

**TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE
THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 12, 1960**

in the matter of....

Comprehensive Amendment
of the Zoning Resolution
of The City of New York

Borough of the Bronx

C.P. 15820

VOLUME:2

PUBLIC HEARING

before the

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

in the matter of a

PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE AMENDMENT
Pursuant to Section 200 of the New York City Charter

of the

ZONING RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

consisting of

TEXT AND MAPS

Held at City Hall, Borough of Manhattan

Beginning on September 12, 1960, and continued on
September 13 and 14, 1960.

CONTINUED HEARING - PROPOSED ZONING MAPS FOR THE
BOROUGH OF THE BRONX
September 12, 1960

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

James Felt, Chairman
Francis J. Bloustein,
Vice-Chairman
Abraham M. Lindenbaum
Goodhue Livingston, Jr.
Lawrence M. Orton
Michael A. Provenzano
James G. Sweeney
Commissioners

Pauline J. Malter, Secretary

*INDEX OF SPEAKERS - SEPTEMBER 12, 1960 - THE BRONX

| <u>Speakers</u> | <u>Page No.</u> | <u>Speakers</u> | <u>Page No.</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| Atkin, Harry | 3 | Larsen, Norma D. | 11 |
| Donnor, Max | 42 | Lippe, Henry J. | 24 |
| Feeley, Edgar | 21 | Petrenchick, John | 45 |
| Gifford, Rev. Millard M. | 28 | Poggi, Catherine | 8 |
| Hauptner, Harvey E. | 13 | Reynolds, James F. | 30 |
| Hausknecht, Harry | 39 | Rose, Joseph M. | 26 |
| Jensen, Stephen F. | 18 | Schmitz, Friedel (commun.) | 39 |
| Kellner, Mrs. Irene | 45 | Whinston, Samuel A. | 28 |
| Kerlin, Gilbert | 7 | | |

*INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS - SEPTEMBER 12, 1960 - THE BRONX

| <u>Organizations</u> | <u>Page No.</u> |
|---|-----------------|
| Bronx Home Builders, Inc. | 3 |
| City Island Civic Assn. | 18, 24 |
| New York Lien Corp. | 39 |
| Residents of City Island | 39 |
| Riverdale Community Plan- ning Assn. | 7 |
| Williamsbridge Road Reformed Church | 28 |

(*See also index in Volume 6 of this transcript)

PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED - SEPTEMBER 12, 1960 - 4:00 P.M.

IN THE MATTER OF THE PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE
AMENDMENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 200 OF THE NEW
YORK CITY CHARTER, OF THE ZONING RESOLUTION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, CONSISTING OF TEXT
AND MAPS (CP 15820)

PROPOSED ZONING MAPS FOR THE
BOROUGH OF THE BRONX

SECRETARY MALTER: The hearing will now continue on
the proposed zoning maps for the Borough of The Bronx.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Harry Atkin.

HARRY ATKIN, representing Bronx Home Builders, Inc.

My name is Harry Atkin, Special Engineer for the firm
of Schaeffer & Atkin, 80 West 40th Street, New York City.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Pardon me. There was a lady who
wished to be heard before on mapping of The Bronx. I think
there were two ladies.

Would you please let us have your names?

MRS. CATHERINE POGGI: Catherine Poggi.

MRS. NORMA D. LARSEN: Norma Larsen.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

Mr. Atkin?

HARRY ATKIN, representing Bronx Home Builders Association.

MR. ATKIN: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission,
Gentlemen.

I represent the Bronx Home Builders Association, of 1054
Allerton Avenue, a member of the National Home Builders Association.

As soon as the master plan was conceived by the consultants,
and the map was available for examination, the Bronx Home Builders felt
that the "R" districts as they were laid out at that time were far too
drastic, were unfair to the people of the Bronx, and it would be very
difficult for them as home builders to supply the people of the Bronx
with the proper home construction.

So they, with my assistance, prepared what they felt the map
should be like. We had a number of consultations with Mr. Smith and
others, and the results were very fruitful.

The maps then prepared by the City Planning Commission came
out in December of 1959, were far more liberal from our viewpoint and
far more in accordance with what we felt they should be.

Now, again, when the new maps came out last month, there
were a number of other changes which we felt were more in line with our
conception of the proper zoning, and I have a letter here from the
Planning Commission thanking us for our cooperation and indicating
four or five more additional changes in large areas in our R6 districts,
so that I'm not here to talk on the residential areas. However, this
large organization of home builders does also own properties in

commercial districts, and there are people who furnish them with land who own areas in the Bronx which were formerly zoned for business, and for business and retail use and which have been changed to residential areas.

Now, in this particular field we haven't seen any changes that were -- that are realistic. We feel that we -- we realize that the Planning Commission feels there have been too many commercial areas under the old zoning, and I won't quarrel with that conception. However, the way it's been applied to the map, we feel has been very unrealistic. There are areas, for instance, on Gunhill Road in particular which have been changed to residential -- to R districts from formerly business and retail districts, and a study of these areas will find that this change is completely unrealistic. These areas are not only -- are business districts now and suitable, eminently suitable only for business, and entirely unsuitable for residence purposes.

COMMISSIONER BROUSSEIN: Did you discuss those areas with Mr. Smith when you met with him?

MR. ATKINS: No, our meetings were completely on our districts only, which is what the Bronx Home Builders were interested in, and, as I say, we've gotten a letter from the Planning Commission thanking us for our cooperation and we feel highly satisfied with the cooperation -- with the patience that the Planning Commission has had with us.

I'm here now not on the R districts, but on the C districts which the Bronx Home Builders are also very much interested in.

I've already presented cases -- Mrs. Kellner, who is getting

up here to speak was one of these cases -- in which I prove and which I feel are -- I feel strongly are suitable only for commercial purposes, not only from the standpoint of the people who own the particular lots, but from the standpoint of the areas in -- commercial districts that are needed for those areas, and an examination of those locations will prove that they are entirely unsuitable for residential construction.

I give Gunhill Road -- the length of Gunhill Road is one of the examples. There are -- now, we, the Bronx Home Builders, and I'm talking for them, feel that we want to have the opportunity in addition to the two cases that I've already filed before the Board, to point out a number of these locations, give arguments to prove that they are suited only for commercial use and not for residential use, and try to evolve a change in those particular areas before the Zoning Resolution is approved.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Will you, Mr. Atkin, come up and see Mr. Smith and give him a list of those particular sections?

MR. ATKIN: I'll not only give him a list, but I'll give him the exact locations of those areas, the arguments we have for retaining them as commercial areas.

I'm not going to talk in a general way; I'm going to give specific arguments for which we feel --

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: All right. Sometime following this week, when we conclude these hearings, will you call Mr. Smith and go up and see him?

MR. ATKIN: That's very much what I would like to do.

In other words, there's still a chance that we will have a chance to change these things before this goes into final approval?

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: We don't know that yet, but we would like to have those areas before us so the Commission can consider them.

MR. ATKIN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: You are welcome.

Mr. Gilbert Kerlin.

GILBERT KERLIN, representing Riverdale Community Planning Association.

Mr. Vice-Chairman and Members of the Planning Commission:

My name is Gilbert Kerlin; I am President of the Riverdale Community Planning Association.

We operate in the West Bronx, in the area bounded on the west by the Hudson River, on the south by Spuyten Duyvil, north by City Line, and on the east by Broadway.

We, in this Riverdale Area, have been beneficiaries of good planning, thanks to the overall rezoning of the Riverdale Area which was instigated by this Commission in 1953 and unanimously approved by the Board of Estimate in January of 1954. Since that time, Riverdale has grown some five times faster than any other area in the City of New York, and in this tremendous expansion, the values of Riverdale, and I speak of the human values as well as the dollars and cents values, have all been preserved.

The plan which was adopted in 1954 has been substantially taken over in the present comprehensive rezoning. We view it as a splendid piece of work; we see that the entire City of New York can benefit as we have in Riverdale. We emphatically and enthusiastically endorse it and we pledge our support for its maintenance.

May I say that there have been suggestions that possible changes in the zoning may be effected, in the proposed plan, may be effected before it becomes final. We, in this area, would appreciate very much a notice with respect to any such notice so that we may have an opportunity to be heard.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Yes, you can be assured of that.

MR. KERLIN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Mrs. Poggi.

CATHERINE POGGI, representing homeowners on Brush Avenue.

I almost forgot how to walk.

I'm talking about Brush Avenue.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Will you give your name?

MRS. POGGI: Catherine Poggi, and I'm representing the Homeowners on Brush Avenue, the length of Brush Avenue, because there's just a few of us.

I have a petition here asking for it to be rezoned E-1 -- it's E-1 now in the old zone, but we would like it commensurate with the new zone.

Now, we're being zoned in Manufacturing 1-1, and in our particular case -- in our particular case, it seems geographically

that we can't expand any further than Brush Avenue. We're between the Creek and the Hutchinson River Parkway. So, your zoning M1 will zone it right out, the homes, right out of existence because the homes are all on one side of the street and the rest of it is completely vacant. I have --

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: The homes can remain there.

MRS. POGGI: Yes, but what's the use? I mean, if you have manufacturing on the other side of the street, that's all there is to it. It's not that it can be absorbed over a period of years in and out of a district.

Now, we studied rules and regulations and the maps of your new Zoning Law, and some people complained it was hard. It wasn't too bad -- it just took a little time to understand it.

Although it is for long-range planning, however, it seems it is a law that zones almost every piece of vacant waterfront property in the Bronx for manufacturing; one, two or three. Is there no future for the Bronx waterfront except for manufacturing? On Brush Avenue, south of St. Helena's High School, we have no industry, no apartment buildings, and no direct transportation to the City. At the present time, Brush Avenue is being used as a relief artery to the Whitestone Bridge. It is so heavily traveled from 3:30 to 7:00 P.M., that the traffic is often bumper to bumper almost every day. Fire apparatus has difficulty in answering some calls. This traffic condition will probably be alleviated upon completion of the Throgs Neck Bridge. Even then, Brush Avenue will end at Ferry Point Park.

Is this -- is it good planning, Gentlemen, to zone such an area that is hardly to be considered within the reach of public transportation for manufacturing of any degree? Either apartment houses or manufacturing must have people to rent them or work in them. There is a public service -- a bus which services us on the west side of the Hutchinson River Parkway which goes over the Whitestone Bridge to Queens. To return to the Bronx or New York Area, it would be necessary to walk about a half a mile to the pedestrian bridge which spans the parkway to the nearest bus stop. Many employees would have to arrive by car. M1-1 Zoning requires one parking space for every three employees on the premises. The remaining cars would be strewn along Brush Avenue.

In a small area such as this, we will be contributing to the aforementioned traffic congestion. A little foresight and a physical inspection is all that is needed to see that Brush Avenue is not an area that can absorb any influx of small manufacturing concerns or large apartment dwellings.

Not too long ago, a site was under consideration for public housing in our area. A spokesman for the Citizens Council on Housing stated that upon physical inspection he found that two bridges as designated on the City Maps crossing Westchester Creek were non-existent. This was one of the prime factors in filing of the project. Entrance and egress is limited at the present time. The area is largely vacant. One or two manufacturing plants now would alter the character of the area and it will be forever

undesirable and under the new Rule not be allowed for future new home construction. Once new homes are built and lived in, the community will grow, and transportation will some day reach us. Entrance and egress may be facilitated by future improvements. Any less restrictive zoning changes could then be easily assimilated. In the meantime, we are submitting a petition along with a petition from our neighbors at the south end of Brush Avenue asking you gentlemen to help us to keep our homes and our neighborhood by zoning Brush Avenue east to the service road of the Hutchinson River Parkway and Brush Avenue west to the Westchester Creek Pierhead Line commensurate with the E-1 designation we now have. That is, R1-1 or R2-1.

Thank you, gentlemen, for any consideration you give us.

I have a map here that might help. We have -- this is what you see on the maps, but this is actually what we have.

We have nothing there; you know, nothing crossing the creek at all except the Unionport Bridge.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Do you want to leave that?

MRS. POGGI: Yes, if you like. But there's only one pedestrian crossing across the whole highway, and people just can't get in or out of the place.

For small homes, it might be easily accessible because people would have their own cars.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Miss Larsen.

NORMA D. LARSEN, representing herself.

My name is Norma D. Larsen. I am here to vehemently object

to the zoning classification of R-3 that has been proposed for my property on the south end of City Island.

This is a valuable waterfront property; has been business for over sixty years. I fail to see how the City can benefit by changing my property from business to residence. We have four businesses on our property; two dealing with restaurant business, fishing pier and a boat business selling boats, motors and operating sightseeing boats.

We have never had any trouble regulating any of the business on our property. It gives pleasure of the healthiest type to thousands of people each week during the summer. We have a large off-street parking area, and the reason a few City Islanders have taken it upon themselves to object to the business we conduct is for one reason only: During the past years, our trade has been a good part colored and Puerto Rican during a few hours of each evening. The City Islanders say right out that they want to drive the colored off the Island.

I am sure that your Commission does not want to be a party to a deliberate act of discrimination, and I ask that you reconsider the zoning classification for our property. We should have a proper business classification, possibly C-3. We have a profitable business and we do not want to be faced with the aggravation and expense of going before the various Boards to prove that we should continue as we have been. We want to be classified so that we can remain as we are, able to improve and expand as the City grows through the years.

The fourth generation of my family is about ready to take over. I want them to be able to work without any handicaps of improper zoning.

COMMISSIONER ORION: Thank you.

Mr. Hauptner.

A VOICE: Which one of us do you mean; would you spell it out, please?

COMMISSIONER BLOCSWEIN: Well, it's Harvey Hauptner.

COMMISSIONER ORION: That's right.

HARVEY E. HAUPTNER, appearing for himself.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission:

My name is Harvey Hauptner. I reside at 28 Fordham Street, and I am a resident and homeowner of City Island in the Bronx.

I am here to strenuously and bitterly object to your Commissioners' decisions as regards the business and residential designation of both sides of City Island Avenue which should have been allotted for business for its entire length with the exception of the spots occupied by our three churches and our one synagogue.

In fact, a look at your latest map of City Island Avenue discloses that it is in such a jumbled-up mess of business and residential designations, it looks as if Hurricane Donna tore right down through the middle of City Island Avenue and there are so many spots showing on our sole business thoroughfare as residence areas.

The acts of your Commission, the action of your Commission has met with the distinct disapproval of many of our business people

up there, our residents and our homeowners. And it is my opinion that the rezoning of the entire length of City Island Avenue should have been handled by expert businessmen instead of the few unqualified amateurs on the so-called Zoning Committee of the City Island Civic Association, of which I was one. I am frank to confess that I don't believe that either myself or any of my colleagues were or are now qualified to competently do this work properly, and it is my honest opinion that your Commission made a grievous and monumental mistake in not seeking and taking the advice of competent and capable trained men to render a fair and qualified decision in the matter.

I feel sure that that is the reason why we are here today. Although there are many areas that should be covered, I will confine my remarks and objections to just two:

The waterfront on the west side of City Island Avenue from Kilroe Street south to Beach Street, as well as the west side of City Island Avenue on Rochelle Street and the east side of City Island Avenue and Belden Street, both south to the waterfront.

The first mentioned area, the west side of City Island Avenue from Kilroe to Beach Street, consists of a heavy concentration of small boat business, marinas, gas stations, parking areas and eating places. Yet, your office has chosen to spot the residence designation right in the center of an area that has existed as a one hundred per cent business area for some fifty years or more.

In addition, Ray's Boatyard at Beach Street has been given a business designation on one side and an M-1 designation on

the other side, which creates a distinct handicap with the yard in two separate areas. Why?

We now come to the south end of the Island. From Buckley Street and Horton Street on City Island Avenue, your office very early in our deliberations chose to designate this area, and I would point out without any opposition from the City Island Civic Association, as a definite business area that embraced both sides of City Island Avenue on the west side from Buckley to Rochelle Street, on the east side from Horton to Belden Streets, yet, very singularly we now find that the extension of this area on both sides of City Island Avenue south of the waterfront is now designated as an ~~am~~^{R3}th residence area instead of the business designation. This area has had and has been paying taxes on for over fifty years. In fact, as a youngster, I distinctly remember that this whole area was used as an amusement park with steamboats discharging and picking up passengers at the dock and it has been used pretty much for business to this day.

It is my opinion, and I know this is shared by many, that this decision was arrived at by your office without investigating all of the facts and without going into all the underlying pitfalls and motives connected with the situation. In addition, your decision is being directed at this particular area on City Island Avenue while adjoining this area, only two blocks north, a business designation has been proposed by your office where exactly identical conditions exist. And I repeat, with still not one word of objection from

the City Island Civic Association, who now appear to be so vitally concerned in denying a business designation on the same avenue only two blocks south. Why?

These demands for changes that your office appears to have given some attention to, could, in the opinion of many, lead to a most serious situation here if not properly handled or the real deep down points of contention given strict attention. There is no question but that certain conditions here have been the cause of great concern and unrest to our residents. Such is an unusual influx of strangers in the past several years, a very small portion of which may have conducted themselves in an objectionable manner, and at unreasonable hours of the night, when the average person is asleep. Some of these may have been newcomers to our City and strangers to our way of life, and the customs that we are accustomed to.

But resentment against some of these and the conditions mentioned could well be the motive behind the demands for a change of designation in the area to your office. But with such demands, an extremely dangerous situation could raise its ugly head. Discrimination, both personal and racial, could be interpreted by some and there seems no doubt that if your decision stands, the situation will not be solved, but could well become a Frankenstein that would engulf us all.

The owner-operators and many of our citizens will certainly view this as nothing more than a bald attempt to utter confiscation of their properties and business with the consequent drop in property

values from business to residence and the attendant great loss of taxes to the City of New York.

In addition, the people who have patronized these places of business, only a small portion of whom can be accused of conducting themselves in an objectionable or unlawful manner, could easily feel that they were being made the victims of discrimination. I need not point out to any of you the vicious cycle that could ensue. I have discussed this subject with many people, and there seems only one sensible course to pursue in this vital issue, if this vital issue is to be avoided: Education, common sense and above all, the law.

For all the operators and owners in this area, our people -- and the visitors will have to all agree that law and order will have to prevail. A great part of this could be accomplished through an ironclad agreement among the business people, among the area, for a complete business close-down at a reasonable hour of the night with a complete barring of the public from their premises to discourage loitering and no chiseling about it. This could go a long way in clearing up the situation.

Education must be carried to a greater degree by all the participants in the area. We must be aware that many of the patrons may be new to our City, and as I have stated before, possibly unfamiliar with our way of life or our customs, but proper education and the proper disposition of police officers in the area should help that quickly.

However, we must all realize that we're now living in an unusual era and both sides, all of us, will simply have to learn how to live with the other, no matter how either feels about it. We will also have to listen to -- we will also have to learn to not listen to or have our minds swayed by the sweet words of false prophets who may only be seeking personal gain or self-agrandizement at our own expense.

We should make our own decisions and not have them made for us. I might also add that we have excellent License, Sanitation, Police and Health Departments, all of whom have no trouble in maintaining order in other parts of City Island. So they should be amply able to cope with any complaints either real or fancied from our residents if they are immediately and properly notified.

Commissioners, I have just tried to point out a few of the danger points our little community is facing should this resolution be adopted. If such is done, then we are facing lawsuits and possible disaster. I humbly plea that common sense would indicate that your office reappraise our entire situation. If such is not done, then I can only feel that you, Commissioner, hold the answer to whether we live in peace or die in despair. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Thank you.

Stephen F. Jensen.

STEPHEN F. JENSEN, City Island Civic Association.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission:

My name is Stephen F. Jensen. I reside and own property at 416 King Avenue, City Island, New York.

I am here to represent the residents in the immediate area

of Kirby Street, and I propose to confine my comments to that particular area of City Island.

The property known as Dillon's Boat Service and Club, 225 Kirby Street, City Island 64, New York, is located at the foot of Kirby Street, a dead end street, approximately centrally positioned on the east side of City Island. Dillon's and the surrounding area have been classified as restricted in the past and are shown as the same on the Planning Commissioner's Rezoning Map.

The immediate area covering Kirby Street, Ditmars Street, Bowne Street and King Avenue, contain well-kept, beautiful, modern homes. All residents are proud of their homes and the community. Any change in Zones Classification from residential will adversely affect the residential character of the neighborhood, resulting in deterioration of property values.

The residents of the immediate Kirby Street area do not oppose Dillon's Boat Service operating as it is under present residential area restrictions. However, the residents of the entire surrounding area, including Kirby Street, Ditmars Street, Bowne Street and King Avenue, strongly oppose any change in Dillon's zoning classification.

On June 20, 1960, Mr. E. Benigan of 210 Kirby Street and I, personally, circulated a petition to the residents of Kirby Street, Ditmars Street, Bowne Street and King Avenue.

I had proposed to read the petition, but in view of the limited time, I will just mention that the petition strongly opposes

any change in classification of the property known as 225 Kirby Street. This petition was eagerly signed by all residents of Kirby Street, except, of course, 225 Kirby Street, the Dillon property, and was signed by ninety-two per cent of the total residents of Kirby Street, Bowne Street, Ditmars Street and King Avenue. Said area bounded on the north by Beach Street, on the south by Roselle Street, on the west by Minford Avenue. Only two per cent of the residents approached refused to sign the petition. The remaining six per cent were not available for signature.

Of the two per cent who refused, we were confronted with a businessman who stated that since he was in business for himself, he did not think it ethical to sign a petition which might adversely affect another businessman.

The remaining part of two per cent involved boat owners who stated that they used Dillon's Boat Service and did not think it proper to be involved in this petition.

On June 20, 1960 -- the 20th of June, 1960, the petition was submitted by mail to the Chairman -- by mail -- was submitted by mail by the Chairman of the Civic Association Zoning Committee to Mr. James Felt, Planning Commission, 2 Lafayette Street, New York, on June 28th, 1960. Acknowledgment of receipt of said petition was received by the Chairman of the Civic Association Zoning Committee on July 11, 1960, signed by Mr. James Felt.

In view of -- in view of 225 Kirby Street having always been classified as residential, the adverse affect that a

reclassification to anything else but residential would have on the surrounding area, the type and beauty of the community involved, and the fact that ninety-two per cent of the residents involved oppose classification -- oppose reclassification of 225 Kirby Street to a business area, appears to logically dictate that said property should remain residential zoning.

Therefore, as a representative of the area involved, I respectfully request that the Planning Board's Rezoning Plan dealing with 225 Kirby Street remain as shown, R-3, in the new Zoning Resolution issued on August 18, 1960.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Thank you.

Mr. Feeley.

EDGAR FEELEY, representing himself.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board:

My name is Edgar P. Feeley. I live at City Island.

I speak in behalf of the entire avenue, City Island Avenue, being continued as business. It has been business for longer than seventy years. Some of the places up there we have now spoken about have been in business as they are now when I was a young boy of five years of age. It does not seem right or proper that at this late date you should rezone City Island Avenue.

We can go from one end to the other. We don't have too many business places on the Island. We do have, in the summertime, several restaurants, in particular, the Lobster Box, and if any of

you men know City Island, you know it's one of the best on the Island.

What do they propose doing to that? Well, first, they'd like to take away their parking lot. That accommodates 135 cars, on one side. On the other side it accommodates 50 cars.

The congestion on the south end of the Island is very serious, which you all know. And I hope you're up there once in a while; if you don't, take a trip up and you'll see that what I'm saying is correct.

At the end of the Island there's a dock, and I was down there Saturday; there were at least a thousand people fishing down there, all colored, whites and blacks, everybody being accommodated, everybody getting along very well.

But there are some in the City Island Civic Association who don't like some of those people, have an idea that if you close it up, they won't come to City Island. They'll still come to City Island. It's the end of the Island and that's it.

I have here, gentlemen, a petition signed by 38 of the business property owners on the avenue. Not a single one dissented. We have not approached some of the others, and I dare say not a single one will object if you continue City Island Avenue as business.

As a matter of fact, not long ago, when some of the members of this City Island Association could not get their way, they threatened to secede from the Union or the City, and join Westchester County, and they didn't want them. But they did approach them.

I think it's all wrong, gentlemen, if you now will change

City Island Avenue from business to residence, and a mixing in of residency. In one particular place in your planning, you have a man there by the name of Eidel who had a marina there for 58 years, and you've cut the property in two pieces. One part of it business, the next part of it residence, next part business. It doesn't seem right that you should do that.

Further, gentlemen, as you go along the avenue, you have one side residence and you have the other side business. Who is going to live opposite a shipyard or a factory up there? Nobody. No one would care to. And if you now will plan and suggest and give to those people residence, nobody will buy it for residence. It must be continued as business.

I'd like now if I could, please -- Mr. Smith, I know, has been very capable up there -- I've had some few talks with Mr. Friedman, very lovely fellow, he's tried to do the best he can, even on the Island. They said, "People, please try to get together and do the right thing," but it doesn't look to me as if they're trying to do the right thing on the south end of the Island.

May I now submit to you people the petition?

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Leave it with the clerk, Mr. Feeley.

MR. FEELEY: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Thank you. Mr. Lippe.

HENRY J. LIPPE, Vice President, City Island Civic Association.

MR. LIPPE: I am Henry J. Lippe. I am a resident of the Island, 667 King Avenue, City Island, and I'm Vice President of the City Island Civic Association and on the Zoning Committee.

In the month of June, we saw this coming through the City Island Board of Trade -- after seventeen months they developed into a Board of Trade, and the people who helped to zone this thing, the very men who are talking against it now, have zoned it into the position it is today, and they said they didn't want it any more, and we came forward and asked them to have meetings with us because your Chairman and Mr. Friedman said we should get together.

We did that because we thought that was a very good idea and that you had a very good right to say that we should get together and bring this thing to a head amongst ourselves. Now, Mr. Kyle -- who is not here -- but who represents the Board of Trade, filed a petition with you, but when he came to our meetings did not have it with him, and he -- he was sent home during the meeting -- we caucused, and when he came to the meeting, he tore out a lot of pages and handed us the part that he wanted us to see.

Now, in our committee was a woman, Mrs. C. Caparello of 47 Hawkins Street, who said to Mr. Kyle, "We don't want to see what you're leaving here. We want to see what you tore out and took home."

Now, the Committee of the Board of Trade which Mr. Feeley is talking about, and the rest of them that are against it, Mr. Kyle is the President of it, and we made Mr. Jensen, president or chairman of a committee, and he asked me to pick any twenty people that he could pick six from, and we gave them to him. We did the same with Mr. Kyle at the Board of Trade.

Mr. Kyle picked a Mr. Bob Borshau, a business residence address, where he has Toit's Restaurant, at 536 City Island Avenue, Mr. Melvin Bard, whose business is United Shipyard, 210 Carroll Street. His residence is 1581 81st Street, City Island, New York City. His other committeeman was ---

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Mr. Lippe, we're not interested in this Committee or its internal matters. We've got a great many people sitting here. Will you tell us what you want us to do. I mean, whatever differences you and your neighbors may have had is a matter of internal relationships.

MR. LIPPE: Well, at the five meetings that we had, we voted unanimously, and the Board of Trade which only has 27 members out of the 200 that are there - we voted unanimously, not unanimously, but in some cases ten to one and in other cases twenty to one for the zoning as it stands on City Island as a whole.

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: So you favor the maps as they were presented for the purpose of this hearing?

MR. LIPPE: We certainly do.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: That is what we want to hear.

Thank you very much, Mr. Lippe.

Joseph M. Rose.

JOSEPH M. ROSE, representing an owner.

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.

Vice-Chairman, Members of the Board:

My name is Joseph M. Rose, and I represent one of the owners of a particular piece of property which I am going to discuss.

Unfortunately, this piece of property in the zoning book is cut into five pages. The closest page would be page 4A in the book. It's the easterly side of White Plains Road and Adee Avenue. In the interim, I compiled an overall map because your drawing does not give you a complete picture.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: What do we have it as, and what do you object to?

MR. ROSE: You have the property now in an R5 Zone, where you can see from this map that the entire area from Pelham Parkway to the City Line, along White Plains Road, upon which an elevated structure runs, is all commercial or retail business now; the only property that is not commercial or retail business is the property that I have reference to, which is north of Adee and south of Adee on the easterly side of White Plains Road.

CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Go ahead. We have located it on the map.

MR. ROSE: Now, this area is approximately three miles, as you can see, and I'd like to exhibit, put in this map as an exhibit.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: You'll leave it with the clerk.

MR. ROSE: Now, this particular parcel abuts the Lexington Avenue-7th Avenue elevated structure which runs parallel along White Plains Road below Pelham Parkway and the City Line.

Your map, which is compiled by the Department of City Planning for land use, shows that the property is right in the middle of a high-medium density area of 105 to 144 dwelling units per acre. Your proposed zoning would put it again in a residential area.

Now, this property is within a hundred yards of two new housing developments, one on Parker Avenue and Adeo, a Mitchell-Lama development of over 500 families, and another development which is in a proposed state of preparation, which is two blocks north, for another 500 families.

This property is only 100 feet in depth, although it runs along about 400 feet on White Plains Road; it's a hundred feet in depth. And, as a resident of the area for over ten years, and in dealing with realty in that area for over twenty years, it's my opinion that it's only suitable for a retail or commercial area with sufficient parking because what we need in that area are better stores with parking areas. And I propose that you take it under advisement to correct this, which I believe might be an error on the part of those who have prepared this plan.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Rose, we will.

Reverend Millard M. Gifford.

SAMUEL A. WHINSTON: May I at this time put in the record under your map consideration the streets upon which are situated those unusual grade plots for your consideration to increase the bulk?

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Mr. Winston, do you want to leave that list with the Secretary?

(The man who just spoke is Mr. Winston who spoke previously representing himself.)

Mr. Winston, you can mail that to us; it will be a lot easier.

Yes, Reverend?

REVEREND MILLARD M. GIFFORD, Williamsbridge Road Reformed Church.

REVEREND GIFFORD: Vice-Chairman Bloustein and Members of the Commission:

I would just like to ask -- my name is Reverend Millard Gifford, Pastor of the Williamsbridge Road Reformed Church at 1625 Williamsbridge Road in the Bronx, and I'd like to ask a question before I make any remarks.

Is it true that if the zoning ordinance is passed that businesses, for example, which existed before the change are allowed to remain?

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Yes, they may continue. The zoning change will not affect the continuance of those uses.

REVEREND GIFFORD: Yes.

In that case, I would like to say that the consistory of the Church, which represents about 200 families in that area, is strongly in favor of changing the present unrestricted nature of Williamsbridge Road to a residential area.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Williamsbridge Road?

REVEREND GIFFORD: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: At what point?

REVEREND GIFFORD: We are between Pierce and Morris Park Avenue on Williamsbridge Road. Since that can be done without affecting existing businesses, legally-operating business, we are strongly in favor of that being done.

We need families there and many of our young people now leave the Bronx because they have no place to live. We think this would be an improvement.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Mr. Smith, have you made a note of this?

MR. JACK SMITH: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: All right.

Excuse me for interrupting; I want to make sure that we have it.

REVEREND GIFFORD: I say, there are many families that are leaving The Bronx because they have no quarters. And there is a Catholic Church near us, and there is also the Lutheran Church on that street a little further up, and we think that this would be very helpful to that area, and we'd like to have your consideration.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Thank you very much, sir.

REVEREND GIFFORD: Thank you, indeed.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: James F. Reynolds.

JAMES F. REYNOLDS, attorney.

MR. REYNOLDS: Mr. Commissioner, Members of the Commission:
My name is James F. Reynolds. I'm an attorney practicing
in the Bronx.

I represent an owner, Mr. Peter Sinnott, and his two
brothers, who own the northeast corner of Morris Park Avenue and
Williamsbridge Road. It is a plot of hundred by a hundred and it has
been zoned retail for many years. This property has come down in
the family; it's been in ownership for more than thirty years.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: And what is it proposed for now?

MR. REYNOLDS: It's proposed for R-4.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: What do you want us to do?

MR. REYNOLDS: We want retail.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: You want it to be commercial?

MR. REYNOLDS: Continued retail.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Some kind of commercial?

MR. REYNOLDS: That's right.

There's many arguments that can be presented here for this
particular property, but I think the most important one is the fact
that the character of the neighborhood has already been established
and there are very few lots on Williamsbridge Road still in existence.
There are many, of course, on Morris Park Avenue, but the character
is definitely a retail; it is definitely a commercial area.

In fact, the road itself, both Williamsbridge Road and
Morris Park Avenue, exceeds the usual width of an ordinary street. If

this is continued to go into an R-4 zone, it would be manifestly unfair to the owners of those very few lots still remaining. In fact, this lot was purchased in 1929 for the sum of \$40,000. Within the last few months, lots, four lots in back of the property in question, were sold for \$28,000.

It's very evident, gentlemen, that this Board is not sitting for the purpose of causing people who have maintained property for many years, looking forward to the time when they could develop the thing, this said property, to cause them to lose money. And under the circumstances, gentlemen, there are only one or two -- and these several isolated lots should in turn be submitted to Mr. Smith, I believe, or someone else before this resolution is completely set for presentation.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: We'd be glad to have you submit that.

MR. REYNOLDS: I would like to do that if you will permit me to, and furthermore, I have submitted in this application a complete, specific setup, and it would be rather foolish to continue giving what I've already put in printed word. And I should like my application that was submitted in this matter be made part of the record. May I have that advantage?

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes.

MR. REYNOLDS: That's fine; thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Well, you're handing it in.

MR. REYNOLDS: No, I've already submitted it.

SECRETARY MALTER: It would be difficult to have something

that's submitted made part of the written transcript. We would have it as part of the record.

MR. REYNOLDS: Well, if you won't grant me that, sir, I think I have a right to read this four-page document --

SECRETARY MALTER: If it's read now we will include it.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: I understood you had it right there.

MR. REYNOLDS: I have it, but I already submitted the original about four weeks ago. You have the original.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Is there any problem about tracing the original?

SECRETARY MALTER: No. Then this statement will be made part of the record.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: You can rely upon it. It is part of the record.

MR. REYNOLDS: Because I certainly don't want to bore you gentlemen with reading something for a matter of record -- something that is already printed and before you. Thank you very much.

SECRETARY MALTER: If you could spare that copy, we would like to give it to the stenotype agency.

MR. REYNOLDS: I would be very glad to, and furthermore, sir, when can I speak to Mr. Smith concerning these isolated problems?

COMMISSIONER ORTON: You can call him up and make an appointment.

Borough of Bronx

NAME: Peter J. Sinnott
Joseph M. Sinnott
William J. Sinnott
c/o James F. Reynolds, Esq.,
560 Melrose Avenue
Bronx 55, New York.

PHONE:
Mo. 5 - 8844

LOCATION OF
PARCEL:

Northeast corner of intersection of Williamsbridge
Road and Morris Park Avenue, Bronx, New York.

Block: 4200
Section: 15
Lot: 35
Size of
Parcel: 100 x 100 (consisting of 4 lots, each of which is
25 x 100)

Liber: 2240
Conveyance: Page 472
Date of
Deed: 4/1/57
Date of Re-
cording 6/6/57

Description
of Parcel:

ALL those certain lots of land situate in the Borough
of the Bronx, City of New York, known and designated as lot numbers
42, 43, 44 and 45 on a certain map entitled "Map of 230 Bronx lots
belonging to Dr. C. Adelbert Becker, deceased, United States Trust
Company of New York, Executor and Trustee, situated on Williamsbridge
Road, Morris Park Avenue, Hering Avenue and Rhineland Avenue,
Borough of the Bronx, City of New York", made by George C. Hollerith,
176 Broadway, dated May 23rd, 1929, and filed in the Bronx County

Register's Office, June 20th, 1929 as map number 1335.

Owners of Property: Peter J. Sinnott
Joseph M. Sinnott
William J. Sinnott

SECTIONAL MAP NO: _____

PRESENT ZONING: Retail

PROPOSED ZONING: R - 4

ZONING REQUESTED: Retail

DESCRIBE PRESENT

USE OF SITE AND

SURROUNDING AREA:

The present owners herein acquired title to the parcel in question upon the death of their father Peter Sinnott, on the 25th day of November, 1955, in accordance with the provisions of his Last Will and Testament dated April 30, 1947, and admitted to probate in Surrogate's Court, Bronx County on December 8, 1955. Thereafter, a deed was executed and delivered to Peter J. Sinnott and Joseph M. Sinnott, as Executors under the Last Will and Testament of their late father to themselves, individually and to William J. Sinnott, the other devisee.

The late Peter Sinnott, Testator referred to herein, acquired title to the parcel by deed dated July 22, 1929, and recorded in the Office of the Register of the County of Bronx, in Liber 752 of Conveyances, page 84, at a cost of \$40,000.00.

The parcel is a vacant and unimproved tract of land located in a section of the East Bronx which is rapidly developing and expanding with construction of commercial and residential type dwellings.

As a matter of fact, a distance of 100 feet on both sides of Williamsbridge Road, from Pelham Parkway to Morris Park Avenue (approximately 4 blocks) is presently zoned for Retail Use, as evidenced by the attached Zoning Map Amendment effected December 14, 1953, excepting therefrom a small portion of land at the intersection of Neill Avenue and Williamsbridge Road.

Furthermore, a depth of 100 feet on either side of Morris Park Avenue from Bronxdale Avenue to Williamsbridge Road, is either zoned presently as a Business or Retail District, most of which, however, is Retail.

For a distance of nine blocks along Morris Park Avenue, from Williamsbridge Road to Bronxdale Avenue, there are many retail stores on each block, including but not limited to an A. & P. Food Store, Carvel Custard Stand, candy and stationery stores, grocery stores, hardware store, taverns, bakery stores, dry cleaning establishments, fruit and vegetable store, apartment houses and a funeral home, etc. and directly opposite the parcel for which this application is made, at the intersection of Williamsbridge Road and Morris Park Avenue, is a large office building used and occupied by Allstate Insurance Company and an office furniture store, and on the southwest corner of Williamsbridge Road and Morris Park Avenue and diagonally opposite the applicants' parcel, is another commercial building with offices and stores, including an ambulance service headquarters and a general contractor's office.

Along Williamsbridge Road from Morris Park Avenue to Pelham

Parkway, there are used car lots, gasoline stations, cabarets, delicatessens and grocery stores, pizzeria, real estate and insurance offices, one and two family residential buildings and more recently a Safeway Market which was erected approximately 1 block from the parcel with which this application is concerned. Further, it is known that there is to be erected a Consolidated Edison building, and a diner, the latter of which will be immediately contiguous to the property owned by the applicants herein.

Aside from the frontage on Williamsbridge Road and Morris Park Avenue, as hereinabove set forth, the balance of the area is composed mostly of one and two family dwellings, which are located to a greater extent on the side streets off Williamsbridge Road and Morris Park Avenue (i. e. Yates, Hering, Tenbroeck, Tomlinson, Haight and Lurting Avenues); the said Williamsbridge Road and Morris Park Avenue are the main thoroughfares in the area and constructed mainly with various business enterprises.

As mentioned, the present owners inherited the property from their late father who acquired title in 1929 for the purchase price of \$40,000.00. It is known that recently 4 lots in this area were sold for construction thereon of private residences and the purchase price of same was \$28,100.00. Certainly the value of the lots of the present owners would not be greater should a sale be consummated for the use of said lots if the zone is changed to residential. Thus, it is evident that there would be a substantial and material loss to the applicants. The present owners and

their deceased father have paid the taxes on the property for the last 30 years or more. They have expended considerable sums of money over the years for the payment of taxes and assessments on the property.

The present owners and their late father always intended to construct a commercial building on said premises and have been awaiting the propitious time in which to proceed and they have held the property for so long a period of time and paid the carrying charges thereon, it would be manifestly unjust for them to be deprived of the right to construct a commercial retail building thereon, because of the proposed change of zoning. The character of the neighborhood has been definitely established as a retail zone which is apparent from the regulations heretofore set forth, and such business activities as presently conducted in the area are of a real need and necessity for the inhabitants of the private dwellings on the side streets of Williamsbridge Road and Morris Park Avenue, as previously mentioned, and this area with which the applicant is concerned, should further be built up with commercial buildings of various type to satisfy the increasing needs for food, clothing and other necessities of life of the said inhabitants of the surrounding area, and to permit a change of zone for residential purposes of the property owned by the applicants herein, would not be in keeping with the established business uses now being conducted in this area.

The applicants verily believe that it would be extremely

difficult, if not impossible altogether, to sell or rent that type of structure that will be permitted to be constructed on said premises as provided by the proposed change of zone for the following reasons:

(a) Traffic on Morris Park Avenue and Williamsbridge Road is heavy and congested by buses, trailer trucks and other heavy commercial vehicles which use these two main roadways, causing the air to be filled with gasoline, oil, soot, smoke and exhaust fumes. This traffic has been further increased by the existence of Jacobi Hospital and Albert Einstein School of Medicine, among others.

(b) The traffic is quite heavy at night, causing noise, discomfort and disturbance of sleep to the potential occupants of the area.

(c) The presence of retail business and commercial activities now in use on most of Morris Park Avenue and Williamsbridge Road would not be conducive to so called "Country Living" or "Suburban Life", and would be a factor discouraging anyone contemplating buying their own home or renting in a suburban area.

It would, indeed, be a hardship upon the owners herein who have had an interest in the property for all these years and who intend to erect a building of the type and use presently permitted by the zoning law.

The undersigned applicants respectfully request that they and/or their attorney, be permitted to speak at the hearing to be scheduled for some time in September, 1960, upon the proposed change recommended by Mr. Felt and that they be advised as to the exact date when and place where such meeting shall take place so that

they may state further why the zoning law concerning this parcel should remain unchanged.

Respectfully submitted,
(signed)
Peter J. Sinnott

COMMISSIONER ORTON: We are in receipt of a telegram which I will read into the record as follows:

FRIEDEL SCHMITZ, representing Residents of City Island

"PD NEW YORK NY 12 1104A EDT
CITY HALL BLDG NYK
COMMISSIONER JAMES FELT
RE THE RESIDENTS OF CITY ISLAND. CHAIRMAN JAMES FELT THE RESIDENTS OF CITY ISLAND ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND TODAYS HEARING DUE TO THE HURRICANE BUT WE WANT TO GO ON RECORD IN FAVOR OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION. PROPOSED REZONING.

"THE RESIDENTS OF CITY ISLAND FRIEDEL SCHMITZ CHAIRMAN ZONING COMMITTEE."

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Mr. Hausknecht?

H. HAUSKNECHT, Attorney, New York Lien Corporation.

MR. HAUSKNECHT: My name is Harry Hausknecht. I'm an attorney.

I come here to speak on behalf of New York Lien Corporation which attends and has attended for many years the sale conducted by the Department of Real Estate of the City of New York, and has, over the years, been one of the largest buyers of vacant land in the five boroughs of the City of New York.

It has in its portfolio possibly some 100 or more parcels of real estate, bought in the last year or two from the City of New

York at these sales.

I have picked some twenty-five of these parcels as examples of discriminatory and unfair proposed zoning changes. In each of these instances, the proposed change will seriously destroy the usefulness and the monetary value of each parcel.

I ask your leave, after I leave you here now, to submit to you in writing an analysis of each of these pieces, so that you may, in your discretion, correct the harm which I think and which my client thinks is being done to these various pieces of land which we bought from the City of New York all in good faith, relying on the zoning as we found it when we bought them.

In that connection, I would like to urge upon the Commission the thought that in fairness to those who have attended the sales from the City and have bought many millions of dollars worth of land, that the effective date of the new resolution, when and if adopted, be postponed at least for one year beyond the date presently fixed so as to give those persons and firms an opportunity to develop and to sell the lands which they bought, based upon Zoning Resolutions in existence at the time.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Are you suggesting an additional year?

MR. HAUSKNECHT: I'm suggesting an additional year.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Because at present --

MR. HAUSKNECHT: Presently, we have approximately ten months or a year from the date of adoption.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes, you'll have a year from the

date the Board of Estimate fixes an approval date, whatever date it is, and you will have a year from that.

MR. HAUSKNECHT: I'd like to throw out a suggestion to make it two years to give us a chance to either file plans and build on these properties, or to dispose of them to builders who will do the same thing.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: We will be glad to have you submit a memorandum with your suggestion.

MR. HAUSKNECHT: You have no objection to me submitting a detailed analysis of the parcels I'm referring to?

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: We will be glad to have it, and you may have ten days for that.

MR. HAUSKNECHT: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Sidney Simon.

(No response.)

William F. Marvin.

Would you state your name and whom you represent?

WILLIAM F. MARVIN: My name is William F. Marvin, and I'm a homeowner at 60 West 98th Street, New York.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: We are not finished with the hearing on The Bronx. Will you wait, Mr. Marvin? Mr. Donner?

MAX DONNER: Representing himself.

MR. DONNER: My name is Max Donner. I represent myself and associates.

I want to echo some of the views that Mr. Housknecht, the previous speaker, had about having in good faith bought a great deal of land from the City of New York, zoned "Business", which is presently being rezoned to "Residence", and I would just like to read something that I had written in the last few moments:

I own a considerable amount of land scattered throughout the East Bronx. I am one of the largest -- a large individual owner of land in the Bronx.

Much of my land is being rezoned adversely to my interest, but despite this very substantial injury to my equities, I, nevertheless, am not opposed -- I favor a city-wide rezoning that would eliminate business use of land indiscriminately, but neither should the change from business to residence be made too wildly.

I want to point out five particular parcels I own which are glaring examples of wild rezoning from business to residence. Parcel number one is on Boston Post Road, corner Boller Avenue, adjacent to subway railroad tracks running directly overhead. Gas stations and auto repair shops are on the same street.

Boston Road itself is a heavily-trafficked street. No one would dream of building a residence on this thoroughfare.

Parcels two and three are on Gunhill Road; on this particular

part of Gunhill Road, at the eastern extremity are located within a two-block area a restaurant, about four or five gas stations, an auto wrecker and miscellaneous businesses.

This parcel I have immediately adjoins a restaurant, backs up against swampy land and is absolutely unsuitable for any residence other than business. And I request that this be left remaining as business.

Parcel number four is on Baychester Avenue, immediately adjoining a concrete abutment of the Baychester Avenue station and retail stores.

Parcel number five is corner Baychester and 222nd Street; a gas station permit was recently granted to the corner opposite this property.

I chose only these five parcels to pinpoint what I consider the most glaring inequities of the wholesale change from business to residence. These five are unsuitable for any residence use because of the existing businesses already present adjoining these parcels.

I request that I be given the opportunity of preparing a more detailed list of these and perhaps avail myself of going over the matter with Mr. Smith.

COMMISSIONER BLAUSTEIN: Why don't you do that rather than give us any further listing? See Mr. Smith and give him those.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. Landau, E. Landau.

(No response.)

Mrs. Poggi, did you want to speak again?

MRS. POGGI: Yes. I have one more question.

We have had a bulldozer come down to our area and clear out a piece of land. Now, that is zoned residential and he came and he bulldozed, and he said he's using it as a manufacturing section.

I understand there's supposed to be a certain time before you can use it in the new zone, and he's already bulldozing and leveling off the land to use it in the new zone.

Now, we have another one that filed plans already right across the street from us.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: If it is presently zoned "Residence", you should report that to the Superintendent of Buildings because we have nothing to do with the enforcing of the Zoning Resolution.

MRS. POGGI: Well, how do we know we're being protected? I mean they can come and build and they think they're doing the right thing.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: They won't have a building permit to build, and they can't build; and if they do build that's a matter entirely up to the Superintendent of Buildings.

MRS. POGGI: Another point:

A man on the corner just bought two lots to build a home and it's worth something like \$30,000, and he's in the "E-1" zone. Now, this is being considered for manufacturing which depreciates his home something terrible.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: That is a matter we will take into consideration.

Is there anyone else who wants to discuss the Bronx mapping?

J. PETRECHICK, representing himself.

MR. PETRECHICK: My name is John Petrenchick. I represent my wife.

My wife owns a piece of property, two lots on East Gunhill Road, known as Block 4732, lot 56.

Now, we've held interest in those two lots for thirty years, known as a business property, choice property.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: How is it presently zoned?

MR. PETRECHICK: At the present it is business property.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: How is it proposed?

MR. PETRECHICK: It is proposed for one or two-family dwellings.

I firmly object to that move. All right. Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Are there any others who wish to be heard on mapping in the Bronx?

Will you step forward, please?

IRENE KELLNER, representing herself.

MRS. KELLNER: My name is Irene C. Kellner, and I own the property on Gunhill Road, 252 frontage, which is zoned now for business, and it's the northeast corner of Givan Avenue.

The southeast corner is a gas station; on the west side of it, on Boston Post Road which is 200 feet away, also a gas station.

The entire neighborhood is built up with City Housing; the Eastchester Housing, over 850 families and the entire neighborhood is residentially built.

Now, this property - I bought from the City seven years ago as business and intend to build stores on it. Unfortunately, I still owe money on this land because I bought it in rem, and I still have \$8,600 mortgage on this property to the City that I owe. Now, they want to make this residential; all these years they were business. Now, we have the Freedomland nearby, all the traffic from all the boroughs come together there, from all the highways, New England Thruway just opened up, the Major Deegan Highway and all the parkways, and the traffic is so heavy there that last week the paper, the Post, had promised through the Traffic Commissioner they're going to have a light the next block from my property and every two blocks thereafter.

The traffic is so heavy, and certainly this land is not for residential but for commercial use. And no one will ever buy this property or will build on it other than commercial and stores.

Now, I'd like you to look into this matter because this property is valuable; on August the 18th, I had an offer on it - \$50,000 - which will not even cover my expenses and, therefore, this property you can see is valuable and is not for residential.

I'd like the Committee to go over and recheck the zoning and find out that this is absolutely true what I'm telling you.

Now, here is from the newspaper a clipping that the Traffic Commissioner has the signature of 3,500 residents that the traffic is so terrific that they've got to have lights more than what they have today. And another thing:

My property is about 250 feet from the corner of Boston Post Road which is also a heavy traffic and for the last fifteen or sixteen years, they propose to widen Boston Post Road by the Planning Commissioner. We have a record on that. And if they are going to widen the Boston Post Road, it will come exactly close to my property which I own now and, therefore, it's certainly not a residential because both sides will be traffic and heavier than ever before.

I live in the neighborhood and I have been selling real estate for 35 years. I'm a licensed broker, I know the neighborhood, what requires residential and what requires business.

My son has builded around the area and still building, but private homes are only supposed to be in residential sections, not on a heavy traffic which is getting worse every day since the Freedomland has opened there.

Now, I'd like you to go there at times and see the traffic and the condition. And the population, it requires there a shopping center, the parking which we do not have in that area. I live only a few blocks away from there and I know the hardship that the people

have there. They have to travel a distance to get to a place where they can park and do their shopping properly. Otherwise, they have to use carts because Boston Post Road and Gun Hill Road have only local stores, with no parking facilities other than one A&P, which is blocks and blocks away.

Therefore, this property is good for commercial and shopping center use only. This parcel happens to be one of the largest pieces there is on Gun Hill Road. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mrs. Kellner.

Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard on mapping in The Bronx?

(no response)

If not, we will proceed with the proposed zoning maps for the Borough of Manhattan.

- - - - -

(The hearing on the proposed zoning maps for the Borough of The Bronx concluded at 5:15 P.M., Monday, September 12, 1960.)