesses (Section 23-86). It was agreed not to exempt any Kitchen or bedroom windows from the definition of legal windows requiring a minimum 30' distance, except in the special situation outlined in point 2 above.

15. Air rights

It was agreed that for the time being no air rights provision would be put into the proposed resolution, as it seemed possible to handle pending problems through the present resolution. The dangers that an air rights provision might encourage "hold-outs" and permanent obsolescence, as well as a significant over-all increase in bulk in certain areas, were discussed. It was agreed that a final decision on this matter would be made at this Committee's last meeting.

16. "S" District in Brooklyn Heights

It was agreed that this problem was academic in view of recent construction in the area and that no such district would be recommended at this time. It was agreed that Mr. J. Smith would draft a letter to Mr. R. Moses for the Chairman's signature, asking his views on the advisability of such a district. A final decision will be made at the last meeting of this Committee.

II. Queens Mapping

Maps 9, 11, and 13 were reviewed. The minutes on the decisions reached on these maps will be prepared and made a part of the minutes of the next meeting at which time the review of all the remaining Queens maps is to be completed.

*Irving Ashworth*

MEETING OF ZONING COMMITTEE - August 27, 1959

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN FELT, Vice Chairman Bloustein, Richard K. Bernstein, Irving Ashworth, Norman Williams, Jr., Nathan Ginsberg, Samuel Joroff, Sidney Frigand, Edwin Friedman

---

Of the 17 maps covering Queens, numbers 9, 11, and 13 were reviewed at the meeting of August 20. No requests were received on maps numbered 6, 8, 17, 24 and 29.

Map #7 - The Committee considered 15 requests from the public and 1 recommendation to grant in full or in part all but four of the 16 items. Final action on the request of Sylvania for an extension of the M1 District was deferred pending a check on transitional sign provisions.

Map #10 - Twenty-six requested map changes and 4 Master Plan recommendations were considered. Action was deferred on 2 requests pending a check on a proposed Mitchell Lama development. The technical staff recommendations were approved for the remainder. One M District as proposed by Voorhees Walker Smith and Smith was modified by the Committee.

Map #14 - Seven requests from the public and four Master Planning Recommendations were considered. The committee deferred an Office of Master Planning recommendation to square off the proposed Jamaica C4 area pending investigation by Jack C. Smith. Six of the requests and recommendations were approved by the Committee; the remaining items were denied.

Map #15 - The one requested change by the public was approved as recommended by the technical staff.

Map #18 - Eleven items were considered of which seven were approved by the Committee, one with a minor modification.

Map #19 - Of 10 requests of the public, 8 were denied, and two approved as recommended by the technical staff.

Map #25 - The one change requested by the public was deferred pending a discussion by Commissioner Orton with the Bayswater group. The two recommendations of the Office of Master Planning were approved.

Map #30 - Eight changes requested by the public and six Master Planning recommendations were considered. One request is to be checked with respect to a Title I development to see if the proposed bulk and other standards can be met. Eleven items were approved in whole or in part, and three were denied.

Map #31 - Three changes requested by the public were considered. A requested change in Bayswater was deferred, one request was approved and one was denied as recommended by the technical staff.

A detailed summary of the action of the Committee on each request and staff recommendation is under preparation. This summary, the summary of the action of the Committee on maps numbered 9, 11 and 13, and a statistical breakdown on the number of requests received, approved, denied, modified, etc. will be appended to these minutes, and will constitute part of the minutes.

PROPOSED WORK SCHEDULE OF ZONING COMMITTEE

June 18, 1959 through Sept. 17, 1959

JUNE 18

Discussion and agreement on work schedule

JUNE 25

- 1) Review of all possible changes in use district structure
- 2) Residential use regulations
  - A) Institutions
  - B) Home occupations
  - C) Accessory uses
  - D) Transient hotels
  - E) Clubs including swimming pool clubs
- 3) Commercial use regulations
  - A) Review of use groups
  - B) Review of problem commercial uses -- garages, lumber yards, gas stations, printers, etc.
  - C) Ground floor restrictions
- 4) Manufacturing use regulations
  - A) Review of the use of performance standards and use lists
  - B) Review of manufacturing use groups and problem manufacturing uses -- printing, lumber, petroleum products storage
  - C) Proposed enclosure regulations

JULY 2

No meeting

JULY 9

- 1) Review of possible changes in bulk district structure
  - A) New zone between R8 and R9
  - B) New single-family district with minimum lot size of 10,000 sq. ft.
  - C) Two-family district
  - D) Review of commercial and manufacturing bulk districts
- 2) Proposed general policy in revising zoning maps
- 3) Proposed modifications of Article VII, Administration

JULY 16

Review of Residential FAR, OSR, and Density Levels

- A) Review of lot area per DU and FAR levels of different districts

- B) Special review of R4 and R5 regulations for row houses
- C) Review of density bonuses in relation to FAR bonuses

JULY 23

Second session on residential FAR, OSR, and density levels

JULY 30

Proposed changes in Article V, Non-conforming Uses and Non-complying Buildings

AUG. 6

- 1) Proposed residential parking and loading regulations
- 2) Proposed commercial " " " "
- 3) Proposed manufacturing " " " "
- 4) Review of mapping commercial parking districts

AUG. 13

- 1) Height, setback, yard and related bulk regulations (Voorhees Walker Smith & Smith and G. Raymond)
  - A) Distance between buildings formula
  - B) Rear yards on corner lots
  - C) Larger plaza bonuses
  - D) Review rear yard equivalent and modify
  - E) Review Sky Exposure Plan, towers, etc. especially if FAR's are changed
- 2) Review of proposed modifications of Manhattan Zoning maps

AUG. 20

- 1) Second session on height, setback, yard and related bulk regulations
- 2) Review of proposed modifications of Queens zoning maps

AUG. 27

- 1) Review of Article VI, Special Height Regulations Applying Around Major Airpor
- 2) Review of provisions for large scale residential projects
- 3) Review of proposed modifications of Richmond zoning maps

SEPT. 3

- 1) Proposed historic and aesthetic zoning
- 2) Review of proposed modifications of Bronx Zoning maps

SEPT. 10

- 1) Review of proposed performance standards
- 2) Review of sign regulations
- 3) Review of proposed modifications of Brooklyn zoning maps

SEPT. 17

- 1) Final review of FAR levels of Residence, Commercial and Manufacturing Districts
- 2) Review of Article I, especially definitions