

114  
D65

122

**TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE  
THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
SEPTEMBER 13&14, 1960**

in the matter of....

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

Borough of Richmond  
and  
Added Communications

C.P. 15820

✓  
VOLUME:6

CP-15820

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 RICHMOND -- SEPTEMBER 13 and 14, 1960  
and  
ADDED COMMUNICATIONS

---

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 - RICHMOND  
AND  
ADDED MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Abbott, Victor H. (commun.)	160	Kane, Daniel J.	18
Alexander, Harold	31	Kane, Hon. Farrell	10
Badgeley, Dale C. (commun.)	126	Kaufman, Abraham K. (commun.)	147
Bagatta, John J. (commun.)	135	Ketchum, Morris, Jr. (commun.)	126
Banner, Irving	102	Kilham, Walter H., Jr. (commun.)	126
Barlow, Theodore G.	73	Klein, David L. (commun.)	159
Bird, William H. (commun.)	153	Klein, Rabbi Edward E. (commun.)	119
Breines, Simon (commun.)	126	Kuebler, Charles	58
Brill, William W. (commun.)	143	LaFarge, L. Bancel (commun.)	126
Buglioli, Paul	72	Lagno, Paul A.	83
Butt, John D. (commun.)	146	Lasher, Richard	37
Campay, Nicholas (commun.)	127	Lauricella, Mrs. Margaret (commun.)	138
Carlos, John J. (commun.)	126	Lefferts, Gillet (commun.)	126
Charnin, Edwin N.	40	Lorimer, Gordon (commun.)	126
Clark, Alonzo (commun.)	126	Lovejoy, J. D.	69
Crossley, J. R. (commun.)	128	Mancusi, Leonard L. (commun.)	119
Cutler, Robert W. (commun.)	126	Milleysack, Catherine	73
Douglass, Lathrop (commun.)	126	Moore, John C. B. (commun.)	126
Edgar, Mary Jane (commun.)	120	Moses, Hon. Robert (commun.)	141
Elder, Duncan (commun.)	133	Mount, Edward J. (commun.)	23
Erlbaum, Mrs. Miriam	89	Mulligan, Rev. John M. (commun.)	119
Felton, Murray B.	113	Murray, Rev. Herbert J. Jr.	3
Ferretti, Eugene	106	Neu, Mrs. Charles	70
Ferretti, Vincent E.	53	Niebyl, Elizabeth H.	66
Friedland, Jacob (commun.)	140	O'Connor, Robert B. (commun.)	126
Gale, Marland	90	Pacifico, Frank J.	103
Ginsberg, Irving	12	Petrillo, Paul (commun.)	129
Glass, Milton (commun.)	126	Pickard, Raymond A.	57
Goldstone, Harmon H. (commun.)	126	Platt, Geoffrey (commun.)	126
Gordon, Mrs. Milton (commun.)	144	Potter, William (commun.)	126
Grae, Joel B.	110	Price, Chester B. (commun.)	126
Grainger, Joseph K.	75	Quist, Christian C.	87
Gurney, G. Harmon (commun.)	123	Raymond, Antonin (commun.)	126
Hague, F. Malcolm (commun.)	126	Reinhardt, Rev. Charles A. (commun.)	22
Harris, Michael M. (commun.)	126	Reynolds, Peter J.	40
Hirsch, I. Bernard (commun.)	157	Rosfeld, A. E. (commun.)	149
Holden, Arthur C. (commun.)	126	Roth, Richard (commun.)	120
Hostrup, Bruce M.	28	Rudolph, George C. (commun.)	126
Hutchins, Robert S. (commun.)	126		
Jacobi, Sidney	80		
Jacobs, Robert H. (commun.)	126		
Jaffe, Peter	85		
Jahnke, L.F.	63		

(continued)

(organizations listed separately)

(continued)

INDEX OF SPEAKERS - RICHMOND  
AND  
ADDED MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Sachs, Richard C. (commun.)	151
Schmits, Friedel (commun.)	127
Scott, Dorothy C. (commun.)	126
Scribner, William J. (commun.)	135
Sherman, Irving (commun.)	118
Smith, Miss Dorothy V.	65
Soling, Chester (commun.)	140
Solor, Abe	43
Spruch, Seymour	59
Stark, Malcolm B. (commun.)	158
Straus, Peter R. (commun.)	154
Stein, Richard (commun.)	126
Sutter, Rev. Carl J. (commun.)	6
Teitelbaum, Gustave	32
Tobin, James J.	26
Turck, Charles J. (commun.)	150
Ullman, Cerald H. (commun.)	132
Urbahn, Max O. (commun.)	126
Van Bloon, Peter S. (commun.)	126
Venuto, Jaffee	24
Weisler, Rose (commun.)	161
Wells, Earl Edward	97
Wiener, Geoffrey R. (commun.)	137
Wood, Paul L. (commun.)	126
Woodbridge, Fredrick J. (commun.)	126
Zakin, Mrs. Ada (commun.)	146
Zeckendorf, S.	78

(organizations on following page)

INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS - RICHMOND  
and in  
ADDED MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

R 2

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Action Inc.	149	Macy's Flatbush	135
Aiken Realty Company	90	Manhattan District Planning Board #4	126
American Institute of Architects	124	Midtown Realty Owners Assn.	147
Annadale Community Civic Assn.	83	New York Life Insurance Co.	123
Automobile Club of New York	129	O'Brien Shipyards	75
Bethlehem Steel Company	23	Perry-Austin Mfg. Co.	10
Chamber of Commerce of the Rockaways	157	Phipps Houses	133
Citizen's Committee for Children	144	Protestant Council of the City of New York	150
Civic Congress of Staten Island	57, 83	Queens Valley Homeowners Assn.	161
Coffee Instants, Inc.	158	Realty Associates, Inc.	58
Corona Home Owners Civic Assn.	127	Regular Democratic Club, 1st Assembly District	139
Decker Avenue Civic Assn.	24	Republican Club, 1st Assembly District	132
Dongan Hills Improvement Society, Inc.	69	Richmond County Bar Assn.	80
Downtown-Lower Manhattan Assn.	146	S. S. White Dental Mfg. Co.	135
Eltingville Civic Assn.	59	Sachs Quality Stores, Inc.	151
Emery Roth & Sons, Architects	120	Seidman-Soling Builders, Inc.	140
Endo Laboratories Inc.	159	Staaten Restaurant, Inc.	106
Far Rockaway Taxpayers & Civic Association	146	Stapleton Board of Trade	32, 97
Federation of Section 213 Cooperatives	118	Stapleton Civic Organization	18
Fort Hill Park Civic Assn.	63	Staten Island Chamber of Commerce	31
Francis Manor Civic Assn.	119	Staten Island Citizen's Planning Committee	66
Gateway Apartment Company	85	Staten Island Protestant Council	3
Gold Seal Company	40	Staten Island Real Estate Board Joint Committee	31
Greater Bayside Citizen's Assn.	138	Trinity Lutheran Church	6
Great Kills Citizen's Committee	70	Twenty-third Street Assn., Inc.	153
Grymes Hill Neighbors	26	Two Bridges Neighborhood Council	137
Grymes Hills Estates Assn.	73		
Hamilton-Madison House	137	United States Gypsum Co.	28
Hoffman & Klein	113	Weissglass Dairies	40
League of West Side Org's.	119		
Lower Eastside Neighborhoods Association	137		
Low Terrace Realty Corp.	90		

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 RICHMOND

9/13/60 - 6:45 P.M.

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

CHAIRMAN FELT: I have some names before me. Many of  
these people may have left because we had announced that those  
who are not heard on the Borough of Richmond today will be heard  
beginning at ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

I want to repeat for the record -- at 10:00 A.M.  
tomorrow morning we will continue the hearing; and we will be  
happy to hear anyone who wishes to speak on the mapping in any  
of the five boroughs or on the text of the resolution as a whole.

I'll call these names now: Mrs. Neu --

MRS. NEU: Commissioner Felt, may I respectfully request  
not to speak until the end of the hearing, and should I be the last  
one and then decide not to speak, may I have the privilege of  
speaking tomorrow morning?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Certainly.

Reverend Herbert J. Murray, Jr.?

REVEREND HERBERT J. MURRAY, JR., Pastor, Park Baptist  
Church of Port Richmond, Staten Island.

REVEREND MURRAY: My name is Herbert J. Murray, Jr.,  
599 Oakland Avenue, Staten Island. I am the Pastor of the Park Baptist

Church of Port Richmond, Staten Island.

Commissioner Felt and Members of the Commission:

I'm here again today representing the church Planning Committee of the Staten Island Protestant Council of which I'm the Chairman of one of their subcommittees, the one on zoning, and I'm here today to again reaffirm our support for the proposed comprehensive amendment to the zoning resolution and that includes the changes which you've made in general this summer.

I would like to just read -- I'm going to turn in a copy of the statement I made last time -- and I would just like to read again a small paragraph from that.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

REVEREND MURRAY: Our Committee observes that the proposed amendment would help maintain and establish better physical settings for wholesome family living, improved traffic flow by the extension of requirements for off-street parking facilitating participation in community activities, consistency and balance in land use and controls to prevent deterioration of residential and commercial areas in the development of slums.

Now, I have with my committee, one of which was here yesterday, Dr. Sutter -- I think he had to leave --

CHAIRMAN FELT: He had to leave, Reverend, but he left with me a statement which he asked me to read and which I will read after you have concluded your remarks.

REVEREND MURRAY: I might say the other member of the

committee is from Tottenville, so we're sort of a triangle of balance there.

We did review some of the improvements in the resolution which you made and things which we had discussed in our larger committee before last March.

One of these we note with approval -- this R3-1 district -- which we think does help protect some of those better neighborhoods from spot apartment houses here and there.

We also note with approval the designation of the shore front in places to M-3 so that the shipping repair companies won't have the problem which they would have had under the other designation.

We also think it's wise that you changed the text regarding non-conforming manufacturing uses in residential districts. We hadn't spoken in favor of such a change, but we are glad that you did it.

We think it does reflect more the feeling of the Island.

Last of all, we appreciate the clarification of that small subject I brought up regarding fixed and removable seats in churches as an index.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I think we partially rectified that in the text.

REVEREND MURRAY: In conclusion, I would like to say that I wish to be on record in favor; that we have heard a great deal of appreciation and confidence expressed in this Commission, and also from the ladies and gentlemen who work on our staff, for the patient, as well as the thorough leadership in helping all of us in our entire



city to create this new instrument for regulating our community life. The pastors as well as the lay leaders of the churches do seem to give these words of appreciation. I would just like to pass those on.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I have a statement from the Reverend Carl J. Sutter, Trinity Lutheran Church, Staten Island. It is addressed to me.

REV. CARL J. SUTTER (commun.) September 13, 1960

TRINITY LUTHERAN CHURCH  
309 Saint Pauls Avenue  
Staten Island, N. Y.

Mr. James Felt, Members of the Planning Commission  
Public Officials, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am The Rev. Dr. Carl J. Sutter, Co-Pastor of Trinity Lutheran Church, Staten Island. As one who has lived on Staten Island for more than half a century, I am deeply concerned about the welfare of our beautiful Borough, and in retaining it as a community primarily for homes.

It is a rather late date for the largest city in the world to plan for the future when most of it is already built up, the one exception being Staten Island where I am sure proper zoning can retain much of its natural beauty and make it a planned community and not one that just haphazardly developed. In studying the suggested zoning, I want to congratulate Mr. Felt and his Staff for the changes that have been made, particularly in the Silver Lake area where property has been upgraded, retaining it for one and two-family houses.

"As I am also a member of the Planning Committee for the Protestant Council of Staten Island, I also want to substantiate what The Rev. Herbert Murway, Chairman, has stated and will say at this Hearing regarding the zoning for Churches and Church parking areas. I am wholeheartedly for the general plan with the exceptions of a few minor changes that will be made. One in particular is the 300 x 150 feet in depth of the lot immediately south of Hero Park along Victory Boulevard. I believe an oversight has been made and I am sure that this area will be upgraded. It is not suitable for an apartment house since it is at the intersection of Forest Avenue and Victory Boulevard and primarily because it is adjacent to Hero Park, a Shrine given by Dr. and Mrs. Louis Dreyfus in memory of those who died in the First World War. I am not alone in this contention. Mr. Felt has a letter bearing the names of Mother St. Egbert of the Notre Dame Schools, Mother M. Berchmans, Superintendent of the Convent of the Presentation of the Very Blessed Virgin, Dr. Richard Reindel, President of Warner College, Mr. David Hunter, County Commander of the American Legion and many others. I am sure there are thousands of others who think similarly as I do. This area is now zoned for one and two-family houses and has been for many years.

"I am certain that when the general plan is adopted and with the increase in population, Staten Island will continue to remain the Garden Spot of New York City. Signed: CARL J. SUTTER."

CHAIRMAN FREE: (Continuing) Is there anyone else aside from Mrs. [redacted] who wishes to speak on mapping in Staten Island?

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) Mrs. Neu, do you wish to speak now?

MRS. NEU: Since there doesn't appear to be anyone in opposition who has spoken, I would prefer - if it pleases you - to speak tomorrow morning.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well. You know why this has occurred, Mrs. Neu. When the weather was inclement yesterday -- and that is rather an understatement -- we communicated with the Staten Island Advance and the Richmond Borough President's Office and said that the speakers from Staten Island could have the choice of coming this afternoon or Wednesday morning. We look forward to hearing you in the morning.

MRS. NEU: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Madame Secretary?

SECRETARY MALTER: Mr. Chairman, at this time the public hearing will stand in recess until tomorrow morning, Wednesday, September 14th, at ten o'clock, when the hearing will continue on the proposed Zoning Maps for the Borough of Richmond.

Roll call on recessing until tomorrow morning at 10:00 A.M.:

Chairman Felt, Vice Chairman Bloustein, Commissioners Landenbaum, Livingston, Orton, Provenzano, Sweeney.

This hearing is now recessed at 5 P.M., on Tuesday, September 13th, 1960, to resume Wednesday, September 14th, 1960, at 10 a.m., on the proposed zoning maps for the Borough of Richmond.

- - - - -

PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED - SEPTEMBER 14, 1960 - 10:00 A.M.

PROPOSED ZONING MAPS FOR THE BOROUGH OF RICHMOND

CHAIRMAN FELT: The meeting will please come to order.  
Will the Secretary call the roll?

SECRETARY MALTER: Chairman Felt, Vice Chairman Bloustein,  
Commissioners Lindenbaum, Livingston, Orton, Sweeney, Provenzano.  
Quorum present.

This is a continued public hearing 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 which are a part thereof,  
and which are appended thereto. (CP 15820)

The hearing began on Monday, September 12, 1960, at  
10:00 a.m., and in the forenoon the hearing was on the Proposed  
Text, and then continued after that on the Proposed Zoning Maps  
for the Boroughs of The Bronx and Manhattan, in that order.

On Tuesday, September 13th, starting at 10:00 a.m.,  
the hearing was on the Proposed Zoning Maps for the Boroughs of  
Brooklyn, Queens and Richmond; in that order.

This morning the hearing is continuing on the Proposed  
Zoning Maps for the Borough of Richmond and for such other business  
as may properly come before this hearing.

On August 17, 1960, Calendar No. 68, the Commission  
fixed these dates just mentioned for a hearing, which was duly  
advertised.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Vice Chairman, have you any statement that you wish to make at this time?

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Yes. Public notice was heretofore given that all individuals who desire to be heard at this public hearing on the proposed new Zoning Resolution would be heard.

Special notice through the press and the public officials on Staten Island was given that because of the storm those who wanted to be heard would be heard today, Wednesday, September 14th.

Before this hearing is closed today, anyone who desires to be heard on any phase of the proposed Zoning Resolution will be heard.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

There were several people yesterday, or I should say last night, who had given us their cards and wished to speak on the Staten Island mapping. What I think I will do is to first call on those whose cards we received for yesterday's hearing, then of course we will have the cards of those who have given them to us today, and everyone, as the Vice Chairman stated, have an opportunity to be heard.

Is Judge Kane present?

HON. FARRELL KANE, representing Perry-Austin Manufacturing Company, re: Parkinson Avenue, St. Mary's Cemetery, Ledyard Place.

HON. FARRELL KANE: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I represent-

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Will you state your full name, please.

MR. KANE: Farrell M. Kane. I represent Perry-Austin

Manufacturing Company, a small plant located in Staten Island. That company has been there for approximately 60 years. It compounds ingredients, and over the 60 years there has never been a complaint against it. It originally had no zoning and then it was placed in a zone partly residential, partly retail.

The retail zone was partly nullified and only last year I applied to this Commission to have the retail zone reinstated so that they could build a modern office building. That request was granted and they built a beautiful office building, put lawns around it, cleared off their property and they are now ready to demolish all of their old buildings and put up a modern one-story plant.

The old buildings are an eyesore, they should come down. They couldn't come down under the present zoning because the plant could do nothing about it.

Under these circumstances, I made a request to the Board, an application to change this zoning from residential, in which it was put by the original zoning resolution to M1.

I submitted a memorandum, I appeared before the Board and I now wish to state that the Board in its present resolution has changed that zoning to M1.

I came up here today to thank the Board for the attention that they gave to this application; for the attention that they gave me as a representative of the company, and for the work they put in in order to do justice to this small plant.

Ordinarily, gentlemen, I have found through experience that with a stupendous task such as this it very often happens that a Commission must resort to general rules. And when they do, some little fellows are hurt.

In this case, if the Commission followed that policy that plant would have been out of business and 50 of our citizens would have been out of employment, and those that invested their capital would have lost it. However, this Commission took the time to go into the details of this particular plant and to do what they in their opinion felt was for the best interests of not only the plant but of the community and of the citizens.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the Commission for the courtesy they have extended to me. And I wish to state that in revising the zoning in this particular section, the Commission did a service not only to the employees, not only to the owners, but also to the entire community of Staten Island.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BELLE: Thank you, Judge.

Is Mr. Irving Ginsberg present?

MR. IRVING GINSBERG, representing George Sabbatino and H. H. Berman, 100 Hudson Boulevard and Evergreen Avenue, Adele Street, North Bergen Avenue, Victory Boulevard, Clove Lakes Park, Cypress and Marko Avenues, Loran Avenue, Little Cove Road.

MR. GINSBERG: My name is Irving Ginsberg, I am an attorney

on Staten Island and I too represent two of the little people that Judge Kane has referred to, and I want to reiterate his remarks in this respect: That I have been here likewise representing several little people who were put in a very unfavorable position by the general rules that would have applied, and I want to put on the record that you have paid attention and corrected those defects, and he is not making a vain statement.

Now, the specific problem I am here this morning on is a problem of an owner of two parcels of property on the northerly side of Hylan Boulevard at the intersection of Evergreen Avenue.

May I call your attention to page 27-C, and this is a very harsh situation, and although it involves, as I say, a little man, you should do something about it.

It is 27-C, the intersection of Hylan Boulevard and Evergreen Avenue.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Proceed.

MR. GINSBERG: As you gentlemen no doubt have been apprised, Hylan Boulevard in that area from Grassmere or Clove Road south towards Dongan Hills, in the last few years has developed as a business area. There are some 20 new business establishments that have been established in the area. Now, as a matter of fact, just the other day there was a notice in the press that 1540 Hylan Boulevard, directly opposite the property I am talking about, Robert Hall plans a second Island store.



The piece I am interested in is a piece on Hylan Boulevard 110 feet frontage and the depth is only 55 feet, and in the rear it fronts on another street called Adele Street. So that we have a piece of property 55 by 100 with 100 feet of frontage on Hylan Boulevard; 55 foot frontage on Evergreen and another 110 feet frontage on Adele Street. With two corners like that it is obvious that no residence could be built because you have a 15 foot setback on each street.

Now, since this is in a business, general business area, Robert Hall is going to build across the street and I also want to point out that you have a C2-1 retail district on Hylan Boulevard, only one block to the south.

In other words, the C2-1 retail district ends one block from this particular point.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Is Adele Street open there serving any purpose?

MR. GINSBERG: It is on the map and the city owns it.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Does it provide frontage for anything? Are there any houses there on, let us say, the north side of Adele Street?

MR. GINSBERG: No houses at present.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: It provides no frontage?

MR. GINSBERG: I don't know what you mean.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Have you discussed the question with the Borough President's office, the closing of Adele Street?

MR. GINSBERG: If somebody would buy it then it would not help us.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: It would not help you. Suppose you bought it in, and it would give you the width you needed.

MR. GINSBERG: Yes. Well, Mr. Schirano maybe suggested that, but that is a matter of two or three years. We now own 55 by 110, that is no solution to the problem I am raising, and I do not think that it is in order at this time to suggest that we could buy 55 feet more and we would be in within a residential district.

The point I am raising is that within one block of this area to the south, on North Burger Avenue, this thing stopped off and it should be extended another 200 feet to protect this particular individual and not put him to the trouble, or to see Mr. Schirano in order to get a street closed, which is an almost impossible job in Richmond County. Because I have been trying to do it in other matters. I know what is involved. That is no answer to the problem I am raising at this particular point.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well.

MR. GINSBERG: One other point that I am trying to establish is on another section on page 21B. This is on Victory Boulevard opposite Clove Lakes Park.

CHAIRMAN FELT: All right, proceed.

MR. GINSBERG: In that area when the book came out in August, the proposed resolution, the area from Logan Avenue to Little

Clove Road on the south side of Victory Boulevard was put in an R-6 district. That was the proposed resolution of August, 1960.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Sir, I am just trying to locate the property. What is the address again?

MR. GINSBERG: South side of Victory Boulevard, Cypress and Marx Avenues, opposite Clove Lake.

In the volume which was published in August, as I say, that area was included in a larger area from Logan Avenue up to Little Clove Road, and it was placed in an R-6 area.

In the new book which came out on December 21st, there has been a revision and it was placed in an R3-1. Now, the particular block front that I am interested in is between Cypress and Marx.. It is block 681.

Now, I was here at the other hearings and I do not remember any public opposition to this revision which the Commission had made putting this in R-6.

In other words, the experts and your Committee went out in the field and decided primarily that this would be a good area for R-6 and that is what was done. Then, in between August of this year and December a change was made, and the only way we found out about it is that I noticed it in the book. And if there is no compelling reason why this should have been changed from R-6 to R-3, I would imagine that the opinion of your experts in the first instance should stand, and I wish you would review that.

I do not know of any public opposition to a change of that, to putting that in an R-6 area.

Now, those are the only two specific things that I have here this morning, but I have one general statement I would like to make which I think would be helpful to the Commission and that is, if you will look at sheet No. 33 -- sheet 33 is the area from Great Kills past Wolf's Pond Park.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes.

MR. GINSBERG: Now, if you will notice on Hylan Boulevard from Wiman Avenue in Great Kills until past Wolf's Pond Park and even further there are no retail districts. I have looked at the entire sheet No. 33, and what has been done there is to place this in various residential units, R1 and R2 and R3, which means that this area will be built up with one and two-family houses on 60 and 50 foot plots. This area from Great Kills to Tottenville is not going to be an area of estates of several acres, you are going to have people living there on 50 foot plots.

I think they should be entitled to do their community shopping five blocks, six blocks, maybe ten blocks from their homes. But the way this setup is now, if a person bought a house on or near Richmond Avenue in Eltingville, if they had to do any shopping they would have to go to Great Kills or to New Dorp; get into a car to buy a bottle of milk or a loaf of bread.

I think if you are envisioning a plan for the south shore

of Staten Island, it is true that section from Great Kills to Tottenville should be primarily residential, but spotted here and there on Hylan Boulevard and one of the other two main thoroughfares, there should be some reservations made for retail districts.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

MR. GINSBERG: I have submitted nine copies of my first suggestion. I do not believe you gentlemen have a copy of that.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will have a copy of it.

Is Mr. Gant present?

Mr. Master?

I think Mr. Master may have been called upon and spoken yesterday.

Reverend Carl Sutter. Reverend Carl Sutter was here yesterday but had to leave. He left with me a statement from his church endorsing the resolution, which was read into the record, Madam Secretary, yesterday, as you will recall.

Daniel J. Kane.

DANIEL J. KANE, Stapleton Civic Organization.

MR. KANE: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission, my name is Daniel J. Kane. I am Chairman of the Stapleton Civic Organization. I would like to read this roughly prepared statement here.

When the City Planning Commission in its proposed zoning resolution designated our area -- that is the area of Stapleton Civic Organization, as R5, -- we of the Executive Committee decided to

Familiarize ourselves with the resolution in order to determine whether or not the R5 was the most desirable designation for the community. We studied the resolution for zoning of the Island, finally after lengthy deliberation we concluded that the R3 designation was more consistent with the general nature of our area.

We contacted the local zoning office and the City Planning Commission. They suggested we submit a petition with a map of the area involved, requesting the R3 as opposed to the R5.

On March 7th at McKee High School, Staten Island, the Executive Committee of our organization presented Mr. Felt with a petition signed by 340 homeowners of the area.

At that time Mr. Felt assured us that he could see no reason then why we could not have the desired R3, particularly since there was no undeveloped land in our mapping area.

Later we submitted an agenda with 180 names. In letters dated March 11th, March 14th, Mr. Felt acknowledged our petitions assuring us it would be given every consideration.

Later, members of his staff assured us that we would receive the R3. We requested this be confirmed by letter. We received no letter.

Subsequent telephone conversations with his aides to obtain such a letter were in vain.

Now, the revised zoning resolution map in the City Record of August 1974 indicated not only were we unsuccessful in obtaining the

ing, but that changes and other goals which we feel are not in the best interests of our community.

First, our organization zoning lines which we were assured would be respected were ignored. The major portion of our area remained R5, the rest was downgraded to R6, and included in that vast empty tract known as Fox Hills.

The members of the organization in the now designated R6 section deeply resent the downgrading and their severance zoning-wise from the organization area.

Second, we cannot understand the Commission's reluctance to grant the R5 to our entire area, in view of the fact that there are many older type neighborhoods, such as ours on Staten Island that have more desirable designations, though they obviously have a much shorter life expectancy.

One of but many, for example, is the adjoining Rose Bank area which is designated R4a2. What I believe you will find on page 21D.

Another point we feel should be considered is that the tax assessments of our area are considerably higher than the assessments of many of those older type areas which I mentioned, and those other areas, as I also said, are better designated.

Quite naturally, we would like to obtain the R3 which we feel is consistent with the type of structures and, as I said before, the general nature of our area.

Now, as far as the controversial C1-1, on Targee Street and Sobel Court adjoining that part of our area now designated as R5, I am not now in a position to reflect the opinion of the majority of the people of our organization. However, Mrs. Scheffler, of our Executive Committee has indicated the people of her neighborhood -- that is, Ralph Street, Boehm Street, etc., those included in the now R6, are opposed to the C1-1.

Respectfully, we request the Commission review our petition and grant us the desired R3 with our organization lines intact.

In closing may I say that regardless of the final determination of the zoning status of our area, we stand by our public endorsement for Staten Island made April 27th of the Zoning Resolution.

When we endorsed the Resolution we did so alone, the only civic group to do so unswayed by the blatant outcries of the vested interests on Staten Island.

We were convinced that the resolution on the whole was an is a progressive step from the outmoded, archaic present zoning laws.

Now, may I thank you, Mr. Felt, for this opportunity to express the views of my people. That is all.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much, sir.

I have two letters that I should like to read because I was asked to have them put into the record.

The first letter is from the Unitarian Church of Staten Island, it is addressed to me:



CHARLES A. REINHARDT, MINISTER  
"Unitarian Church  
of Staten Island

12 September 1960

"James Felt, Chairman  
New York Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York, New York

"Dear Sir:

"Under the existing zoning ordinance Staten Island shows each week, in ways more dramatic than her sister boroughs, an alarming, ever growing need for the City Planning Commission's zoning proposal (now revised). It is evident that old habits of land misuse are increasingly complicated by much new construction.

"Both as clergyman and officer of a borough social service agency I am anxiously awaiting the time when, under your new zoning program, hopefully accepted, our community's growth will show reasonable patterns, instead of the rambling chaos that now depreciates family life, frays commuter nerves, and unsettles commercial values.

"Sincerely yours, /s/ Charles A. Reinhardt."

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) Then I have a second communication which I have been requested to read - from the Bethlehem Steel Company:

Mount (statement of)

R 23

J. EDWARD MOUNT, Assistant Secretary  
" Bethlehem Steel Company

Bethlehem, Pa.

September 8, 1960

"Mr. James Felt, Chairman  
City Planning Commission  
The City of New York  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York, New York

"Dear Mr. Felt:

"I regret that the pressures of other matters have prevented my earlier statement of what I am about to say.

"I am quite pleased to note from the revised proposed amendment of the zoning resolution of the City of New York, published on August 18, 1960, that the revision has deleted from the earlier form of amendment Section 52-51 with the effect that the performance standards are not now made applicable to existing uses in Use Groups 17 and 18 in Manufacturing District. You have thus met the request that we presented to your office at our conference during February last.

"I want to express the genuine appreciation of this Company for your granting of that request, and especially do we appreciate the personal attention which you gave to this one point and that you were able to so handle it among all the studies and details of what without any doubt has been a colossal undertaking, and I do not use the word "colossal" in any casual manner of speech.

"Thanking you again, I am, Very respectfully yours,  
J. Edward Mount, Assistant Secretary."

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mr. Venuto here?

JAFFEE VENUTO, representing Decker Ave. Civic Association, Inc.

MR. VENUTO: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I am Jaffee Venuto, representing the Decker Avenue Civic Association. I would like to make the following statement to be included in the record of this hearing: We have in this association 2,000 participating member families. We would first like to express our sincere appreciation to James Felt and the members of the Zoning Committee for the patience and interest in the welfare of the citizens of Staten Island. Without the endless amount of time spent by these officials, both central and local in the Borough Hall, these conclusions could not have been reached.

In addition to the personal contacts, all of the mail from our parent body -- the Civic Congress of Staten Island -- and our own local group was always promptly answered, clarifying any issue of doubt. Because of this and the many local and Island-wide discussions, we would like to make the following recommendations:

1. Speaking for the Borough of Richmond, the best interest of the majority will be served if the zoning change is approved as it is now before you.

2. We further believe that immediately after this approval has been gained, the new zoning should become effective. We cannot see any advantage in any additional time being given.

All interested parties have had ample time to express their views.

3. Our local group is most grateful for the complete adoption of an R3 zone. This will continue to preserve for their future, their present one and two-family patterns.

4. The only exception we are somewhat disturbed about is the variance from the present E1 zone that may permit the construction of a bowling alley on one of our most desirable residential streets, namely, Decker Avenue. The original zoning plan calls for the removal, after 25 years, of non-complying structures.

However, in a recent newspaper release we find this now changed to permit any non-conforming structures. - if plans have been filed, then built to remain. In this instance, we are not in agreement.

Deny this application which will be a source of annoyance because of the character of the patrons in a residential area.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for having the opportunity to express the recommendation of our civic association to this Commission. We are in accord with the recommendation of the Civic Congress of Staten Island and concur with them in its entirety.

We earnestly request the immediate adoption after all changes have been approved.

Respectfully submitted, Jaffee Venuto. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Venuto, now that you have concluded your remarks, I am going to have Mr. Smith see you right at the gate and he

will explain the effect of what you refer to under the proposed zoning and the existing code.

MR. VENUTO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. James J. Tobin.

JAMES J. TOBIN, representing Grymes Hill Neighbors.

MR. TOBIN: My name is James J. Tobin and I represent the Grymes Hill Neighbors of Staten Island. This is a statement of the Grymes Hill Neighbors and I would like to have it made part of the record.

I am appearing today as spokesman for the Grymes Hill Neighbors, an association of the homeowners in the western side of Grymes Hill. Our association wishes to address the Commission today on the occasion of this hearing with reference to the proposed zoning resolution as amended and made public last month. We would like to express our views both in relation to the particular consideration the Commission has given to the zoning requirements of our neighborhood as well as to the over-all treatment of Staten Island in the proposed law.

With respect to our own neighborhood we are gratified to see that the Commission has amended the original R-6 zones along Victory Boulevard between Edny St. and Silver Mount cemetery to R-1, bringing them into conformity with the surrounding area of one family houses which closely abuts this property. This was the specific amendment that our group suggested at the hearing on the new zoning

resolution held on March 25th of this year. At that time we pointed out that this was the only instance in the proposed zoning map for the whole city where an R-6 would have directly abutted an R-1 zone without intermediate zones in between and as such seemed to us a violation of one of the basic principles of the new zoning - the principle of "buffering" and the gradual transition of housing types.

The amendment to R-1 will save this quaint and picturesque neighborhood of tree-lined streets and one family houses from the disastrous effect of the construction of massive apartment buildings that would have been possible in an R-6 zone. We would like to commend the Commission for the thoughtful attention given to the particular characteristics of our neighborhood and for soundly applying the broad principles of the new zoning resolution in this specific case.

We would like to take this occasion also to applaud the Commission on their general treatment of Staten Island in the new resolution. We had always felt, despite our objection to the originally proposed R-6 in our area, that the new resolution represented a significant advance over the existing law in that it based zoning upon sound, modern principles of city planning and, particularly in Staten Island, placed controls of unplanned and potentially destructive growth.

Upon the publication of the amended resolution we have noted that the Commission has made many specific modifications in the Staten Island maps in an attempt to refine and adapt the new law to the particular character and needs of our Borough. We feel that these

adaptations reflect the sincerity of the designers of the new law in arriving at a practical and workable zoning system and the truly democratic methods employed to achieve this fundamental change in our city's life. It is our opinion that given a basically sound zoning plan, the subsequent modifications and refinements have removed the last grounds for objection to the new law and that the resolution as now amended should be adopted as speedily as possible so that New York City may begin to benefit from its provisions.

We wish to repeat our appreciation to the Planning Commission for the courteous and the thoughtful consideration given to the needs of our neighborhood and our Borough.

James Tobin, spokesman for the Grymes Hill Neighbors.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Tobin.

Is Mr. B. M. Hostrup present?

MR. B. M. HOSTRUP, United States Gypsum Company.

MR. HOSTRUP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the City Commission, my name is Bruce Hostrup, I am works manager in charge of the United States Gypsum Company's plant located at 561 Richmond Terrace, Staten Island 1, New York. We manufacture a full line of gypsum building products which are shipped to various building material yards in the metropolitan area.

I have for the past year and a half been very much interested in the work of your Committee.

I have written to you personally.\*-

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, sir.

MR. HOSTRUP: On the subject, as well as met with and discussed this problem with several of your members.

I am very much interested in the efforts to improve zoning regulations in this city, among these reasons:

Firstly, the company that I represent depends upon the building business for its livelihood.

Secondly, I am most interested in Staten Island. I am anxious to see it develop in a way that is pleasing and proper rather than a haphazard method.

Thirdly, I believe that industry is most important to the city of New York and it must have opportunity to perform its designed function in its intended manner.

After the public hearings that were held in March of this year I wrote to Mr. Felt and made certain suggestions regarding the area surrounding my plant. I explained to him that continued operation in, and future expansion plans of this plant could take place only in the areas south of Richmond Terrace. I further explained that severe difficulty and hardship would result, both to the company and to the community, if the company could not expand its operations.

And I now note after reviewing the maps and the proposed comprehensive amendment of the zoning resolution, as published in the City Record of September 8th, that my suggestions have been considered.



They have been evaluated and I want to thank you for your study and consideration of this problem.

I have also reviewed the text of the resolution, particularly those sections pertaining to performance standards. I believe that certain clarification and further definition in this area might be worthwhile and advisable. I believe that the performance standards regarding noise, off-street parking and so forth need further clarification; particularly in those areas where non-conformance now exists.

Can a plant be expected to expand if non-conformance exists in the older part of the plant, even if the new portion meets the standards?

This is an important consideration. It is one that may well affect decisions regarding the expansion and moderniation of any plant.

Industry must be allowed to prosper in this City, as it is a very important part of our economy.

The plant that I manage has been a contributor to the Staten Island economy for over 75 years and we want to continue.

I am very much in favor of the proposed comprehensive amendment to this resolution, but before the final approval I would suggest that you further clarify the performance standards so that we are not unjustly penalizing existing industry.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak. I commend you for the job you have done with a problem of this

magnitude.

I am confident, with the considerations you will make as the result of these hearings, that this new zoning resolution will be a vast improvement in planning and building in this City.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

Harold Alexander.

HAROLD ALEXANDER, representing Staten Island Chamber of Commerce and Staten Island Real Estate Board, Joint Committee.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Alexander, I have you listed for the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce and also the Real Estate Board. I assume that in the statement you will make you will refer to the group for whom you speak.

MR. ALEXANDER: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Felt, Members of the City Planning Commission: I am Harold Alexander, I am assistant secretary of the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce. At this hearing I represent the Joint Committee of the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce and the Real Estate Board.

CHAIRMAN FELT: So that we will have it clear for the record, does that mean that the statement which follows will represent the views or recommendations of both the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce and the Staten Island Real Estate Board; is that correct?

MR. ALEXANDER: Yes, that is correct.

At this time I would like to express our sincere thanks to

the City Planning Commission for the fine cooperation which it has extended to our committee.

Many recommendations which we have submitted to the Commission were recognized and adopted. However, we feel that in order to make this revised zoning resolution an acceptable plan to Staten Island there are still many important mapping changes to be made. As these changes are too numerous and detailed to read at this time, I am submitting them for the record in printed form and request an early meeting between our committee, the Planning Commission and its technical staff to discuss these details.

Thank you, Gentlemen, for your time and consideration.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

Is Gustave Teitelbaum here?

GUSTAVE TEITELBAUM, Stapleton Board of Trade.

MR. TEITELBAUM: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, my name is Gustave Teitelbaum, President of the Stapleton Board of Trade and I am here in the capacity speaking for our organization in reference to 21D, Fox Hills, where you have a proposed zoning change setting up a C1-1, a retail area.

Two years ago I came before this Commission in opposition to a group that was attempting to set up a retail area, a so-called shopping center. At that time the application, after the hearing, was rescinded. The Commission's office was requested by the Stapleton Board of Trade, to, at any time in the future, notify our Board of

Trade in the event of any proposed zoning change or any application for zoning change. We have that letter in writing, I do not have it with me. We have it on file.

However, the only way I found out about this was by chance that one of the women who lives in the area, namely, Mrs. Shefler, contacted me last week. This was the first I knew of this proposed zoning change.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That is the change in connection with this proposed zoning resolution.

MR. TEITELBAUM: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In other words, you didn't know anything about it until last week?

MR. TEITELBAUM: That is correct, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I would just imagine, with all of the discussions on zoning and all of the newspaper releases on it, that people would be aware of this before just last week.

However, would you proceed.

MR. TEITELBAUM: Mr. Felt, any ordinary lay person could not understand the zoning changes, believe me. I say C1-1 because it was brought to my attention. I knew nothing about C1-1, as to what its meaning was.

I never knew what R-6 meant or R-5 or R-3. I am not a real estate agent, I am not in the real estate business.

To get on with the facts: We are a group of storekeepers who

are trying to make a living.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, but I just want to say that as a rule Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade, including the New York Board of Trade, have gone into this very carefully in the interests of their own constituents, and I would assume that any organization representing trade or industry would have been following what goes on or what has gone on in our zoning proposal.

MR. TEITELBAUM: Mr. Felt, it may have been followed by some of these members of the Boards of Trade, but it did go from an R-3 to an R-5, to an R-6, in your last recommendation. The situation hasn't changed any in the Stapleton area, gentlemen.

The situation that exists is still the same. There are possibly a total of almost 200 storekeepers, small store owners -- small businessmen, the so-called portion of the backbone of this nation which -- believe me when I say this -- I hate to make such a statement -- is being torn apart by big interests.

We have gotten to a situation here that I brought out two years ago. In a radius of three and a half miles there are seven shopping areas, and two additional shopping areas are already proposed and passed on, giving this area -- this small radius -- nine shopping centers to pull from, with a total population of possibly 100,000 people.

Two years ago there were 21 super markets for a population of 200,000 people. This far surpasses the average that you will find

throughout the nation. Now there are additional super markets being built. By the end of this year I think there should be a total of, I think, in the vicinity of 24 or 25 super markets.

We have no place to pull this trade from. We can't pull it from Brooklyn, Queens or Nassau County. We have only one place to pull it from, we pull it from Staten Island. And if you put in a shopping center one mile away from us we are out of business.

I am speaking for 200 storekeepers running parallel to this Targee Street area. You have a group of storekeepers on Richmond Road. These men will be out of business in 30 days. Give us consideration.

Have some feeling for the little man that is struggling. This has become a forgotten individual in this city and in this country today. Everything is bigness.

If this resolution is passed and the Stapleton area -- and I say this without hesitating -- the Stapleton area will not stand a chance due to the fact that they are all small storekeepers. The City of New York stands to lose more than it stands to gain from a tax point of view. Because we are still not in a low-tax assessed area, we are still highly assessed.

The fact remains that the City of New York has not done anything to aid this area to any extent. It pulled away the one source of income that it had, basically the east shore piers.

There hasn't been a thing done down there in the last five years. We have had promises, yes. We are living by promises but we

can't fill our bellies on promises.

We have a site -- this looks small on a map. As one man mentioned to me, one gentleman mentioned to me -- well, it is only 200,000 square feet that is proposed in this area. The R-6 area in the middle of an R-5, I can assure you of one thing, they put up a shopping center there and they will come back two years later and a year later asking for a larger parking area. I know the individuals you are dealing with. They are not concerned with the welfare of the people.

When a man says he doesn't care what people say or think, this is not a man that has the thought in mind of his neighbors or people in the surrounding area.

We brought to you two years ago approximately 187 names. They are still in your file and these same people are still objecting to the shopping center.

Believe me, Gentlemen, at least the last time I came before this Commission I had a little bit more time to prepare myself.

I have to admit that I am practically, totally unprepared to make this presentation.

And I take this time to request that this Commission give this particular phase of Fox Hills a thorough going-over, and give consideration to the people in this particular area.

It is going to be on your conscience if this thing is approved and Stapleton goes down the drain. I mean, you have to live

with it, not us, and we will go out.

If we have to go out, we are going to go out fighting, and that I mean sincerely. But consider this and consider it carefully: Let us stop leaning toward the big pressure and big business. Give the little guy a fighting chance. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir. Is Richard Lasher present?

MR. RICHARD LASHER

MR. LASHER: Mr. Felt, Gentlemen of the Commission, I want to thank you for your consideration in the past, especially Mr. Friedman and Mr. Smith and a few others. It is essentially the opinion of many of us on Staten Island, if given an additional year we can iron out all our problems and difficulties. However, I have a few requests here -- for modifications in part.

The first request I have concerns the southerly side of Hylan Boulevard between Kensington and Jerome Road on Plate 27C.

On behalf of my client, the owner of the property, I request a change of zoning from R3-2 to a commercial zoning. The land in question in part faces Steuben Street, and the request is a continuation of the commercial zone proposed for the southerly side of Hylan Boulevard.

The southerly side of Hylan Boulevard proceeding westerly is all built up with commercial structures. We have Carvel Ice Cream Stand, a super market, a dry cleaning establishment, used car lot and a few new automobile establishments. This request, that is, for the



change or prolongation of a commercial zone for an additional 200 feet would be in keeping with the pattern already set on one of Staten Island's main, busy arteries. The contour of the land in question also is of such a nature that the cost of residential building would be prohibitive and it would only be productive for commercial construction.

It is therefore requested that this area in question, to wit; the southerly side of Hylan Boulevard between Kensington and Jerome Road, be zoned for business. That is request number one.

Request No. 2: Request No. 2 is also on the southerly side of Forest Avenue between Amity Place and Summerfield Place. At the present time, there are several stores in question there.

The proposed zoning is Re-2. It is requested that this be changed to C zoning.

Upon inspection of the proposed zoning maps on this page, 20D, we noted that the northerly side of Firest Avenue in the immediate vicinity, the proposed zoning is C8-1. On the westward side of the southerly side of Forest Avenue the proposed zoning is commercial zoning.

Three blocks from the area in question on the southerly side, the proposed zoning is M-1

Therefore, it would be more consistent to retain the area in question in a commercial zoning than to change it to a residential area, especially when there are stores already in existence. That is Request No. 2.

Request No. 3 is regarding the southeast corner of Targee Street and Toule Street, Plate 21C.

It is a store located on a corner there and it is being zoned R-5.

For the purpose of expansion at any time in the near future, in view of the fact that everything around there is zoned R-5, there no doubt would be a demand for a store in that particular area to serve the local people there. I also request a change of zoning on the southwesterly corner of Arlington Place and South Avenue.

My last request is something I have been up before the Board now, I guess, on five different occasions. It is the southerly side of Richmond Terrace between Taylor Street and Alaska Street. The Commission has changed the zone, which I am thankful for. However, in keeping with the structures there and the actual construction of all the buildings there, the depth of property there is greater than 100 feet. And my request basically is to increase the depth of the zoning to 100 feet or more, which I believe is the policy of the Planning Commission here, to make the commercial endeavors more than 100 feet; also if it would see fit to rezone it to M1. However, the main consideration though is the depth to more than 100 feet. That's on Plate 21A.

Thank you, Mr. Felt, and Members of the Commission. My name is Richard Lasher.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

The next speaker is Peter J. Reynolds.

PETER J. REYNOLDS, representing Weissglass Dairies & Gold Seal Company, re: Mariners Harbor, Morning Star Road along Forest Avenue.

MR. REYNOLDS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the City Planning Commission, I speak for the Weissglass Dairies and Gold Seal Corporation, and it is on map 20D, the areas west of Morning Star Road and along Forest Avenue.

My people feel that the industries concerned, the people in the area and the community itself will benefit from these proposed changes. More specifically, we feel that the following benefits will ensue: Greater economic growth through increased employment by permitting expansion of the existing industries with a strong potential for growth.

Alleviate the present and future traffic problems, and realizing the need for off-street commercial parking.

We finally realize that the new zoning cannot please everyone, but we sincerely believe that with the continuing efforts of this Commission such cases will be adjusted. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Your name, please.

MR. REYNOLDS: Peter J. Reynolds.

CHAIRMAN FELT: The next speaker is Mr. Charnin.

EDWIN N. CHARNIN, representing Self, re: Block 2162, Lots 1 and 250, northwest area near Victory Boulevard and Travis Avenue.

MR. CHARNIN: Mr. Chairman Felt, Gentlemen, my name is Edwin N. Charnin and I am the owner of record of a parcel of vacant land, 20 acres in size, which is located in the northwest quadrant of Staten Island just north of the intersection of Victory Boulevard and Travis Avenue. I would like to say that I have no criticism whatsoever, but only respect for this very masterful and comprehensive job which has been done by this Commission.

My problem today is a very specific one and I respectfully ask you to refer to page 26C in the extreme upper left-hand corner.

Unfortunately, this parcel of land is trisected by three of your maps so that it is necessary to refer also to pages 26A and 20B. But I think that the problem can be best seen on this page, 26C.

If you notice at the extreme upper left-hand corner, the R3 category runs into a heavy line there. Within that little gore at the top you have your M1-1 designation. Now that M1-1 designation indicates the extreme margin of the M1-1 buffer zone. My parcel of land is located just within that particular line.

Now, the difficulty with that -- and I am asking for a modification upwards so that this parcel can be retained for residential development -- the difficulty is that our present plans, which are for residential development, must of course be stopped if this is M1-1 property.

The tract presently is designated for residential use and

one and two-family homes can be built there. It perhaps is only fortuitous that this line continued past Travis Avenue and went down Crane Avenue, which is an unmapped street, when it could very easily have stopped at Travis and then gone to the northwest along Travis.

Now, there are houses, one family houses located on that northwest side of Travis Avenue, perhaps 12 or 15 of them. Some of them are already within the M1-1 designation.

Now, if this parcel can be retained in an R3 designation, which would be consistent with all of the land to the east and to the north, we can develop that immediately and provide one-family houses for New Yorkers who will expand into this area.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: You believe that if that line is moved from Crane to Travis, that will provide the relief you want.

MR. CHARNIN: Yes, it will.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Your 20 acres come within that area?

MR. CHARNIN: Twenty acres are just within that tiny point. If it is left as M1-1, that will be the outer periphery of that buffer zone.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: What exists there now, vacant land?

MR. CHARNIN: It is vacant land, yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: No houses?

MR. CHARNIN: There are about 12 or 15 houses located along the northwesterly side of Victory Boulevard. All utilities are there,

the land is on grade. We are ready to commence building.

THE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Suppose you submit a memorandum.

MR. CHARNIN: Yes, sir. Thank you very much.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Very well.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Charnin, would you be able to have that memorandum for us within one week?

MR. CHARNIN: Yes, sir. I can leave a map at this time, if you desire.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I think it might be better for your papers to be joined together.

ABE SOLOR, representing Birlor Realty Corporation, Fred Weinrock, Kings Mercantile Company, Inc., re:(1) Vanderbilt and Tompkins Avenues;(2) Manor Road and Victory Boulevard, maps 21B and 21D; (3) Fox Hills.

MR. SOLOR: My name is Abe Solor; No. 1, I will speak as chairman of Birlor Realty Corporation, the owner of Fox Hills.

In answer to the Stapleton Civic Association, I fail to know what the lines of the Stapleton Civic Association are, where they come to include a vast track of 104 acres within their category, and where they come in to include the Park Hill Gardens development of 27 acres, which I previously developed with one family homes and garden apartments.

I have no objection to what Mr. Kane of the Stapleton Civic Association would want, but I am sure that if you gentlemen could make

an on the spot examination of ever house in the particular blocks that are marked R6, and even across the street on Vanderbilt Avenue running to Targee Street, you would see that you are doing these people a favor by putting this property in R5 and R6.

The assessed value is not high, gentlemen, because it is the best section for one family houses.

The assessed valuation is high on the land, not on the buildings. And if the City of New York felt it was essential have an assessed valuation as high as they do on that land, the land is useable for better than one family homes for eternity.

I didn't know about this until two nights ago when Mr. Kane had called me at my home and told me the Civic Association is going to object to it, and Mr. Shefler, who in conjunction with the Stapleton Board of Trade opposed me on the previous application on the 21C for a shopping center in Fox Hills. I had no objection to what they want, if they want to confiscate their property, let them put deed restrictions on it. Let them put anything they want. But they are not going to confiscate my property.

I was raised a million dollars on the assessed valuation, \$125 a day every morning I wake up, and as I told Commissioner Rivkin and Commissioner Boyland I hope they leave me some money for breakfast some morning.

I am not a big man and neither are my associates as big as they claim they are. I wasn't born with a gold spoon in my mouth.

Everything I have, I have through my own work and my own brains and my own knowledge. And I have held this property now for 14 years, stymied by, first, the sovereignty of the State of New York, stymied when we tried to develop something for Staten Island.

The large shoppingcenter that would have helped Stapleton -- not hurt them -- in fact, I would rule that application without prejudice at your request to be submitted later. So nobody is fooling the gentleman from the Stapleton Board of Trade that a new application was put in for this. This came about with the comprehensive zoning amendment. We felt that if we are going to put residences of any kind, whether apartments, one families, two story apartments, high rise apartments or anything, there was a need for local retail shopping so that people wouldn't have to walk a mile and a half or two miles to Stapleton.

And if the gentleman -- I wouldn't mention names because I am going to bring that up in a minute -- the gentleman of the Stapleton Board of Trade feels that we are hurting Stapleton, he has got to learn something about real estate and what is hurting Stapleton. Stapleton has hurt themselves. Stapleton is so physically located that it can't develop. And anything that Stapleton has got today in the business, and the business they are doing today, has been caused what this gentleman created in the Park Hills Gardens development. Even for his own business.

We are not the kind of guys who don't care about our



neighbors, I am interested in zoning. I am interested in community activity. This gentleman has an organization today that uses a building in which I donated the land for and without which they couldn't use that building for a purpose, one purpose of that organization. So, I am not the bad guy that he tries to paint me, although at a previous hearing on 21 C he passed a libelous remark, and a criminal libelous remark, about Abe Solor.

I didn't proceed and take action, which any individual other than myself would do. Because I don't, I belong to a faith that doesn't want to take vengeance because the other fellow talks dastardly about him.

I don't know what word to use. I can use other words.

I come out of the mud. I'm a builder and I can use foul language if I want to, but I don't do those things.

I am not out to hurt anything -- anybody. As I told Mr. Kane over the telephone, that the children and grandchildren of people that live in those homes that only want to restrict themselves to an R3 district will perhaps curse their parents or their grandchildren, or the grandchildren and the children will do because they have left them inheritance with an old home that they can't sell after and get any kind of dollars for, and it happened all over New York.

I have had experience for 35 to 37 years in that thing. I have seen estates where they couldn't sell the property because of deed restrictions or because of the improper zoning there, and the

estates were left nothing and just had to give them away for the taxes.

So we are not trying to hurt anybody. I think you gentlemen have done a service to the community and a service to Staten Island. And when we get an R6 zone and an R5 zone in our area, we are going to help Stapleton, gentlemen.

3500 to 4000 or 4500 people living in a community of theirs will help Stapleton. Stapleton has hurt itself by fighting me with the vast shopping center because New Dorp is getting it and the crowd will go to New Dorp. They won't come back to Stapleton anyway. And I made up my mind that in 1965, when that shopping center perhaps would be built, I didn't want the gold monument left to me -- it was Staten Island's loss that they fought it, not Abe Solor's loss.

So let them forget about that. Gentlemen, you use your judgment as to what is the proper thing there. That is all I have to say.

But I am going to warn Mr. Teitelbaum now that he had best be careful how he gets up at a public hearing and speaks about individuals in the future, and slanders them and libels them, because I won't stand for it much longer.

Now, gentlemen, I want to show you-- (indicating on map)-- there are the two blocks involved, with the few houses on my side of the street which are, in effect, in the R6 zone. The blue

is all vacant land owned by us and another 110,000 feet owned by two owners, the Greenberg Estate represented by Mr. Aberlin, from whom I got permission to state that he wants the R6 zone, and by a Mr. Grossman whom I am sure will not stand for an R3 zone on his property.

So we control 80 per cent of those two blocks involved and we are not hurting anybody. Because all the opposite houses opposite us are built on 30 foot lots. Most of them on 30 foot lots except seven houses that were built about four or five years ago on Ralph Street.

We intend to put up on that lot on Vanderbilt Avenue with 654 foot frontage where the plans are being drawn now -- the first luxury apartment house in Staten Island occupying only about 14 per cent of the land of a plot of 160,000 feet.

Now, if that is going to hurt the neighborhood, let them show me how it is going to hurt it. Leave them bring in their real estate experts; leave them get all the retail experts they want. I am through with Fox Hills.

I will now talk as an interested owner of the corner of Vanderbilt and Tompkins Avenue, title which is in the Kings Mercantile Corporation.

I thank you gentlemen for the change you have made as requested on part of it, but I know this is spot zoning and there is a plot of

100,000 feet involved where an R5 district would not do justice to the development of that plot.

I know it includes a vast area and the United States Marine Hospital is adjoining us with a vast light and area of over 25 acres. And permanent light in all four sides, both Vanderbilt Avenue, our own plot adjoining and the Mariners' Home adjoining that.

It would lend itself better if that plot was in an R6 zone for the proper development, both for the benefit of Stapleton Board of Trade and for the benefit of everybody else involved.

There is a housing project, as you know, going up -- the Stapleton Houses, which I do not think conforms with the R5 district now, and they occupy a vast tract of 13 acres within 200 feet or 300 feet of this property.

And I personally think that that plot should be changed as requested before, to an R6 zone. I will leave that up to you gentlemen to decide.

I am requesting that--if we can have it we would be thankful.

Now I am turning to Map 21B.

Representing Mr. Fred Winrock on the plot on Manor Road and Victory Boulevard running for 700 feet, some odd feet, on Manor Road to a varying depth from 147, 157 feet to over 240 feet, and also being the owner of two plots on Raymond Avenue adjoining this property.

I formerly was the owner of the 99-year leasehold on that plot and we still have a controversial interest in that plot, and

plans were filed for a small neighborhood shopping center with leases signed with Woolworth's, Miles Shoes, and other chains on this property. Voluminous money was spent for plans, over \$35,000, and plot plans by Leo Novick, with parking facilities sufficient to take care of not only our shopping center but the traffic hazard at Manor Road and Victory Boulevard today.

That whole <sup>square</sup>/block should have been zoned in a C1-1. You gentlemen have changed it only to 200 foot in depth. It was changed some ten years ago when the streets that ran through it were closed by the Planning Commission and the Board of Estimate.

I say today you put the whole area in R3-1. I built a war housing job with attached houses there. Another builder built a war housing the other side of Manor Road, and we were such bad guys that we built houses, that we sold to people there after the war for six, seven and eight thousand dollars apiece, which are selling today for \$14,000. We did a job for the community then.

I fail to see why the whole area is put into R3-1. It should be put into a residential district higher than that up to Crowell Avenue, at least, because you have got more attached houses there than anything else.

And another thing about this plot, there is a creek running through it. We have arranged with the City of New York -- this takes in the storm water from a large area -- we arranged in developing this plot for the shopping center with the sewer department and Borough

President's office for a concrete culvert to run under the ground of the parking area to take care of the outflow of that water and eliminate the creek at that point.

The utility companies have arranged with us for everything to go underground.

Gentlemen, we can proceed with these plans and beat the deadline of the effective date. We don't want to do it. We don't want to do anything that will non-conform later, and I say to you gentlemen that you should change back to what it is today, not only the area that is developed but the whole square block of Manor Road, Goodell Avenue, Raymond Avenue and Victory Boulevard, into that C1-1 for local shopping in order to take care of sufficient parking with any business that you allow there today.

Because the building we are going to build, we could sweat that plot on Victory Boulevard to its maximum and then there won't be any room for parking. We would have to come to the Board of Standards and Appeals, or to you people, to make additional parking. But if the whole plot is zoned the way we want it--this will show you the plans for that property that is already on file and approved.

The only thing we have got to do is walk in and get the permit.

So, Gentlemen, let's not -- do not force, as I say, us to do it hastily. Let us have a change to what it is today, including, I say, even the Raymond Avenue frontages, because on Raymond Avenue

you approved parking for the A & P building for a depth of an additional 150 feet behind their building, behind the 200 feet.

And an examination of that whole block will show that I am entirely within reason in asking for that request.

Gentlemen, one other thing--I must come back to Fox Hills, which I forgot about. Do you know, Mr. Bloustein, when the Edison Company applied for that -- Edison Company applied for that transformer on the other side of the tracks, the retail zone, I stated that if they built a building properly we have no objection. They have an unrestricted zone now.

However, you have taken the land east of Mosel Avenue -- my land -- and put it in R5. A close examination of that plot would show that Mosel Avenue drops to the railroad tracks, to a variance of anywhere from 15 to 35 feet, sloping down hill and the other side would be the transformer plant.

You gentlemen can't expect us to build residence on that plot. We ask to keep that in its present C, which is equivalent of M1, will give us. We do not wish to put heavy industry or anything on it, but we want the right, if we want to put a light manufacturing plant with plenty of landscaping around it, or an office building for the insurance industry, and a one story building where they don't need the everyday contact at a price which they can afford to pay as against the price per square foot they pay in lower Manhattan.

We are not definite as to what we want to do, -- a research

laboratory -- but definitely housing is out of the question on that plot because of its topography and because on the other side for a length of over 14, 1500 feet, you are going to have the transformer, the major transformer plant of the Con Edison Company.

Thank you gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

Is Mr. Ferretti here?

VINCENT E. FERRETTI, representing Ferretti & Company, Inc.

Re: Concord Hill side of Spring Street.

MR. FERRETTI: My name is Vincent Ferretti, an attorney representing Ferretti and Company, Inc. I have an office in Staten Island at 25 Hylan Street.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Will you spell your name, please?

MR. FERRETTI: F-e-r-r-e-t-t-i, 25 Hylan Street. The first name is Vincent.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, your proposed zoning resolution has a worthwhile objective and you are to be congratulated on what you have accomplished. However, every situation cannot be covered.

Although the present proposal contains many provisions and regulations, there should be added the rule of reasoning. There are some terrains that cannot conform to the present proposal, and I have in mind the valley off of Emerson Hill which leads down into Spring Street. The particular property in which I am interested on behalf of



my client is a ten acre tract, block 839, lot 25, and another one and-a-third acre plot adjoining-block 839, lot 250.

I might add, next door to this area is another plot of ground, six and a half acres owned by the City of New York. Part of this acreage, the upper tract, amounting to about five acres, lies at an elevation running at 245 feet and extending to 300 feet over a distance or stretch of 225 feet. This makes a grade of 25 per cent.

Now, this grade cannot conform to the City streets of New York which are fixed or had fixed an eight per cent grade for a street. Therefore, this area has no accessibility.

The Planning Commission has approved a road on a lower tract of this parcel, but the grade required by the City of New York was such that the road was curtailed and could only reach the lower tract.

The upper tract is therefore without road and impossible of having one under the present situation.

Your present zoning for this area is R1-1, which I believe covers parcels of 100 x 100 feet.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That is right.

MR. FERRETTI: Now, the only utility that we can have of this area in the light of that proposed zoning is a small stretch of 80 feet on Coverly Road, and it drops abruptly, but in an emergency we could build a house on that 80 foot frontage, and that is the only utility we can have out of that parcel of three and a half and four

acres under the present proposed zoning regulation.

Of course, we could build from Coverly Road an elevated structure conforming with the requirements of your R1-1 and build houses on the side of stilts. I am sure you never intended that, and I am sure that if you had had the time -- and no reflection is intended -- to study and analyze it you would have realized that an R1-1 proposal is not in order for that area.

Now, the lower tract which has been approved by you in an impartial way for 1600 feet of road is now under a proposed development of 41 40-foot houses. Now, your zoning proposal will not become effective until a year hence after its approval, but in that period of time the developer of those 41-odd 40-foot houses will have gotten so far ahead that the whole area would have been downgraded. So what are we going to do with the upper tract?

We cannot do anything with it because nobody is going to build on a 100x100 in an area that is dominated by 40-foot houses.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I want to mention at this time, Mr. Ferretti, that in our zoning proposal we have limited the scope of the Board of Standards and Appeals, particularly as relating to the exclusion of gasoline stations in residential areas. This is not applicable in situations of distinct hardship, which cannot be fully described for every parcel in the city in any zoning resolution. I would say that the parcel that you

refer to, topographically, is a most unusual one -- in fact, there are no other boroughs but Staten Island that have situations as acute in spots as you have mentioned. The Board of Standards and Appeals would be in a position to treat that problem under its proper function, under our proposal.

MR. FERRETTI: I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, but the Board of Standards and Appeals is the rule of reason that I have reference to. But it will no longer be as effective as it is today when your zoning proposal has been adopted.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Oh, yes, sir, may I say --

MR. FERRETTI: I bow to your superior knowledge of your proposed zoning resolution. However, your Honor --

CHAIRMAN FELT: I might say this so that at least you will understand our motives and intention; there are always situations where appeals are warranted for hardship situations that are different from the alleged hardships that we are endeavoring to control and which we will control.

The problem which you refer to, in my opinion, would be a very logical and basic example of how the Board could and will function. However, I will discuss that with you at some later time. I do not think we can debate it here.

MR. FERRETTI: May I add a few more words?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Certainly. I want you to complete your statement.

MR. FERRETTI: You seem to have a pretty good understanding of the situation existing there, which I appreciate-with all you have to do. However, knowing the situation, why not be realistic. Don't put us to some more trouble later on, let us approach the Board of Standards and Appeals, et cetera, et cetera. Why not meet the issue now and provide for something that is so obvious.

Now, if you do that, if you do what I suggest, Mr. Chairman, the terrain will have been equitably treated. A fair tax return will be brought to the city, the owner will not be impoverished and no one can be harmed, for the very simple reason that the people who are trying for R1-1 live up on top of the hill. We are down in the valley. We don't disturb anything.

There is nobody around us to object, so let us go on our way with a reasonable application of your proposed zoning resolution. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Raymond A. Pickard?

RAYMOND A. PICKARD, representing Livingston and whole of Staten Island, Delegate and Vice President of the Civic Congress of Staten Island, representing about 10,000 homeowners.

MR. PICKARD: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, my name is Raymond Pickard, P-i-c-k-a-r-d. I am here to represent an area known as Livingston in Staten Island. I am also a delegate, vice president of the Civic Congress of Staten Island, being our parent organization representing about 10,000 homeowners.

It is our believe that the proposed zoning resolution being submitted today in general will be beneficial to Staten Island, the Richmond Borough as a whole.

I am authorized to inform this Commission that we are in favor of the adoption of the proposed resolution, with the understanding that we will be able at a later date to have some changes made in certain residential areas.

It is also our request that the resolution, if it is adopted, that it become effective immediately instead of one year later.

On behalf of myself and the members of the organizations which I represent, I want to congratulate Mr. Felt, Mr. Jack Smith, members of the Zoning Committee for the work that they have done in their attempt to bring about a zoning resolution in Richmond County which will be satisfactory to everyone.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Charles Kuebler.

CHARLES KUEBLER, representing Realty Associates, Inc.

MR. KUEBLER: My name is Charles Kuebler. I represent Realty Associates, the owner of a six-acre parcel in Pleasant Plains, and I'm here to thank the Commission for seeing eye to eye with us on the proposed zoning.

Currently, the property was -- is zoned retail; the proposed zoning was residential. It's a piece that is adjacent to a railroad

in Pleasant Plains, and it's on map No. 33, and after talking with Mr. Felt and submitting data they went down and made an inspection -- they have zoned it M-1, and we're entirely satisfied.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Thank you very much.

Mr. Seymour Spruch. Excuse me if I mispronounced it.

SEYMOUR SPRUCH, representing Eltingville Civic Association,  
re: Great Kills, Tottenville, New Dorp.

MR. SPRUCH: It's perfectly all right.

Mr. Acting Chairman, whoever you may be, and the other  
Gentlemen:

My name is Seymour Spruch. I am representing the Eltingville Civic Association as president.

I am also president of the Staten Island Federation of Civic Associations.

I refer you to this past Thursday's Staten Island Advance wherein it is stated that our master organization, the Federation, represents 30 civic groups on Staten Island. Essentially, though, I'd like to start -- and those of you gentlemen who are checking for or against -- I'm for. I'd like to start on a small scale, and on map page 33C, we find that one small area has been downgraded.

We feel it should not be downgraded, especially since it is now composed entirely of one family homes. I refer to the area west of Eltingville Boulevard and recommend that the block which is bounded by Eltingville Boulevard, Wilson Avenue and Richmond Avenue,

with the exception of 100 foot depth east of Richmond Avenue, be designated as R-2 instead of C-1-1, as proposed.

Secondly, we strongly recommend that the entire area of Eltingville, lying between the Staten Island Rapid Transit Tracks and Arthur Kill Road or Drungoole Blvd., which is designated as R-3 -- this was in my letter of August of '59 -- now I believe it's R-3-2 -- be changed to an R-2 zone instead. Most of this area is vacant land.

Now, this is like agreeing with you -- agreeing with you in general on the entire menu. We're merely making a suggestion in entree. But what I'm actually frankly annoyed at are some of the previous speakers. Our association, and mainly the large Federation, is striving for a save-the-trees campaign now. You have made in your suggestion the recommendation that Hylan Boulevard, south of Great Kills, that is, Hylan Boulevard running from Great Kills to Tottenville, be a residential classification. We strongly urge that you retain the present residential classification which now exists and the one which you propose and that you do not listen to these other interests.

In my letter to you, in August of '59, I was polite. I stated that we urge that Hylan Boulevard south of Great Kills be left in the present residential classification and that the particular interests and places of residence of those persons and organizations who are so anxious to create a business and commercial strip out of Hylan Boulevard between Great Kills and Tottenville be carefully

scrutinized.

I said a business and commercial strip -- I'd like to state now that what I have in mind and what we fear is that they would make a honky-tonk out of that area.

Now, I remember at the beginning of the hearings, the Staten Island -- large segments of the Staten Island group, objected to, ~~was~~ they said, you gentlemen from Manhattan coming over here to Staten Island and telling us what to do. Well, we on the south shore are in the same position. We're objecting to the Chamber of Commerce and the Real Estate Board from Bay Street telling us what to do in the south shore.

The only way we can save the trees that we now have, which is one of the biggest assets in Staten Island, is to keep that area residential.

One of the previous speakers mentioned that Richmond, people on Richmond Avenue from Eltingville have to go to Great Kills and New Dorp to shop. That's not so. We have shopping areas in Eltingville. We have and can have shopping areas in every little community along the Staten Island Rapid Transit.

The people will be going from the railroad to their homes and from the homes to the railroad. They do not use the bus which would go along Hylan Boulevard.

Further, there are plans in Eltingville now, and as soon as the Building Department unlatches its present problems, one of the



largest shopping areas is proposed. It will be a Food Fair on Amboy Road in Eltingville. That will take most of the residents from Tottenville to Eltingville- they will go there. They will no longer have to go to Great Kills or to go to New Dorp. To go to New Dorp is ridiculous.

What I'm striving for, gentlemen, is that we do not need commercial areas on Hylan Boulevard. We are most thankful that that area is now green grass; we want to keep it that way. We appreciate that you gentlemen intended it to be that way and we will be once again most thankful.

I have just one little favor to make. My mother is dead now, but when we were kids there were four of us in the house and we were healthy, lively young kids.

Now, can you imagine my mother saying to us at nine o'clock in the morning on any given day, "Children, I want no more crayon marks on a wall, I want no more ink on the floors, and this ruling is to be effective at 4:00 p.m. this afternoon".

In other words, we feel that as far as changing residential zones from a minimum present of forty feet lot to sixty feet lot, if you're going to make this change, and say, "Those areas which are now 40 feet can only become 60 feet lots", and you say in effect that this will take place one year from now, every builder on the Island will fill up that land within that one year on 40 foot lots so that your effective zoning will have no effect whatsoever.

Now, I understand that it will harm certain commercial districts. So I'm agreeable on the year there. But I do feel some consideration should be given to the detrimental effect of the year's wait.

Before I leave, I have one slight hint to throw out as a code for you:

You might say that this new zoning business will change from "Archaic" to R-1,2 and 3. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

Mr. L. F. Jahnke.

L. F. JAHNKE, representing Fort Hill Circle and Fort Hill Park Civic Association.

MR. JAHNKE: My name is L. F. Jahnke, and I appear for the Fort Hill Circle and Fort Hill Park Civic Association.

One or more members of our group have appeared at each of the public hearings and have also attended a separate meeting held for certain people in the area who disagreed with the classification that had been given to our area. The constant position of a majority of the people in our area is that this should be an R-2 zone.

We've provided the Commission with written statements, photographs, and a petition signed by 90 per cent of the people in the area taking this position. The Commission has seen fit to agree and we have been awarded the R-2 designation for the majority of this area.

The only question on which there has been a difference of

opinion between the people in the area has been as to where one of the boundaries should be drawn. The most recent map that has been put out, we note that boundary has been moved in, so that fewer people, fewer homes are included in the R-2 area than were there before. That has had this effect:

Two people who are now in the R-6 area are in favor of that move because they never wanted the R-2 in the first place. Three other owners find their property bisected, part in the R-6 and part in the R-2, and I presume they are thankful for the part that's in the R-6 and object to the part that's in the R-2.

However, there are sixteen owners who prefer an R-6 -- who prefer the R-2 designation and who are now included in the R-6 area.

Now, this whole situation has been discussed with the people in our area, and while there is disappointment among those sixteen owners, the consensus is that the whole situation has been examined exhaustively and that every circumstance in respect to it has been aired, and that, therefore, we should adopt the position that an equitable line has been drawn by the Commission and they have been as fair as is humanly possible.

We also have been led to this consideration by the general overall position of the Commission which has impressed us so favorably, as we've been here in this chamber and listened to the replies that have been made, that our judgment has been swayed to accept what has been

done.

Therefore, we wish to go on record as supporting the resolution in its overall aspects, particularly as it affects Staten Island, and to accept and support the line that has been drawn in respect to the Fort Hill area.

We wish to add only one plea -- it's been made a good many times this morning -- that is, that the effective date of this resolution be made as early as possible because we believe that delay can only aid those people who wish to do something which is contrary to the spirit and the provisions of this resolution.

We've sent you a statement recently in support of the general provisions of the Commission, and this particular line is drawn, and I now hand it to you, a copy of the same one, so that you have it.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Jahnke.

Miss Dorothy V. Smith.

DOROTHY V. SMITH, re: Clove Road and Victory Boulevard.

MISS SMITH: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission:

My name is Dorothy V. Smith, and I own approximately five acres along Clove Road and Victory Boulevard in Sunnyside.

I'm asking consideration and favor action in rating that area, especially the land adjoining the Clove Lakes Park on the west side of Clove Road, as R-6. I don't ask for a change of the rating, C-2-1, for the small strips along the northeast and the northwest

corners of Victory Boulevard and Clove Road.

Now, my reasons for asking for R-6 are that the three colleges and a number of schools within a mile of the area, attracting more and more families here, the needs of the increasing number would be better met with such apartments. Because of excellent transportation, with four bus lines, the area is and will be even more attractive to commuting business people, thus increasing the need for living space.

High-rise apartments have already been erected in the Sunnyside area. As you probably know, this is one of the most naturally beautiful sections of Staten Island, plus the advantages of sports and playgrounds and the extra recreational pleasures of Silver Lake.

The area in my opinion should be made available for a far larger number of families to live in comfortably than could be enjoyed by the proposed R-2-3 plan.

I believe these reasons are valid, and would truly benefit the area for the future, and I respectfully urge and ask a favorable action, and I thank you for the courtesy and for your consideration.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Thank you, Miss Smith.

Elizabeth H. Niebyl.

ELIZABETH H. NIEBYL, representing Staten Island Citizens.

MISS NIEBYL: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners:

I'm Elizabeth Niebyl and I speak for the Staten Island

Citizens Planning Committee.

As you, on the Commission, know, we have been deeply concerned with the long range development of the Island, and in view of that have been particularly interested in planning and in zoning as an instrument of effecting planning.

We, therefore, have studied your original proposals and your two subsequent ones with great care and interest, and we would like to say, as we have before, that this new one still embodies the very important new concepts which make us feel that the resolution is essential for the welfare of Staten Island, more than any other Borough, because of its comparatively undeveloped nature.

You have a modern, coordinated resolution, a single mapping system, the new floor area ratio and bulk concepts and regulations, you have the very important distinction of each type of development, residential, manufacturing and commercial, standing on its own feet and not one better than the other, but each protected from each so as to develop as well as possible.

The permissive use policy is an important advance over the prohibitive, which allows one bad use of each new category before you find out that you need to prohibit it. The performance standards is another most major contribution allowing for much greater flexibility in the application of all the manufacturing regulations, and the bonus plan is also a great advance.

With regard to the specific changes which were needed in the

text and the mapping, I will not go at length here. Those few which we felt were essential, we have had the greatest courtesy from the Commissioners and the staff in discussing. Most of them either have been changed and many have been mentioned here this morning, some have been explained to us like the one about shopping centers in the large R-3 areas which are at present undeveloped.

Therefore, one cannot know now which is the best spot and the zoning ordinance, it was pointed out, is flexible enough to permit putting in those later.

We appreciate the extra R zone where we felt the gap was too large between the R-2 and the R-3, and also that prisons may not dwell in the C-2 area which is the neighborhood shopping.

I think the only thing which we raised after the last draft, which we feel it important to raise now, is one which has also been raised several times this morning, that is, the question of time of enforcement. We feel that it should go into effect as soon as approved, as the previous speaker said; if there is agreement that this is good, then put it into effect as soon as you can because we need the protection in Staten Island that these new advances mean of the general resolution, and if there are necessary minor map changes, certainly, the attitude of the Planning Commission during the past year and a half we have been working on maps shows a real understanding of the need to look into individual situations as they come up and develop.

Therefore, the Staten Island Citizens Planning Committee asked me to represent them here to endorse fully the passage of the resolution.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

I have been asked by Mr. Lovejoy, J. D. Lovejoy of the Dongan Hills Improvement Society, Inc., to read his letter of September the 9th into the record.

J.D. LOVEJOY - DONGAN HILLS IMPROVEMENT SOCIETY, INC. 9/9/60

"At a meeting of the officers and directors of the Dongan Hills Improvement Society on Thursday, September the 8th, 1960, it was agreed that the undersigned should address a communication to you expressing our appreciation for the painstaking efforts taken by the City Planning Commission in rezoning New York City. The comprehensive amendment which will perpetuate the present open character of Staten Island by zoning this Borough for a capacity of less than 1,000,000 as compared with the possible capacity of over 7,000,000 under the existing regulations, and at the same time providing for compatible industrial areas has unqualified approval.

With specific reference to our residential areas, in the Dongan Hills sections of Staten Island, we commend your action in establishing the R-1-1 zoning district, thus insuring <sup>minimum</sup> lot areas in consonance with the suburban atmosphere which presently obtains. Prompt action by all departments of the City of New York to finalize and formally adopt this modern zoning resolution is earnestly requested.

Sincerely yours,  
(signed)

J.D. Lovejoy.<sup>w</sup>



CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing)

Mrs. Charles Neu.

MRS. CHARLES NEU, Chairman, Great Kills Citizens Committee on Zoning.

MRS. NEU: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission:

I'm Mrs. Charles Neu of 44 Hillside Terrace, Great Kills, and am chairman of the Great Kills Citizens Committee on zoning.

Now, perhaps -- I'm going to take, usually, the last items first. I want to say that looking at the entire proposed comprehensive amendment to the zoning resolution, let me clearly and emphatically state that it is undeniably the very foundation for an indestructible structure upon which our five boroughs must be built. Surely you and many of us know that we cannot continue in a progressive manner under outmoded patchwork zoning laws.

I sincerely hope and pray that the Board of Estimate will recognize the merits of this very excellent plan and realize that it would be only good judgment and common sense to make this our new zoning ordinance without undue delay.

I unreservedly endorse this as an ordinary garden variety citizen to whom you have been most fair.

Now, getting to our specific thing:

In connection with the dispute between the residents of Great Kills in the area affected by the Jaeger interests, please refer to page 33D, page 240; I would like it known that our committee

and the Jaegers have reached an accord and agreement and compromise of all of our respective difficulties up to the present time, and this has been reduced to writing and will form the basis of understanding for now and in the future between us and them, I wishfully hope.

This agreement will be made available to you and Mr. Jaegers after it has been recorded.

Mr. Chairman and Members of this Commission:

I am deeply grateful and I sincerely appreciate and I wish to thank you on behalf of myself and those members of the community who are directly or indirectly affected by the change—that you've rezoned us, back to our previous residential zoning. I feel, Commissioner Felt, you are keenly attuned to the residential resident's needs. I appreciate your thoughtfulness.

May I say also I have had dealings with Mr. Sapenkopf and I have found him to be unequalled in kindness, consideration and attention. Also, I've had dealings only as recently as last Friday morning with our zoning commissioner's office in Richmond, and they were helpful to me, too, and I do appreciate it.

May I say again I feel that Mr. Sapenkopf certainly deserves special merit for his fine consideration and personal application to this case. I do not believe that I am the easiest person in the world to deal with at times, and he has had fortitude.

Your decision to return our residential area to a C-3-2 zoning for the present meets with our wholehearted approval, provided

it remains that way from now on.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

Mrs. Neu, We are happy to see you today, particularly after having been here last night. You have always been a guardian of the interests of those in your area, and we were delighted to see you this morning, even after you had been here yesterday, and we want to assure you that we shall extend every interest and effort to see that the confidence you have in us is well merited.

MRS. NEU: Thank you, Commissioner, very much.

May I add one further thing:

I want most of the people on Staten Island to realize that you are a very reasonable man to deal with, and that, actually, the needs of all the residents are, I think, well, a prime consideration with you. I appreciate this fully and we do have a good many residents and we're going to have a great many more in the future. So I hope they look kindly at you for this because I certainly do.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Buglioli.

PAUL BUGLIOLI, re: Great Kills.

MR. BUGLIOLI: Paul Buglioli, 28 Locust Place, Great Kills.

I'm also in favor of the citywide plan and as she spoke about the agreement we have now in connection with our opposition, we

wish to conform to the zoning and not to exceed what we have already in disagreement, and I also want to thank you for your interest, patience and consideration in our case.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Buglioli.

Mrs. Catherine Milleysack.

CATHERINE MILLEYSACK, representing Great Kills Citizens Committee.

CATHERINE MILLEYSACK, I am Mrs. Catherine Milleysack, and I wish to thank you all in a body and also Mr. Felt for your consideration in our problem, and I also wish to go on record as in favor of the new citywide zoning for the good of the greater majority of the people of Staten Island.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mrs. Milleysack.

Theodore G. Barlow. Mr. Barlow?

THEODORE G. BARLOW, representing Grymes Hill Estates Association.

MR. BARLOW: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission:

My name is Theodore G. Barlow. I address you on behalf of the Grymes Hill Estates Association, Incorporated, with regard to an area shown on map 21 on the east side of Victory Boulevard, south of Theresa Place.

On the original map, this area was designated as R-6 area.

and after hearing and deliberation, you have amended it to make it an R-1.

On behalf of the Association, we wish to thank you and commend your good judgment in this matter. Obviously, you have recognized the destructive nature of putting an R-6 zone smack up against a well-established R-1 zone consisting of fine, one-family houses.

There is an additional consideration which I would like to point out:

The entire area of Grymes Hill running from Hero Park down to Clove Road, an area of approximately three-quarters, or a mile in length, and possibly half a mile in width, contains five educational institutions; two colleges, Wagner College and Notre Dame College on Staten Island, the Augustinian Academy, a secondary school, the Notre Dame Academy which is both a primary and secondary school, and P.S. 35.

This area is now almost exclusively devoted to these educational institutions and to what might be classified as a better grade of one family house. If our colleges, particularly, are to have room for expansion in the future, and to maintain the atmosphere of suburban -- of a suburban campus, it is essential that the march of the apartment houses be stopped on the periphery of this area.

Now, along with a number of other speakers I would like to stress to you the necessity of speed in this matter. This is particularly true of the narrow area that I defined initially, because we are

informed by newspaper stories of imminent development of eighteen-story apartment houses in this area and our association, together with Wagner College and Notre Dame College, have requested this Commission to grant us immediate zoning change to prevent this. If this does not take place, all your future zoning in this area is a nullity; it will be an accomplished fact, and we are licked and we believe Staten Island will be licked, too.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

Is Mr. Grainger present?

JOSEPH K. GRAINGER, representing O'Brien Shipyards.

MR. GRAINGER: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission:

I represent O'Brien -- I'm Joseph K. Grainger. I represent O'Brien Brothers Shipyard Corporation on Edgewater Street, Staten Island.

We have been before the Commission before Mr. Sapenkopf and Mr. Smith and they have been most helpful. I have also given them the full background of the yard and I will not elaborate on it further at this time. I believe that's in your record.

However, I would like to point out that on Map 21D, it appears -- a portion of the property appears in the first M-3-1 classification, if we look upward from the lower right-hand corner. Now, prior to March 25th of this year, that area you had tentatively set down for a zones M-2 classification, and we appreciate this M-3

portion of the yard being designated very much, and I have so written to the Commission, to you, Mr. Chairman.

However, the yard is divided into two sides. One on what I call the waterfront side and the other on the west side divided by Edgewater Street, and we look forward in the future to possible expansion. We don't want to do anything hasty and injudicious to beat any deadline and, of course, M-3 classification, M-3-1 or M-3 itself entails the repair and fabricating and building of ships over 200 feet in length.

Now, I have previously pointed out to the Commission that most of our work entails the repair of vessels over that length and, of course, we do much defense work as I pointed out in the past, and I point out in a memorandum I am submitting today.

I do ask, therefore, that consideration be given to our application that the entire property be designated M-3, that we do not have this limitation, that we be afforded the opportunity to develop fully.

I believe your records will indicate the yard is in proper repair; it is a credit to the area, in which it provides employment for approximately 80 men year-round, and which is a substantial payroll.

That concludes my remarks except to thank you for what I may say is the full opportunity to have been heard. I thank Mr. Saperkopf, Mr. Smith and yourself and Members of the Commission.

I have several copies of the statement. May I submit them?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, you may, sir.

Thank you, Mr. Grainger.

"BEFORE THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
September 13, 1960

O'BRIEN BROTHERS SHIPYARD CORPORATION  
200 Edgewater Street

STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.  
MAP 21d

"1. The Shipyard property consists of two portions, divided by Edgewater Street. One is the waterfront property, to the east, and the other lies to the west of the dividing road.

"2. Prior to the hearing on March 25, 1960, the Commission had proposed that all of the Shipyard be classified M2-1. After consideration, however, the Commission reclassified the waterfront side to an M3-1, but the western portion remains M2-1. (Commission letter of August 17, 1960):

"3. Thereafter, while we expressed our appreciation for a partial M3-1 zoning, we asked for reconsideration so that all sections of the Yard property might have an M3-1 designation.

"4. At the present time, all of the work is done on the shoreside property, the other side being used for storage and parking. However, the company hopes in the future to utilize this area more fully and requests that all of its property may be used for shipyard purposes without restriction. It does a large amount of work for the government, (a U. S. Navy Destroyer was in the Yard for extensive



work during the summer) and it would like to be in a position to be a part of any government program even if it required expansion of facilities. Private industry of course may require it also.

"5. The area to the west of Edgewater Street, now M2-1 is about two-thirds of the size of the waterfront property and capable of development. It covers about 2 acres.

"6. The zoning regulations provide for an M3 designation for the repairing or building of ships over 200 feet in length. Most of the Yard's work involve vessels of such size, as we have previously advised the Commission. If the west side property may be used in this connection in the future, it should be given such a classification at this time.

"7. We respectfully request that the Yard not be limited in its plans for development, but be granted an M3-1 classification for all of its property at this time.

Joseph K. Grainger, Attorney for O'Brien Brothers Shipyard Corporation, 26 Broadway, New York 4, N.Y."

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. S. Zeckendorf.

S. ZECKENDORF, re: Stapleton.

MR. ZECKENDORF: Gentlemen:

I am here in my own behalf. My name is S. Zeckendorf. I'm located at 582 Bay Street, Stapleton, Staten Island.

I was here two years ago when a proposition was made to establish a shopping center in the Fox Hill area. At that time,

nothing came out of it and we all, in Stapleton, were very happy about it.

Now we find out that a similar situation has arisen and we feel the same way as we did two years ago, that there is no additional need for a shopping center in this area. After all, you gentlemen realize that business people have to make money to be able to pay taxes. If they don't make any money -- they don't make any money -- they are not able to pay any taxes. Real estate will go down in value.

Now, the Stapleton area, in the last assessment, hasn't been as over-assessed because the area right now is a depression area. The shore, the piers are idle. We have very -- quite a few vacant stores in our area because there is not sufficient trade in Stapleton. In fact, we have a few bankruptcies.

Now, if you gentlemen consider that a certain amount of population is needed to support a shopping area, you will come to the realization that there is no further need for such a decision. If you gentlemen would give Stapleton consideration, you would help it by parking lots, by seeing to it that the piers are busy, and we believe that Stapleton can supply all the needs of the surrounding territory.

We have a situation in Port Richmond where a shopping center was opened, and the whole area is suffering now. So there is a certain amount of balance; what you take away from one you give to the other. The old people, the people who have paid taxes, have invested all of

their life savings in their property and want to make a living are being deprived by new establishments. Certainly, I don't think that it's the purpose of this Commission to create situations where the old people, the people who have worked all their lives to establish themselves, should suffer because somebody wants to open up a new shopping center.

I appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much, Mr. Zeckendorf.

Mr. Jacobi, Sidney Jacobi.

SIDNEY JACOBI, representing Richmond County Bar Association.

MR. JACOBI: Chairman Felt, Members of the Commission:

My name is Sidney Jacobi. I'm representing the Zoning Committee for the Richmond County Bar Association.

We have a committee that is still working on the report. We lawyers move very slowly, as you know, and we have come up with two conclusions so far that this Commission has really tried to do a tremendous, colossal job, but we feel, too, -- and secondly, that everybody is in agreement that we want a good zoning resolution -- but we still feel that sufficient time has not been had by civic groups, even though some come up here and say we like this resolution, it should be adopted, should be made effective immediately, and then off they go, "except" or "but" some other changes should be done with the area or with the individual parcel.

We feel that we still need some time, and whether or not this

is going to be the resolution that's going to govern us for many, many years to come, and whether it is the proper one, we'll tell you that five or ten years after its existence -- as to whether or not everybody is in here with all kinds of change.

But for the moment --

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Jacobi, pardon me for my interruption, but I think you and the others in this chamber realize that any zoning resolution that is put into effect does not remain constant perpetually. In other words, there are always changes in resolutions. People coming to us, civic organizations and individuals who have wanted changes in our existing Resolution have had an opportunity to be heard on their case.

We feel that after this resolution is passed, there may be changes here and there that are necessary and you realize that, too.

MR. JACOBI: Yes, I appreciate it, Mr. Commissioner, but the fact is that the general thinking of the people in the community is that if we're going to have a zoning resolution, let's try to clean up as many problems as we can on the go, rather than reducing the people eventually to requests for change of the City Planning Commission or the Board of Standards and Appeals, and I think that's what makes for a lot of this confusion.

CHAIRMAN FELT: And you are speaking, when you say the feeling of the people in the community, I think you mean the people of your Bar Association.

MR. JACOBI: Yes, I'm talking about our --

CHAIRMAN FELT: (Continuing) Because I hear the contrary expressed quite often by other groups.

MR. JACOBI: Yes, I'm aware of that, Mr. Commissioner.

We realize that something has to be done, and that time is of the essence. But our committee will submit its detailed report and recommendation within the next two weeks in writing instead of belaboring you with specifics at this point, Mr. Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

MR. JACOBI: Now, while I am here, may I specially plead for somebody, for the Food Farm Super Markets, an independent Super Market operation on Staten Island that has eight stores on Staten Island, and owned entirely by a Staten Islander, he's an independent, and he's beleaguered by all the national concerns of A & P and Aome and all the others that have stores throughout the United States. And we ask in their behalf that in connection with these so-called shopping centers that you have now spotted, we know that as time moves on and as the population comes, shopping centers are inevitable, but we now say to you, in the formulation of this resolution, where you take and spot a shopping center area in a piece of vacant land, that has still not been developed and where the people aren't, all that happens is that the national concerns or the owners rush for those spots so they have a shopping center; they create that shopping center in anticipation of the population growth that will follow, and all

that happens is that the independent storekeeper in the built-up business area is being destroyed.

We are in that same category. Our super markets are located in Staten Island, in the heart of populated areas along with all the other independent store owners. And we say to you that in spotting shopping centers, permitting them to be created there, where it is not geared to the population growth immediately around it, it's nice to hear all these pious statements that we're going to build garden apartments and apartment houses, we're going to have a hundred thousand more people in this area-- the trouble is the shopping centers get full of the national concerns who knock out the local independent store owner, but the residential areas come nowhere near it and do not come into the area.

So we ask that you pay specific and careful attention to the spotting of these shopping center areas, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Lagno. Is Mr. Lagno present?

PAUL A. LAGNO, representing Civic Congress of Staten Island, Inc., Annadale Community Civic Association.

MR. LAGNO: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am representing Mr. Irving Herrick--of the Staten Island Civic Congress of Staten Island -- my name is Paul A. Lagno,-- an organization comprised of representatives from some 20 civic groups

scattered throughout Staten Island.

We of the Congress wish to go on record as being in favor of the proposed new zoning plan for the city as a whole and particularly as to its obvious benefit to Staten Island. We will at this time request its immediate approval by the Board; in addition, we would strongly recommend that the present effective date of this resolution be considered and modified so that it can be made effective immediately upon approval by the Board.

We firmly believe that in order to protect the development of Staten Island and to realize the fullest benefit of these proposed changes and to avoid the possibility of a mass movement by developers to beat the effective deadline date, that this resolution must be made effective at once on approval of this Board.

Now, I also represent the Annadale Civic Association, and we in Annadale feel that our community is a community of homes, one and two family houses, and we'd like to keep it that way.

We know that a lot of these speculators and developers are planning on building a lot of homes which we feel may not be in the best interest of our community, so we ask the Commission to consider our zoning down there.

You have it now as R-2 and as near R-2 as possible.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

Is Peter Jaffe present?

PETER JAFFE, representing Benjamin Jaffe.

MR. JAFFE: Chairman Felt, Members of the Commission:

My name is Peter Jaffee. I'm speaking for Mr. Benjamin Jaffee, an attorney in New York City who represents the Gateway Apartment Company, the owners of a lot in Staten Island between Seaside Boulevard and Lily Pond Avenue.

I'm here to ask that the proposed zoning of that lot, R-3, be changed to a proposed zoning of R-6. My reason for those, for that change is two-fold.

The first reason is because of the uniqueness of the location of this plot. I say it is located uniquely because it is bounded, it is in the shape of a triangle, bordered by Fort Wadsworth, on the front side by Seaside Boulevard and the beach is in the rear.

Because of its location, it is relatively isolated from the rest of the area to be rezoned, and, accordingly, I ask that it be considered on a completely different basis because of its special location.

The second reason I ask for the proposed zoning of R-6 is because the owners of this property, when they bought it, invested a substantial amount of money with the intention of building two six-story apartment houses. At that time, the plot was zoned in E, which would have allowed such a proposed improvement.

The size and shape of this plot would make it uneconomical to improve the same with anything other than an improvement such as



has been contemplated. The owner, therefore, would be subject to unnecessary hardship and practical difficulties to utilize the plot in compliance with the projected rezoning of R-3. Further, in light of the expected completion of the Narrows Bridge and the proximity of the Bridge Plaza to the plot in question, the plot would support an improvement containing the number of the families contemplated by the owners.

I, therefore, respectfully request that after giving due consideration of the special circumstances involved in connection with this plot, you recommend the continuance of the present zoning with respect to the plot.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

I have just been given a message which I have been asked to read in behalf of Mrs. Alida F. Goodrich.

Is Mrs. Goodrich here? She may have gone -- I have been asked to make this statement in quotes:

"I personally want to go on record as endorsing the new Comprehensive Amendment to the Zoning Resolution."

It may be that the lady who sent this slip up to us left earlier this morning.

Thank you.

MMr. Quist. Is MMr. Quist present?

Are there any further slips that you have, sir? I just want

to read the remaining slips so that if we, by any chance, have missed those who wish to be heard, you will be able to give us your slip. They are as follows: -- Just one moment, please, Mr. Quist. And this is in the order that we intend to follow:

(The Chairman then read a list of names.)

CHAIRMAN FELT: Are there any others who wish to speak?

A VOICE: Mr. Felt, there's one thing I'd like to speak about at the end of the meeting, is the repudiation of the statement that was made by Mr. Solor in reference to Mr. Teitelbaum.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, I will speak to you about that when the proper time comes.

A VOICE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: When statements are made by one person against another, we usually suggest that they go out in the corridor and settle it amicably amongs themselves. This is hardly a place for hearing statements of one against another.

Mr. Quist, will you proceed?

CHRISTIAN C. QUIST, Victory Boulevard along Mann Avenue.

MR. QUIST: My name is Christian Quist. I'm the owner of a property on the corner of Victory Boulevard and Mann Avenue.

I have had occasion to petition the Commission for an amendment to the proposed Zoning Resolution, and I would like to refer to my last letter to the Commission in that respect. This is to Mr. James Felt, City Planning Commission, Subject: Lot 40, Block 462,

Section 21.

" Dear Sir:

I thank you for your letter of August the 17th. I was pleased that you have decided to propose my property for zoning C-2.

However, I find that the zoning applies only to 100 feet in depth from Victory Boulevard along Mann Avenue. Since my property extends 159 feet from Victory Boulevard along Mann Avenue, the proposed zoning would split my property into two zones which would materially depreciate this value.

Inasmuch as there is a newly built gasoline station abutting my property to the east, and for its entire depth, the portion now proposed for residential use, which is below grade so that a sewer cannot be installed and would be bordered on two sides by commercial property, it would be of little value unless included in the C-2 zoning. For this reason I respectfully request that you consider zoning my entire property C-2. This would bring the north boundary of the C-2 zone in straight line with the end of the gas station.

This modification of the proposed zone would be a great advantage to my property and I believe it would be consistent with good planning. I am attaching a sketch for further classification of my proposals. I hope you will consider this favorably. I advance my best thanks."

I have also found that on the south side of Victory Boulevard directly opposite, the commercial zone extends 150 feet in depth. I

want to thank the Commission for their attention and courtesy in this matter and --

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you very much. Is that the end of your statement?

MR. QUIST: This is the end.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you. Mrs. Erlbaum?

MIRIAM ERLBAUM; representing self re Stapleton

MRS. ERLBAUM: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission: This is in regard to Page 21 -- the new proposed shopping center.

My name is Mrs. Miriam Erlbaum. I am a small store owner in Stapleton; and I feel that another shopping center will greatly harm our business. This new planned business area in our R6 is too close to our business section and would greatly affect us.

My widowed mother and family live and have been in business in Stapleton for many years; and if any more super shopping centers arise nearby, we will be forced out of business and also lose our home.

Also, my children attend school near the proposed section and a new super shopping center will create more traffic hazards for the school children.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you. Mr. Winrock? (no response)

Mr. Gale?

MARLAND GALE, representing A. T. Pouch, President, Aiken Realty Co., Low Terrace Realty Corp.

MR. GALE: Here. Members of the Commission, my name is Marland Gale, G-a-l-e. I am here on behalf of Mr. A. T. Pouch who is the owner of two properties adjoining each other in map 21C.

I wish to express tribute to the Commission's staff for all the diligent and hard work that they have done and the time they have spent on all the problems including this problem. But I feel that this problem has not been solved and that it is an important and serious problem which should be considered, particularly in view of a change which has been made since the last time that we have spoken about this to the staff.

Now, I think it would be helpful if I could -- I have marked out here specifically on map 21C the property involved. May I hand it to you now so that you can look at it and see just what I'm talking about?

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Yes, that's all right. It would be the easiest way perhaps.

MR. GALE: I have marked it yellow on that map, the precise area involved. I thought it easier than to try to describe it to you.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: This is familiar territory.

MR. GALE: Well, all right, sir.

Now, there are two lots there, one of which is owned by the Aiken Realty Company which is a vacant lot on the north, at the corner. And the one immediately below that is owned by Low Terrace Realty Corporation, which is a large lot which has a house on it, but most of the area is not built on.

These two corporations are owned by my client, Mr. Pouch. Now, the change that was made since the last hearing and since our last discussions with the staff was to increase R-6 to bring it down to -- right up, across Vine Street to our property. That was formerly R-2, and also it draws a line as you are undoubtedly familiar with it, 100 feet from Belmont Avenue for R-6 use.

Now, I think this raises a really serious problem of the -- of confiscation, and I use that word because of the circumstances under which this property was, has been developed.

In the first place, the corner property has been vacant since 1928 because at that time an old private house couldn't be used as a private residence and it was torn down to cease becoming an eyesore. The remaining property has a house on it which was built in the early part of this century, as a private residence. It cannot continue to be used as a private residence and in about 1948 it was converted legally into a four-family, four apartment house. It's one of those old houses. It is -- when that property ceases to have any further utility, which won't be too long, we'll have two vacant plots of land on our hands. Now, it would be perfectly feasible to build --

I beg your pardon -- the zoning regulation would be feasible -- we would have no objection if it were possible to build R-2 housing on that property, but I respectfully submit that we have submitted evidence that it is not. There is, to our knowledge, there has been only one house in this whole area that has been built since World War II, and that house itself has been converted since into two apartments; one of my friends lives in one of those apartments.

You'll find two telephone numbers in the book. Another house was built earlier right across from this vacant -- from our property -- has also been converted into a two-family house. They're nice houses. But the reason nobody wants to build a house there is not only the high taxes which make it a formidable and uneconomical operation, but because of the encroachment in this area of all kinds of new buildings, apartment buildings, stores, garages, a city parking lot and a tremendous number of new commercial and industrial developments.

You will note that almost very close to this property which is now zoned by R-6, there is also C-4-2.

Now, the difference between R-2 and R-6 is quite a big jump and you cannot, I submit, by legislative fiat create a demand for R-2.

Now, I have given you one reason why people won't want to live there. Now, that is the encroachment of other uses.

But on top of that, the area consists in large part, the

remaining houses which have not been torn down and I might say there have been a number of properties torn down in the immediate vicinity, right across the street from our property one was torn down two or three years ago -- why? Because it was uneconomic to keep it alive as a single family residence and it was an eyesore. It was going to get to be, and that's been zoned R-6.

Now, the fact is -- and I have gone, there has been a dispute of facts about this, my client who lives in this neighborhood was raised in it and has interests in Staten Island, has carefully gone through and prepared a map. Now, this was submitted to the staff; we have a copy here. I can just show it to you here, but the parts marked in red here are either actual apartment houses or multiple apartment -- multiple housing, converted private houses.

The parts marked in blue are largely boarding houses, two-family houses, non-conforming uses under R-2, even in the very area where the people who have asked that our properties be designated as R-2, even in their area, there are non-conforming uses.

It's the familiar story which is going on in this part of Staten Island, closest to the ferry which goes on, has gone on in every city in the country of the old, beautiful street, with the old beautiful houses that couldn't be kept up. They begin to be broken up into multiple houses, they begin to be used as boarding houses, they go down. That's the reason the people want to be a little farther out to have their detached family houses. That's why we can't sell this for this kind



of housing.

Now, I understand, one reason why I submit that this is wrong is that all of the evidence shows, and we've submitted a lot of it, that as far as we're concerned, you are requiring us by fiat to devote this vacant land which will be a non-conforming use to something that can't be used there.

Now, I think we ought to consider two other factors, the first is that this is an area which is useful and which would normally be, I should think, normally be used for apartment use. It's close to the ferries, it's close to the buses, it's close to every means of transportation on Staten Island. It's only a few minutes walk downhill and it's a not much further walk uphill to this property. It's the kind of place that I think you would first put apartment houses just as an optimum use, residential use, just as the nature of Park Avenue has changed and the optimum use no longer -- of Park Avenue, as has been pointed out many times -- no longer is apartment use, but office use.

Now, here is the place you're going to put apartments; people will come to Staten Island -- I don't know from just where, but they will come probably many of them without cars, and they can walk a short distance.

Now, the very last point I want to make is, you're considering the equities between different people; on the one hand is our claim that you are, by fiat, destroying the value of our property

because nobody will buy or build there as a detached house. But let us look at the equity of the people who are objecting and at whose insistence this line was drawn this way, and I submitted all this. I went over this property very carefully. I looked in the telephone directories that showed the number of houses, I walked it, I drove around it by car, and I prepared a map.

Now, actually, there are only a few houses that would be affected by granting our original request that this lot be devoted to R-6. That is the block south of Vine and not just 100 feet of it, which I will come to in a minute -- almost all of the people who signed the petition or who were said to have signed it and for whom the committee spoke, Mr. Jahnke spoke, are down under a hill. In fact, a high hill. You can't see over it.

Our property is on the far side of the hill, partway down. There are, indeed, I must admit, some very beautiful houses, but they are all surrounded and blocked off in the view of our property.

I have submitted this map to the staff, and only about three or four houses in the whole area would be affected, and two of those right across the street are not single one-family detached houses; they are two-family houses, been converted that way; they're non-conforming.

Now, I think the equities of the situation, considering the number of people who are not affected and who are non-conforming to R-2, now, on the one hand, now our situation on the other, justified

keeping the whole area and not just a hundred feet of it for R-6. This was D zoning, it was E zoning, it's been R-6 until just recently. Then it was R-6, R-2 and now R-2 and R-6.

Now, a hundred feet is not a sufficient amount of property to build an apartment on. If you will look on the other side of that line that you have drawn, down through my client's property, you will see that the distance which is R-2 varies from about 130 feet to 221 feet. Now, remember that an R-2 zone has a 95 foot depth; you're requiring my client to dedicate 221 feet to what is normally a 95 foot depth. And I submit, in all fairness, that the Commission ought to give very serious consideration to that particular problem which is not unique to this, that property marked in yellow, and that the property, the line of R-6 should run down Low Terrace.

And I want to add one further thing, that we feel so strongly about this, we really feel we must protest this to protect our rights to the Board of Estimate.

Now, thank you very much. I also am sorry to have spent so much time and I want to -- I'm grateful to the staff; they couldn't have been more helpful. The last time I was before the Commission, I spoke very briefly, thinking that the staff and I had an understanding of this nature, and we find out we didn't, and that's why I take your time today and I thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Wells.

EARL EDWARD WELLS, representing Stapleton Board of Trade.

MR. WELLS: My name is Earl Edward Wells. Mr. Chairman and City Planning Commission:

I am speaking in opposition to the proposed retail shopping area known on Staten Island as Fox Hills and I believe it's on the records as 21D.

Now, I'd like permission, sir, if I may, to speak about myself, not to brag, but just to bring a point across. May I, please?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Oh, certainly.

MR. WELLS: I live at 243 Robinson Avenue, Staten Island. I'm married; I have six children.

I've lived in Staten Island 41½ years. I was born in Halifax, Nova Scotia, and came here when I was six months old.

I enlisted in the United States Navy December 8th, 1941, discharged honorably in 1945 on September 20th. I rose from an enlisted man to a flight officer in the United States Navy.

Now, I'm a member and active layman of the Great Kills church; I am a member of the Sports and Youth Advisory Committee of the Staten Island Protestant Council; Honorary President of the Stapleton A.C., dedicated to the youth of the Stapleton area; Vice President of the Stapleton Board of Trade, in business since November 5th, 1945; active member of the Stapleton Youth Council of the New York City Youth Board; operated football leagues on Staten Island for six years. I have been the original sponsor of Little

Leagues on Staten Island and the first sponsor of Babe Ruth League on Staten Island; active in numerous youth programs all over our Borough; former member of the South Shore Reviewing Board of the Boy Scouts of America; former active member of the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce; active in all school and church programs in my community.

Now, I'm not bringing that up to talk about Earl Edward Wells. Now, I'm an average or below average of the men and women in the community of the Stapleton business area. Now, our president, Mr. Gus Teitelbaum, believe me, is much more active than I am, and a much more dedicated man to our community. I brought this up to show you the type of people that are being affected by this proposed shopping area, the type of Americans that you are dealing with.

We are not out for personal gain, we're only trying to make a living.

Now, here is an organization, what the name of it is I do not know, which is attempting to put a shopping area in Stapleton which is absolutely not necessary. It is no more needed than anything you could realize.

Now, how did this area come into being; this is known as Fox Hills. Years ago, gentlemen, this was a golf course and a beautiful home, too, that people came from other boroughs and areas to play on. During the war, the State of New York and the Government of the United States used this area to put up houses and barracks

and buildings for troops and servicemen who were necessary to man the ships and load the ships going abroad to win the war.

Now, when this area was no longer necessary, here were these barracks and everything else standing there, and here were millions and thousands of Staten Islanders of course veterans, coming home who needed some place to live, and they had married during the war or before the war and they had children.

Now, these barracks were converted to veterans' uses and you had to be a veteran or have a family of necessity to get there. Now, after a couple of years the veterans, the buildings became a little rundown and due to some city regulations which I am not aware of, these buildings were condemned and these veterans were asked to leave this area.

Now, some of these veterans and a lot of them were friends of mine, were evicted, and they really suffered the consequences -- here's veterans who attempted to sacrifice their lives for their country and they were thrown, some of them, personal friends, evicted right out in the street with no place to go.

Now, this is how this Fox Hills area came into existence and how the people who are attempting to put this shopping area in got this property in the first place. They got this property -- now, I know this is on the record because it was at the last hearing of April, 1959, and it was stated here by the gentleman who represented them, that he got that property with the idea that he would

build housing and allow facilities for veterans who were being evicted.

Now, I've been in business there for a few years, fifteen years to be exact, and I have yet to see a house. I think there's three foundations in that area. You see what I mean, what I'm trying to bring out, is how this area came into existence. That should be houses already; it shouldn't even be brought up as a shopping area.

Now, the shopping area of Stapleton itself has had very many hard knocks but we as businessmen are in there fighting for our lives. What we have done? We have actively tried to forestall these evictions of these veterans with petitions and other programs and we lost all of these petitions and we lost all of these potential customers.

Three. We have actively tried to get our local city, state and national officials to promote pier activities for our community when the United States Government pulled out of Staten Island piers, and centralized their activities in Brooklyn.

Four. We have actively had meetings with organizations that could use these facilities. This we have been let down on in every instance. An entire area in our community was torn down for a housing project about three or four years ago and we are now in our third year of waiting--just when these buildings will be put up.

When all these customers -- where all these customers once lived, now there were people living in this area, this is an additional

Stapleton housing area, nothing to do with Fox Hills -- there were people living there and these people were forced to move and their homes taken away and they moved away and we also lost that potential customer.

Now, we have actively requested, petitioned and fostered additional parking in our area for ten to twelve years and only now do we have a definite program of such a thing. So we haven't been laying there stagnant; we've been in there battling all the way. Now, we are against this proposed shopping area because, as you can see, our area has more than adequate facilities to take care of this location and any future growth. We are all in there battling for our business lives. We are all interested in our Island, in every way, and dedicated to our communities, our churches and our local organizations.

We help and promote all worthwhile programs for our youth, regardless of color, race, religion or national origin. Our members are active in their schools, their churches, and in their synagogues. We do not want to have happen to us what has happened to downtown shopping areas in Nassau, in Suffolk, out in Jersey, with business failures caused by such a shopping area being developed where existing areas already exist.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we need your help, after all these continued hard knocks, because we are in a battle against money and private interests which you know, who have no regard for the little man's



investments, his interest and well-being. We have a right and a genuine American right to the pursuit of happiness. We beg of you to consider our cause and our plight. It is a serious one and a genuine American problem. Excuse me.

CHAIRMAN FELT: It is all right.

MR. WELLS: I used to fight in the Navy, but it took a lot less nerve, believe me.

If you let us down, you're turning your back -- excuse me -- on dedicated Americans who believe in our way of government, who have sacrificed their families and their fortunes to make our way of life successful. You're not only letting us down, you're letting down America.

Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Irving Banner.

IRVING BANNER, property owner.

MR. BANNER: My name is Irving Banner. I am the owner of 76 Canal Street in the Stapleton area.

I wish to add my protest, Chairman and Members -- I wish to add my protest to the proposed shopping area in the Fox Hills Section. It is definitely not needed.

As far as space is concerned, we have plenty of empty stores in the town itself. Why do we need another one there?

As far as super markets are concerned, we have five or six

bix stores there that can take care of all the people there, and I feel that it's definitely not needed.

Again, I wish to ask the Chairman to consider the small men in our town.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Mr. Pacifico.

FRANK J. PACIFICO: Re: Hylan Boulevard and Old Town Road.

MR. PACIFICO: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission:

My name is Frank J. Pacifico, and I'm representing myself.

I have here a letter of August 17th from the Commission in which the letter states that my particular parcel located on the northwest corner of Hylan Boulevard and Old Town Road is to be rezoned to an R-3. This in itself is a mistake.

If the gentlemen would please check the maps on page 27, they'll find that this particular area or my parcel was not included on that page, but it is on another page and I have here before me a combination of both pages joined together and it shows that my particular parcel is zoned R-5. That I feel is also a mistake.

This particular parcel I purchased six years ago, and with the thought in mind that sometime in the future --

COMMISSIONER ORION: Excuse me. Do you want to hand that up so we can just see what you're referring to.

MR. PACIFICO: The map, sir?

COMMISSIONER ORTON: If you want to hand it up, we can just see

what you are talking about. We don't need the letter.

MR. PACIFICO: As I was about to state, this particular parcel I purchased six years ago with the purpose in mind to develop it commercially when the time presented itself.

I have paid taxes on this parcel for those six years and received exuberant increases. And I paid them wilfully because I felt it was a good commercial piece of property and I felt that it rightfully was to be taxed as so.

Now, I find my future plans about to be disrupted or I am going to be compelled to make a hasty decision which I don't feel I would like to do at this moment because this parcel is not a small lot; it comprises one acre with 246 feet on Hylan Boulevard and I feel as though it should be developed commercially because adjoining properties are now commercially developed, are in the process of being commercially developed, so that I am going to be completely surrounded by commercials.

I've been told by Mr. Sapenkopf and Mr. Smith that the property or that area warrants another investigation by the Commission, and I feel that when the Commission does so on a field investigation, I feel when the Commission sees what is being done in the area, they will rightfully zone the property back to its original status as a commercial piece of property.

As you approach along Hylan Boulevard from the Grassmere area, it is zoned commercially with the new proposal. It stops

abruptly at Old Town Road and continues as residential R-5 along Hylan Boulevard to Burgher Avenue where it again becomes commercial property. Then proceeds for five or six blocks and again it is zoned residential. And that seems to be the pattern as it goes along Hylan Boulevard.

Now, I -- at this moment I would like to interject a thought about Hylan Boulevard that I have in the future of Hylan Boulevard:

Being a resident of Staten Island all my life, and being very familiar with what takes place in the immediate surrounding areas of New Jersey, I feel that the future of Hylan Boulevard, since it has not been designated as a parkway, will, noneother, turn out to be a truck route. And as a truck route, I can't see how any man in his right mind would invest in residential real estate.

My thoughts as to why I think Hylan Boulevard will be a truck route is because in geometry the shortest distance between two points still is a straight line, and if a truckman is looking to make time coming down from the New England States, taking the new proposed Narrows Bridge, he is not going to travel the width of Staten Island to the Goethals Bridge, or he's not going to travel the width of Staten Island to the West Side Highway which is a proposed route on Staten Island which I believe is to be a truck route, and then travel the length of Staten Island to get to the Outer Bridge where, when he crosses the Outer Bridge he will find the junction of all the highways that go north, south, east and west, that is in Fords, New Jersey.

In Fords, New Jersey, the Jersey Turnpike, Garden State now meet. The proposed new highway which is right under construction at this moment coming from Summerville, New Jersey, to the Outer Bridge connecting route 22, going west along that route, will junction at Fords, New Jersey.

So any truckmen coming down from the New England States, wanting to make time going southwest or in any direction that he so desires, he will not travel the length of Staten Island and the width of Staten Island to get to the Outer Bridge. He'll choose the shortest route which is going to be Hylan Boulevard. And that is my contention as to why I think Hylan Boulevard will be a strictly commercial traveled road, similar to your Route 1 in New Jersey.

And I'd like to see anyone in this room that would be willing to invest in residential property on Route 1 in New Jersey. And, therefore, gentlemen, I feel that if this Committee would give a sincere and honest inspection of this particular location, I feel sure that I will retain my zoning in that area, and that is a thought I'd like to interject at this moment.

Thank you very much for offering me a time to speak.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

Mr. Ferretti, Mr. Eugene Ferretti.

EUGENE FERRETTI, representing Staaten Restaurant, Inc.,

Forest Avenue, etc.

MR. FERRETTI: My name is Eugene Ferretti, and I'm here on

behalf of two separate clients.

The first client is the Staaten Restaurant, situated at 697 Forest Avenue, and occupying block 168, lot 60 and 64 on the tax map. Their property appears on plate 21A of the Zoning Resolution.

The Zoning Resolution and, gentlemen, before I continue, I have some pictures here indicating the traffic situation which I would like to circulate among the members of the Commission while I'm speaking.

This property has 160 foot frontage on Staten Island, and has an average depth of 150 feet with one leg extending to Myrtle Avenue in the rear.

Now, at the present time, this property falls within a retail D area to the extent of 150 feet in depth. The proposed Zoning Resolution indicates a cut to 100 feet in depth.

If this goes through as indicated, this is going to deprive my client of valuable parking area. He is presently using this property for parking, and he would then fall into a non-conforming use.

In addition to that, he is anticipating an expansion of his kitchen facilities. In order to expand them, he is going to have to put an addition to the rear of the building. Any addition to the rear of the building will fall wholly outside of the proposed 100 foot C-1-1 area.

This area of Staten Island is a developing commercial,

retail area and parking is quite a problem. The zoning map of December, 1959, issued by this Commission, treated the area bounded by Forest Avenue, Bement Avenue, Myrtle Avenue and North Burgher Avenue as entirely C-1-1. Evidently, the Commission had a change in mind, and on the most recent map, concerned with this resolution, they have eliminated that entire block from the prior map and only gave us a 100-foot depth on Forest Avenue.

Now, in an easterly direction running along Forest Avenue, the Commission has zoned a 200 foot depth for approximately seven blocks and yet, when it reached this point, they decreased it to 100 feet in spite of the necessity of the parking facilities in this area.

When they got to the other side, to the other block, running in a westerly direction, they indicated a 150 foot C-1-1 area. And it appeared that for some reason this particular block was penalized, and my client as a result is suffering for it.

Now, this does not seem to be consistent zoning. And we respectfully request that this Commission give their attention to this matter once more, and reinstate their map of December, 1959.

Now, may I also say in connection with this property that my client has an investment there of over \$200,000. In anticipation of creating additional parking facilities, he has acquired an interest on a piece of land situate 120 feet south of Forest Avenue on Bement. Again, the proposed Zoning Resolution would eliminate this parcel from

the availability of making additional parking facilities.

He is the only merchant in the area who has presently provided parking facilities for his patrons, and he is seeking to expand those facilities. Intentions of this kind can only benefit all of the community and most certainly the other merchants who are his neighbors.

Now, I have one additional piece and on that matter, I represent a Mr. Guttman who owns a piece of property on Victory Boulevard known as block 240, lot 6. And this is indicated on plate 21B. The present proposed zoning for his parcel of property is R-3-2. This property has a frontage of 393 feet on Victory Boulevard with an approximate depth of 270 feet.

Presently, it is an E zone area and available for apartment house construction.

Immediately adjoining this property to the south is a gas-line station.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: What cross street is this, can you tell me?

MR. FERRETTI: This is situate about a block, two blocks up from Cheshire Place, going towards St. George.

Now, opposite him there are two cemeteries extending several blocks in either direction. There are four bus routes running along Victory Boulevard and Victory Boulevard is designated a New York route



Now, there has been no substantial change in this area over the years and it seems to me that this site is a natural apartment house area. It's backed up by Silver Lake Golf Course; there's a gas station next door, and there are no private homes immediately adjoining it except one rather old house, and the rest of it is park area.

It has 110,000 square feet and having such an area, it could provide adequate off-street parking and most certainly, having such an area, the development of this into one-family units would be a very expensive proposition.

Therefore, it is requested that the Commissioner -- the Commission -- reconsider this matter with the view and end of establishing an R-6 area there.

Thank you.

I would also like permission to submit a memorandum on both of these matters.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Please let us have that in ten days, Mr. Ferretti. Mr. Grae?

JOEL B. GRAE, re: Ocean Terrace, Sheridan - Clove Lakes Expressway.

MR. GRAE: Mr. Acting Chairman, Members of the Board:

My name is Joel B. Grae. I'm one of the owners of a parcel of land located at the foot of Ocean Terrace which has been rezoned to R-1-1. The property is located in Block 837 -- lot 280 and lot 275. It's located on the north side of Mildred Avenue and the south

side of Staten Island Boulevard, east of Ocean Terrace.

The Emerson Estates, a group of houses that were built by a speculative builder and on approximately 70 x 100 is several hundred feet to the north of us. And our property overlooks this property and these houses.

These houses went for approximately \$29,000 to about, I believe, \$35,000.

Now, approximately two years ago Milden Avenue and Staten Island Boulevard, which are parallel to each other, were cut, and several of the lots were sold to people who were going to build on 100 feet.

However, another one was sold on a 60 foot-plot. Again, this is at the bottom of Ocean Terrace.

Now, all of these people were ~~deed~~ restricted to a home that had to cost them \$25,000, exclusive of the land. Staten Island Boulevard is a large, triangular piece; frankly, we haven't got 200 feet on Staten Island Boulevard. We have approximately 189 and that would force us to sell one plot of -20,000 square feet. It's also a sloping lot; it has approximately a 15 degree pitch.

Now, the people, we intend to sell the rest of the lots with the same proviso of the \$25,000 house. Now, the people that we sell to are not as fancy as the people up in the country club. We have telephone wires above the ground and we haven't got all sorts of deed restrictions.

The people would rather put their money into the house than into the land, and the old 60 feet, if you would reinstate that for us, is ample. If you wish to send an inspector over to see the houses that have gone up on Mildred Avenue, you would see for yourself that these homes on the property far exceed \$25,000, and the house itself is restricted to \$25,000. It would be an intolerable hardship for us to sell off these lots as 100 footers. Again, the people want to put the money into the house.

There's one more piece of land I'd like to protest. It's block 779. It's approximately 92,000 square feet between Sheridan, Warwick, Westwood and Clove Lakes Expressway.

This property is off Victory Boulevard, between Westerleigh and Bullshead.

This property is not now built up. However, it is near and adjacent to the Clove Lakes Expressway. This is not an area where people have existing expensive homes and are afraid of being crowded out by an apartment house. Rather, this is a future site, a future development area for Staten Island as is the Clove Lakes Expressway, a future area of Staten Island, and it would seem to me ideally suited for the apartment houses as we will not inflict harm on anyone.

It is for that reason that I respectfully ask you to change this to R-6. It's accessible to shopping areas and the ferry and Victory Boulevard. It would be ten minutes from the Bridge and approximately fifteen minutes from the ferry.

I thank you for your time, gentlemen, in letting me speak.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you.

Now, we come to the last of the cards, Mr. Felton.

As has been said here before, there always has to be a last.

MURRAY B. FELTON, representing Messrs. Hoffman & Klein.

MR. FELTON: I represent Messrs. Hoffman and Klein who own -- and others, incidentally, who own the east side of Victory Boulevard between Eddy Street and Theresa Place, approximately 1,000 feet.

Gentlemen, one of the reasons why I probably am the last person to appear today is the fact that three hours ago I had no intention or no reason to believe that I would even be here. Our clients came into our office this morning with a newspaper clipping which had been given to them yesterday.

An analysis of the newspaper article indicated the property in question being rezoned different from the proposed rezoning as originally recommended by the Board in its original comprehensive plan. It was only several hours ago that our attention was directed to the fact that this area, which under the present day zone is classified as an E area, and which under your first recommendation was to be classified as an R-6, is now to be classified as an R-1.

I have not heard the arguments by the opposition or those who are in favor of this reclassification and, as a matter of fact, neither has our clients, because the staff in reconsidering this apparently has had audiences with people who, and others, who are

interested in reclassifying it, but we have had no knowledge, no discussion, no indication of what the reasoning is for this reclassification.

By way of background, I should like the Commission to know that my clients own the apartment house development immediately adjoining the premises in question on Victory Boulevard. That is to say, approximately 550 feet of area frontage on Victory Boulevard consisting of three apartment houses.

It is bounded on one side by Eddy Street and the other side by Notre Dame College.

My clients have -- my clients built those apartment houses in 1939, in 1940, and have continuously since that time owned, maintained and operated those three apartment houses. They are experienced operators of apartment houses, they are investor-operators. They own the London Terrace Inn on 23rd Street in New York City and are well qualified to operate well-maintained apartment houses. As a matter of fact, I think -- I personally am familiar with the three apartment houses. I think that an examination would indicate that they are well maintained, beautifully landscaped, occupied by prominent people in many instances, and fully rented.

As a matter of fact, there is a three-year waiting list in those apartment houses, and only recently one of the ex-Borough Presidents of Richmond, Mr. Palmer, became a resident of this apartment house and had been on the waiting list for three years.

Gentlemen, I indicate that by way of passing to emphasize that this area which is now owned by my clients and now operated and used for apartment houses represents the finer, the well-built, the well-maintained apartment house. The area in question of approximately 1,000 feet has been owned by the same people who own these apartment houses for approximately ten years, waiting for the time when this area would be built and developed propitiously.

Before presenting the present status of my clients' plans, I should like to indicate that it is our opinion that the area in question is primarily good only for apartment houses and for no other purpose. By rezoning it R-1, and by restricting it to one-family dwellings, would practically make that property useless.

For one thing, the property has an exceptionally steep grade. For a depth of a hundred feet, there is a 35-foot drop. In other words, this property which runs along Victory Boulevard for 1,000<sup>feet</sup>/at a depth of 100 feet has a 35-foot drop which makes one-family houses practically impossible or impractical.

To develop the area in question for an apartment house development would not be to the prejudice of any residential tenants because indeed there aren't any who would be immediately affected. The only residential building in this entire 1,000 foot area is a one-family house located at the extreme end of the property, that is to say, on Theresa Place, being a house approximately fifty years old, but more important and more significantly, would be a house

approximately 500 feet away from the proposed improvement that my client attempts to put on the property.

The other houses which are anywhere near the area in question are in the rear, separated by a right-of-way, a row of houses which are approximately 40 years old, but there again, significantly, they do not front or face our area. It is the rear of their property; it is their garage which would face our area when it is improved.

Our clients, in reliance upon the existing zone and in reliance upon the recommendation that was made originally by this Board in the comprehensive plan, have made extensive plans to develop this area with a single 13-story apartment house FHA insured. It would involve a 20 per cent coverage, so that on this entire 1000 foot strip of land there would be just one building.

In reliance upon our zoning, my clients have made extensive plans, have, in fact, completed architectural and structural plans. They have, by way of example, filed with the FHA, have received FHA site approval, have deposited a \$5500 filing fee with the FHA, have actually paid \$5,000 to a broker, have actually demolished three small buildings on the premises at a cost of \$15,000 to them, have paid \$3,000 to tenants for relocation in those buildings, have, all in all, incurred expenses well over \$100,000, including expenses for such items as complete plans and specifications, boring tests and the other items which I have indicated.

The FHA has appraised this property, the vacant land, for \$250,000. To put it to any use other than an apartment house erection would be confiscation from our clients' standpoint, but more significantly and what I think your Commission is primarily interested in, is whether or not this is a proper improvement. I respectfully submit that for the reasons that I have advanced today, that you regard our proposed improvement of a single apartment house building with a 20 percent coverage by the people who have owned this property for approximately ten years and owned the adjoining property, and have thereby indicated the manner in which they operate apartment houses, and that for all of the other reasons that I have advanced, that you respectfully review the proposed amendment and reinstate the original R6 designation originally proposed. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Thank you. Are there any others who wish to be heard on the mapping in Richmond?

(no response)

CHAIRMAN FELT: Are there any others who wish to be heard on the Resolution as a whole, that is - the text - or on the mapping of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn or Queens?

(no response)

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Mr. Chairman, may I say that during the course of this meeting a telephone call was received from the President of the Municipal Art Society, Mr. Geoffrey Platt, who said that it was impossible for them to be represented in person, but they did request that the Municipal Art Society be recorded in favor of the entire proposed zoning resolution.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well. We will record that, and I wish, Commissioner Orton, that you would have Mr. Platt confirm that in writing so that we will have it available in our files. We also have a number of communications which we have received with



Chairman Felt / Sherman  
(statement of)

R 118 Misc.

these communications be made part of the record. First, a letter from Irving Sherman:

" FEDERATION OF SECTION 213 COOPERATIVES  
DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF ALL HOUSING COOPERATIVES  
500 Fifth Avenue Room 1436 N.Y.36, N.Y.

September 9, 1960

Hon. James Felt  
Chairman  
City Planning Commission  
City Hall  
New York City

Dear Mr. Felt:

The Federation of Section 213 Cooperatives, which is the sole spokesman for all Section 213 Cooperatives in New York City, representing some 30,000 owners of apartments on a cooperative basis, strongly endorse the proposed Zoning Resolution which was explained to us at a recent meeting.

The feeling is general among the Section 213 cooperator-apartment owners that this Zoning Resolution, if enacted, would tend to result in better neighborhoods and hence, in greater rental value for cooperative properties. It would also fulfill the aspiration of cooperators to live in suitable and happy environments at costs within the range of lower and middle income ranges.

Very truly yours,

(signed)

Irving Sherman  
Chairman "

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) Then I have a telegram from Leonard L. Mancusi:

Mancusi / Klein - Mulligan (statements) R 119 Misc.

" WESTERN UNION  
TELEGRAM  
VU141 NASSAU STREET

NB 525 NB310

RX PD NEW YORK NY 13 212P EDT

JAMES FELT, DLR IMMY

CHAIRMAN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING ROOM CITY HALL  
NYK

FRANCIS MANOR CIVIC ASSOCIATION OF WHITESTONE URGES IMMEDIATE  
ADOPTION OF THE NEW ZONING CODE. WE SUPPORT THE COMMISSION  
IN ITS ENDEAVOR TO PROTECT THE HOME OWNERS OF QUEENS AND IN  
ITS BATTLE AGAINST THE FOES OF PROGRESSIVE CITY PLANNING.  
REGRET INABILITY TO APPEAR IN PERSON

LEONARD L MANCUSI

PRESIDENT"

-----  
CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a telegram from  
Rabbi Edward E. Klein and Reverend John M. Mulligan, Co-Chairmen,  
League of West Side Organizations, Dated September 13, 1960:

"HONORABLE JAMES FELT, CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, 2 LAFAYETTE ST., NYK  
REGRET INABILITY TO TESTIFY IN PERSON IN BEHALF OF REVISED ZONING  
PROPOSAL. GOOD ZONING AND SOUND PLANNING ARE "MUSTS" IF OUR CITY IS  
TO BE LIVABLE. WE HEARTILY COMMEND THE REVISED ZONING PROPOSAL AS  
THE MEANS OF BUILDING A BETTER NEW YORK.

RABBI EDWARD E. KLEIN, REVEREND JOHN M. MULLIGAN, CO-CHAIRMEN,  
LEAGUE OF WEST SIDE ORGANIZATIONS.

CHAIRMAN FELT (continuing): I have a telegram from Mary  
Jane Edgar and Miriam F. Moody of Flushing, New York:

Edgar-Moody / Roth (statements of)

R 120 Misc.

" WESTERN UNION  
TELEGRAM  
VU141 NASSAU STREET

NA585 SYB912  
SY FGA 187 PD FLUSHING NY 13 251P EDT

SEPT. 13, 1960

JAMES FELT

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION ZONING HEARINGS BOARD OF ESTIMATES  
RM CITY HALL NYK

UNABLE TO REMAIN AT HEARINGS TODAY WISH TO GO ON RECORD AS  
SUPPORTING ZONING RESOLUTION BUT OPPOSE REVISION DOWN GRADING  
ELDER TO GERANIUM KISSENA TO COLDEN REQUEST YOU REOPEN AND  
UPGRADE TO R3-2 URGE THAT GRANTING OF VARIANCES REMAIN OUTSIDE

JURISDICTION OF BUREAU OF STANDARDS AND APPEALS

MARY JANE EDGAR 137-35 GERANIUM AVE MIRIAM F MOODY L#&-22  
GERANIUM AVE. FLUSHING NY. "

- - - - -

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) Then I have a rather lengthy  
communication from Emery Roth & Sons, Architects, dated September 12th,  
of which I will just read the last paragraphs.

(Chairman Felt then read the last two paragraphs of the  
following communication:)

EMERY ROTH & SONS, ARCHITECTS  
400 Park Avenue  
New York 22, N.Y.

BY: RICHARD ROTH

September 12, 1960

Hon. James Felt, City Planning Commission

Dear Mr. Felt:

"Obviously, a comprehensive amendment to the 1916 Ordinance is of  
great significance to all architects, and certainly to our office  
which designs well over \$100 million in residential and commercial

"construction yearly, in metropolitan New York City. We have made an intensive study of the proposed Zoning Resolution, bearing in mind the interests of our clients, as well as the welfare of New Yorkers and the economy of the City.

"Firstly, we wish to state that we certainly support in principle the Resolution. Secondly, we wish to congratulate you and your staff for the intelligent and sincere effort you have made to create a proper Zoning Resolution for the metropolitan New York area, and to find a formula to meet not only existing conditions but also to control conditions for the foreseeable future. It is, therefore, obvious, that we as an architectural firm, want to inform you and the legislators that we are in full accord with the theory of the proposed legislation. In our opinion, it will serve as a sound basis for future planning, and its intention to permit greater freedom in architectural design is most praiseworthy.

"We realize that it is most difficult, if not in fact impossible to affect a comprehensive amendment to the Zoning Resolution that at its inception will offer perfection. Basically, you have drawn up a set of rules that will protect the citizens of New York and insure the continued welfare of the City itself. However, we believe a number of changes are warranted; it was our hope that the entire law would be as simple to interpret as that portion controlling the commercial and manufacturing areas. We find that the rules governing the residential areas are complicated and need both clarification and amplification; as presently written the mathematical calculations necessary to arrive at a solution satisfactory to ourselves and our clients, are burdensome. We would, therefore, like to suggest that our office, and I am sure many other architectural firms who will be working closely with the new law, be allowed full contact with the

Planning Commission so that some of the complexities can be eliminated.

"It is our hope that there will be a grace period, during which new construction will be allowed to be filed under the present Zoning Resolution or take advantage of the provisions of the new Resolution. We feel that this period will be most helpful, since mere reading of the law, cannot iron out the difficulties, as much as trying to work with it. If we as architects are permitted for a period of time to work with the new Zoning Resolution, but not be bound by it, we feel we could make the residential portion of the law as simple and as commendable as the balance of it. We also find that the definitions are unnecessarily complicated and wordy and that the mapping was not done in a comprehensive manner nor with the full outlook of a City plan. We further believe that the grace period is necessary for the continued economic well-being of the City. All of these we feel will be, and can be satisfactorily resolved, if we will have, as we always have had in the past, the cooperation of, and close contact with, you and your staff.

"If we have seemed critical of an undertaking for which there is such a great need, you must realize that architects, above everyone else, need a clear-cut law; for the resolution will be part of our working conditions and an instrument that will be used by us daily.

"Despite the fact that we feel that there are still modifications and amendments required to make the proposed resolution a perfectly workable implement of legislation, that we all want it to be, our faith in the willingness of you and your staff to work to this end, is so great that we wish to go on record as approving the new resolution.

"We also wish it written into the record that you and your staff are to be commended and congratulated upon undertaking so gargantuan a task, and to have come up with, in what is comparatively a short time for a city as intense as New York, a solution that we are sure will prove to be a noteworthy achievement.

"Again, may we take this opportunity of assuring you of your support.

Respectfully yours,

EMERY ROTH & SONS

By: Richard Roth"

Gurney (statement of)

R 123 Misc.

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a letter from G. Harmon Gurney;  
NEW YORK LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

HOUSING DEPARTMENT  
TELEPHONE: MURRAY HILL 5-5000

BY: G. HARMON GURNEY

September 12, 1960

The Honorable James Felt  
Chairman, City Planning Commission  
Court Square Building  
New York 7, New York

Dear Mr. Felt:

While I personally appeared before the City Planning Commission this morning and filed a statement on the proposed Zoning Resolution as published August 18, 1960, I thought it important enough to submit the enclosed letter which has been signed by some 31 prominent New York architects so that it can be made part of the official record of the hearings as stated above.

You will note that these signatures represent architects who have been very prominent in the development of New York City as a whole and will continue to be in the future. That is why I felt that this ought to be part of the official record.

Sincerely yours,

(signed)

G. Harmon Gurney  
Chief Architect for Housing

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) And attached is a letter addressed to Mr. Charles Merz, Editor of the New York Times, dated September 6th, which is a vigorous supporting statement of the Zoning Resolution, signed by the 31 prominent architects referred to in Mr. Gurney's letter.

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) These architects include:

Geoffrey Platt, Frederick J. Woodbridge, A. Gordon Lorimer, Max O. Urbahn, Richard Stein, Michael M. Harris, Peter S. Van Bloon, Robert W. Cutler, Lathrop Douglass, G. Harmon Gurney, Simon Breines, Arthur C. Holden, Robert H. Jacobs, M. Milton Glass, Morris Ketchum, Jr., John J. Carlos, L. Bancel LaFarge, George C. Rudolph, Antonin Raymond, C. Dale Badgeley, Alonzo Clark, Paul L. Wood, Robert B. O'Connor, Chester B. Price, Gillet Lefferts, Jr., Robert S. Hutchins, John C.B. Moore, Dorothy C. Scott, William Potter, Walter H. Kilham, Jr., Harmon H. Goldstone.

(The above architects' signatures appear at the end of the following letter, which is a copy, addressed to Mr. Charles Merz)

"NEW YORK CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS  
115 East 40th Street, New York 16, N.Y.

September 6, 1960

Mr. Charles Merz, Editor of the New York Times  
229 West 43rd Street, New York 36, New York

Dear Mr. Merz:

"The Proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution as revised and published by the City Planning Commission on August 18th reflects the Commission's careful and detailed study of the voluminous proposals for modification submitted to it since the publication of its previous draft of December 12, 1959, by the many interested organizations and individual citizens, both at the public hearings held in March and at the many working conferences held by the Commission and its able technical staff.

"We believe that in this new document the Commission has presented a sound and practical application of the modern principles of zoning



(continuing)

"which we must have if our City is to meet the needs of its people. There may yet be areas of dissatisfaction with minor details, but as a practical matter, these cannot be resolved until the Resolution is adopted and tested in the day-to-day process of planning and designing specific buildings on specific pieces of property. Those who are disposed to resist changes of any kind will find endless arguments for opposing the Resolution, masking their basic opposition by superficially plausible pleas for delay to afford additional time for further study.

"Since the Commission has already given ample time for intelligent and conscientious study to those who are sincerely interested in achieving an improved modern zoning ordinance, and has given full and sympathetic consideration to all bona-fide suggestions for improvement, we believe it is now time to move forward to the adoption of the Resolution by the Commission and the Board of Estimate, so that those who are concerned with the many facets of building construction in this City may proceed to plan with full knowledge as to what the ground rules are to be.

"We also believe that with the adoption of the Zoning Resolution, Chairman Felt and his colleagues on the Planning Commission should and will concentrate on the completion of the Master Plan for the City, as envisioned in the City Charter, which has for too long been put off. This has been a matter of the greatest urgency for many years, but with the increasing problems of redevelopment and renewal of our deteriorating neighborhoods, of traffic and parking congestion, of schools and other public construction requirements, the lack of a master plan as a matrix in which these numerous and often competing needs may be properly evaluated and related is crucial.

"The establishment of the new Housing and Urban Renewal Board last May was a great forward step toward organizing and programming our multifarious housing efforts, but until the Planning Commission completes the Master Plan the efforts of this Board will inevitably be piecemeal, uncoordinated and lacking in unity of design and purpose.

"We hope the public hearings on the new zoning will convince the Commission and the Board of Estimate that New York demands adoption of the new zoning regulations without delay so that the Planners can then turn to the urgent task of the Master Plan.

(signed) GEOFFREY PLATT, FREDERICK J. WOODBRIDGE, A. GORDON LORIMER, MAX O. URBahn, RICHARD STEIN, MICHAEL M. HARRIS, PETER S. VAN BLOON, ROBERT W. CUTLER, LATHROP DOUGLASS, G. HARMON GURNEY, SIMON BREINES, ARTHUR C. HOLDEN, ROBERT H. JACOBS, M. MILTON GLASS, MORRIS KETCHUM, JR., JOHN J. CARLOS, L. BANCEL LA FARGE, ANTONIN RAYMOND, GEORGE C. RUDOLPH, C. DALE BADGELEY, ALONZO CLARK, PAUL L. WOOD, ROBERT B. O'CONNOR, CHESTER B. PRICE, GILLET LEFFERTS, JR., ROBERT S. HUTCHINS, JOHN C.B. MOORE, DOROTHY C. SCOTT, WILLIAM POTTER, WALTER H. KILHAM, JR., HARMON H. GOLDSTONE, members of

NEW YORK CHAPTER OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS "

CHAIRMAN FELT (continuing): I have a telegram from  
F. Malcolm Hague, Chairman, Manhattan District Planning Board No. 4:

September 12, 1960

HON. JAMES FELT, CHAIRMAN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEMBERS OF DISTRICT PLANNING BOARD NO. FOUR REPRESENTATIVE OF  
CHELSEA CLINTON AND LASALLE AREAS OF MANHATTAN HAVE AFTER CAREFUL  
CONSIDERATION GONE ON RECORD IN FAVOR IN PRINCIPLE OF THE PROPOSED  
RESOLUTION ON THE REZONING OF NEW YORK AND WOULD LIKE TO SEE ITS  
EARLY ADOPTION BY THE CITY AS A NECESSARY STEP FORWARD IN MAKING  
NEW YORK MORE BEAUTIFUL AS WELL AS THE GREAT METROPOLIS IT IS.

F. MALCOLM HAGUE, CHAIRMAN, MANHATTAN DISTRICT PLANNING BOARD NO. 4

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a telegram from Nicholas Campay, President of the Corona Homeowners Civic Association:

"SEPTEMBER 13, 1960

"JAMES FELT, CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

"MEMBERS OF THE CORONA HOME OWNERS CIVIC ASSOCIATION ARE IN FAVOR OF THE NEW REVISED ZONING CODE AND WE URGE FOR ITS SPEEDY ADOPTION INTO LAW

NICHOLAS CAMPAY  
PRESIDENT"

. . . . .

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a telegram from Friedel Schmits, Chairman of the Zoning Committee, for the Residents of City Island

COMMISSIONER JAMES FELT

SEPTEMBER 12, 1960

"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 COMMISSIONS PROPOSED REZONING

THE RESIDENTS OF CITY ISLAND

FRIEDEL SCHMITZ CHAIRMAN  
ZONING COMMITTEE "

. . . . .

CHAIRMAN FELT: I have a letter from the Automobile Club of New York, Inc., signed by its Vice President, J.R. Crossley:

AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF NEW YORK, INC.

28 East 78th Street  
New York 21, N.Y.

BY: J.R. CROSSLEY, VICE PRESIDENT

September 9, 1960

"Mr. Jack Smith  
City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York 7, New York

Dear Mr. Smith:

In view of the fact that the enclosed statement was made at the City Planning Commission hearing relative to changes in zoning regulations on March 22, 1960, it is not our intention to have a representative of the Club appear at the hearing on Monday, September 12.

We would, however, appreciate your having the enclosed statement made a part of the minutes of the hearing on Monday as what we said on March 22 is exactly our sentiments and what we would repeat were we to appear personally on Monday.

Sincerely yours,

(signed)

J.R. CROSSLEY,  
Vice President

Encl.

(statement referred to on following page)

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) This is a statement endorsing the zoning resolution, which was made on March 22nd. In accordance with the request of Mr. Crossley, we shall introduce this into the record and regard it as the statement of the Automobile Club of New York, Inc., as at this hearing.

PAUL PETRILLO, representing AUTOMOBILE CLUB OF NEW YORK, INC.

"Gentlemen:

I am Paul Petrillo, Assistant Director of Traffic Engineering and Safety of the Automobile Club of New York, an organization of more than 370,000 members. I am here to express our vigorous support to three sections of the proposed new zoning regulation which are of direct interest to motorists.

Specifically, they are the sections dealing with off-street parking and loading. In general, the report emphasizes the inevitable continued growth and use of the motor vehicle and takes the positive viewpoint that vehicles and their drivers must be accommodated if the City is to continue to thrive and develop.

This viewpoint is particularly refreshing in view of a rash of recent proposals which seek to ban the automobile from certain areas of Manhattan, and generally make Manhattan more inaccessible to motorists than ever before.

Article Two, Chapter Four of the new resolution is concerned primarily with requirements for off-street parking facilities in residential areas. Without going into detail, it substantially increases the amount of off-street parking to be required in multiple-family developments. The proposed changes are well supported on the basis of clearly established trends toward increased car ownership and use, and as an answer to the practical problem of saturating streets with parked cars.

(continued)

"Article Three, Chapter Five deals with commercial off-street parking and loading regulations and establishes the requirement that off-street parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with an established formula depending upon the character and size of the commercial establishment and the kind of district in which it is located.

The formula established, relating to the number of parking spaces required to the floor area of the establishment, or, in some cases, to the seating capacity, seem reasonable.

The provisions in this suggested change certainly seem to be moving in the right direction.

It should be noted, however, that in some areas, notably lower Manhattan, commercial and manufacturing buildings are exempted from providing parking facilities on the grounds that they would be impractical and would attract still more cars and add to traffic congestion. The answer to alleviating traffic congestion is not to bury our heads and blandly state that we should do nothing to attract more motorists. History shows that we cannot eliminate congestion merely by hoping that it will go away. Nor should we want it to "go away". Traffic and our ability to accommodate it is essential to any growing and vigorous community. Traffic will continue to enter these core areas. It is therefore essential that we provide additional parking spaces in those areas where the public wants to be.

To a large degree, the city's off-street parking program will fill a major part of the parking space shortage. Where possible, however, private builders, as well, should make provisions to accommodate still more parkers.

(continued)

"Article Four, Chapter Four covers the problem of providing off-street parking space in manufacturing districts. The introduction to this chapter points out that this is a serious problem -- that off-street parking facilities are not provided to the degree required in factory areas. Consequently, streets in these areas are clogged with curb parking to the detriment of moving traffic.

The suggested formula calls for one parking space for every three people employed. This is a reasonable figure.

Again, I should like to say that the three provisions covering parking facilities seem reasonable, in our opinion, and should be adopted."

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a letter from Gerald H. Ullman, an attorney, addressed to me, and dated September 12th:

(continued)

Ullman  
(statement of)

R 132 Misc.

" GERALD H. ULLMAN  
Counselor At Law

120 Broadway  
New York 5, N.Y.

September 12, 1960

Hon. James Felt  
City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York 7, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Felt:

I appreciate very much your prompt reply to my letter concerning the effect of the rezoning proposals on Greenwich Village. I have read carefully your letter to Mr. DeRham of the Washington Square Association, the enclosure in your reply, and based upon the information contained therein it would seem that the C4 classification would on analysis be the very best that could be obtained for the Eighth Street section.

In view of this fact and your assurances that the matter will be sympathetically reviewed with respect to matters affecting Greenwich Village during the grace period before the new zoning law goes into effect, I wish to state on behalf of the Republican Club in the 1st Assembly District that we support the proposed zoning resolution. I would appreciate it if you would make this letter a part of the record and will look forward to working with you to obtain modifications in the future of the Eighth Street zoning.

Thanking you again for your courtesy, I am

Sincerely yours, (s)

GERALD H. ULLMAN "



Elder  
(statement of)

R 133 Misc.

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a letter from DeForest Elder & Mulreany, enclosing a statement of Duncan Elder on behalf of Phipps Houses:

DE FOREST ELDER & MULREANY  
20 Exchange Place  
New York 5, N.Y.

September 13, 1960

"Mr. James Felt  
City Planning Commission  
Department of City Planning  
2 Lafayette Street, NY 7, N.Y.

Re: Bellevue South Proposed Zoning Resolution

Dear Mr. Felt:

I had intended to appear at the hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution, to speak in favor of its passage. However, due to Hurricane Donna, I was unable to reach the hearing.

I enclose herewith statement which I had intended to make and which you may put with the other statements in favor of the new zoning.

Very truly your,

(signed)

DUNCAN ELDER

(statement referred to on next page)

STATEMENT OF DUNCAN ELDER ON BEHALF OF PHIPPS HOUSES

"Mr. Chairman, I wish to appear on behalf of Phipps Houses, of which I am legal counsel and Secretary, in favor of the proposed zoning resolution.

As some of you may already know, Phipps Houses was organized 55 years ago through the generosity of Henry Phipps, as a non-profit corporation, incorporated by Special Act of the New York Legislature to provide housing accommodations for working people.

Since that time, Phipps Houses has constructed four model housing projects, has a fifth under construction and has been named sponsor of the proposed Bellevue South Title I project, between 23rd and 30th Streets and First and Second Avenues. During this period, we have worked with and retained some of the outstanding architects who have practiced in New York City - among them, Grosvenor Atterbury, Clarence Stein, Whitfield & King, Pomerance & Breines and Fred G. Frost, Jr., & Associates.

Therefore, we believe that we have some knowledge of City Planning as it relates to housing. Certainly, we do have a vital interest in the proposed zoning, especially as it affects housing. In connection with Bellevue South, I am pleased to state that the proposed zoning permits us to build the type of buildings that our architects have already recommended as the best solution for the particular area.

In accordance with the purpose of Henry Phipps to make a better City, we heartily endorse and recommend the proposed comprehensive amendment of the zoning resolution of The City of New York."

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a telegram from  
John J. Bagatta, Manager, Macy's Flatbush:

September 13, 1960

JAMES FELT, CHAIRMAN PLANNING COMMISSION, 2 LAFAYETTE ST., NYK  
"SORRY CANNOT BE WITH YOU AT THE HEARING TODAY NEVERTHELESS I WOULD  
LIKE YOU TO KNOW THAT WE APPROVE THE COMMISSION'S REVISED ZONING  
PROPOSAL IN PRINCIPLE YOU HAVE OUR FULL SUPPORT

JOHN J. BAGATTA MANAGER MACYS FLATBUSH

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a letter from the  
the S.S. WHITE DENTAL MANUFACTURING COMPANY:

" S.S. WHITE DENTAL MANUFACTURING COMPANY  
WILLIAM J. SCRIBNER, PLANT ENGINEER  
SEPTEMBER 13, 1960

"The S.S. White Dental Manufacturing Co. operates a factory  
at Prince Bay, Staten Island, employing 700 to 1,000 people.

Upon publication of the first revision of the Voorhees proposal  
last December, it became apparent to us that our mapped category,  
partly M-1, partly commercial and residential, was too restrictive  
to permit lawful continuation of many of our processes and operations.  
We immediately brought this to your attention and were assured, both  
by your Office and that of our Borough President, that our property  
in total would be designated an M-3 Zone. This was confirmed by a  
letter over Mr. James Felt's signature, dated March 22nd.

In addressing your Body on March 25th, I stated that we had  
been given the concession we sought, and expressed my Company's  
appreciation of your attitude and your help. I did this on the  
assumption that you had made or intended to make the mapping  
change we required, an assumption which your Office had amply confirmed.

(continued)

We were given further apparent assurance that this was an accomplished fact in a second letter from Mr. Felt, dated August 17th.

"We received the latest revision of the Proposal on August 26th, and found that while that portion of our property which originally bore the M-1 designation had been changed to M-3, the commercial and residential areas, amounting to about a third of our land, remained unchanged. Our immediate efforts to obtain an explanation or some indication of your future intent, have met with little success.

We have explained at great length to your representatives and to the interested Borough authorities, the necessity for an M-3 designation covering our entire property - an area roughly bounded by Seguine Avenue, Purdy Place, and the waterfront. We cannot compromise or modify this request and hope to successfully operate our Factory. We feel that as a reasonably important factor in the economic life of our Borough, we should have without constant effort and unrelenting watchfulness, the consideration necessary for our continued existence on Staten Island. We therefore request immediate consideration of our requirements."

William J. Scribner, Plant Engineer

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) A letter from Hamilton-Madison House, signed by Geoffrey R. Wiener:

Wiener (statement of)

R 137 Misc.

HAMILTON-MADISON HOUSE  
50 Madison Street - New York 38, N.Y.

September 13, 1960

Dear Commissioner Felt:

I wish to apologize to you and members of the City Planning Commission for not having appeared as scheduled yesterday at the hearing at City Hall in order to voice support again of the Proposed Comprehensive Zoning Resolution. I must plead the weather as my excuse.

I wish to reiterate the strong support of both the Lower Eastside Neighborhoods Assn. and the Two Bridges Neighborhood Council for the Planning Commission's proposals. We are hopeful that the Resolution's adoption will mean the end of unscrupulous exploitation of our City's "natural resources"--land, open space, commercial and industrial developments and homes.

The adoption will also hopefully initiate comprehensive planning in the City. We feel it is imperative that the Commission immediately set about the development of a master plan. In the Lower East Side we have repeatedly experienced the frustration and futility of piecemeal planning - a project here, a project there, without any relation to the surrounding community. We are particularly grateful for your promise to Mr. Martin Livenstein a few weeks ago to assign a member of the Commission staff to work with us in planning for the Lower East Side community.

We trust that the Zoning Resolution will be passed promptly and look forward to continuing to work with you towards a better New York for all our neighbors.

Very sincerely,

Co-Chairman, Housing Division  
Lower Eastside Neighborhoods  
Assn.

GEOFFREY R. WIENER  
Executive Director

Lauricella (statement of)

R 138 Misc.

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) A letter from the Greater  
Bayside Citizens Association:  
GREATER BAYSIDE CITIZENS ASSOCIATION, INC.

BAYSIDE, NEW YORK

September 13, 1960

City Planning Commission  
Mr. James Felt, Chairman  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Felt:

The Board of Directors and members of the Greater Bayside Citizens' Association, Inc., Bayside, N.Y., have voted unanimously to support the proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution.

The lack of planning is to be found in the erection of large apartments adjacent to one (1) family homes and lacking parking facilities and thus squeezing out the small Homeowners in the Borough of Queens.

We say, that this new proposed zoning and text of the new proposed zoning which we are supporting is a tremendous step forward to the better development of the Borough of Queens, and it offers a solution to control density in our Borough.

In addition we object to the present zoning which permits gasoline stations, drying cleaning plants and other non-conforming structures in residential areas.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Margaret Lauricella, Pres.  
39-21 217th Street  
Bayside 61, N.Y. Ba 4-0195

La Fauci (statement of)

R 139 Misc.

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a letter from  
Mr. Thomas V. LaFauci, Assemblyman, 1st Assembly District:

THE ASSEMBLY, STATE OF NEW YORK  
ALBANY

From:

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMAS V. LA FAUCI

September 13, 1960

Addressed to:

Mr. James Felt, Chairman, City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette St., New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Felt:

I write this letter in order to oppose the adoption of the proposed zoning law. I write to you as a public official, an Assemblyman in the 1st Assembly District, Queens County, representing the view of many of my constituents, and also as Civic Chairman of the Regular Democratic Club of the 1st Assembly District.

After due deliberation and consideration of the new law, it is the consensus of opinion that same be postponed and its adoption deferred until the public has had adequate opportunity to give same the intensive study which it requires.

I enclose herewith a statement explaining their reasons and mine for the opposition to the immediate passage of the zoning law. I trust that you will give serious consideration to these proposals which are made in the interest of helping the people of our district.

While we feel that zoning changes are necessary and should be updated, nevertheless, we feel that a subject which affects the lives and welfare of so many people should be cautiously approached and not be decided in a haphazard and arbitrary manner.

Thanking you very kindly for your consideration, I remain

Very truly yours,

TLF:nm  
enc.

THOMAS V. LA FAUCI

Soling (statement of)  
Friedland

R 140 Misc.

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a letter from Mr.

Chester Soling:

SEIDMAN-SOLING BUILDERS INC.

September 12, 1960

Commissioner James Felt  
N.Y.C. Dept of City Planning  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York City

"Dear Sir:

"As Investment Builders in the City of New York, who own property for future construction we have been keenly interested in the proposed new zoning regulations.

"We are members of the I.B.A. and endorse their stand on the proposed zoning. I write this letter to point out one thing though. In reading through the proposed zoning regulation I question the definition of the word "Plaza" as given by the resolution. Throughout, the word is defined "a plaza is an open area accessible to the public at all times". It seems to me that any area open to the public at all times will become part of the public domain unless such space can be closed to the public for at least one day a year. You might thus run into some legal difficulty I feel with this one provision of the resolution.

Very truly yours,

SEIDMAN-SOLING BUILDERS INC.

CS:lv

CHESTER SOLING"

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a telegram from

Jacob Friedland:

"COMM. JAMES FELT, CITY PLANNING COMM.

REQUEST RETENTION AS BUSINESS ZONE OF WEST SIDE OF MANOR ROAD FROM  
HOLDEN BLVD NORTH 350 FEET



Moses (statement of)

R 141 Misc.

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) I have a letter from  
Mr. Robert Moses, addressed to me:

ROBERT MOSES

BABYLON, LONG ISLAND

SEPTEMBER 13, 1960

HON. JAMES FELT  
101 Central Park West  
New York 23, New York

Dear Jim:

Since my return from Rome, I have been reading  
about the pending zoning changes.

Not that it's of interest to anybody, but just to  
keep the record straight, I want to tell you that in spite  
of hesitancy about revolutionary reclassifications and doubts  
about bulk zoning and restricting population as panaceas, I  
should vote with you if I were still a member of the City  
Planning Commission because your main objective is certainly  
admirable.

Let me add that I admire your persistence and  
wish you the very best of luck.

Cordially,

(signed)

ROBERT MOSES

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing ) I ask once more: are there any others who wish to be heard on any phase of the proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution of The City of New York?

(no response)

If not, will the Secretary please call the roll on closing the hearing?

SECRETARY MALTER: Roll call on motion to close the public hearing in the matter of the proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution of The City of New York: (CP 15820)

Chairman Felt, Vice Chairman Bloustein, Commissioners Lindenbaum, Livingston, Orton, Provenzano, Sweeney. Unanimously carried. It is now 2:00 P.M., Wednesday, September 14, 1960.

- - - - -

(Additional miscellaneous communications on following pages)

Brill (statement of)

R 143 Misc.

WILLIAM W. BRILL

INSURANCE • CONSTRUCTION • MORTGAGES • REAL ESTATE  
Seven Cornelia Street • New York 14, N.Y. • Algonquin 5-0143

September 16, 1960

Mr. James Felt  
Chairman of City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York City

Dear Mr. Felt:

I just returned from a two week's business trip to Nigeria in West Africa, which involved the construction of housing in that country and, unfortunately, missed the City Planning Commission's hearings on the new revised zoning proposal.

I should like to put myself on record to the effect that as at the previous hearing, I am very much in favor of the zoning proposal and urge that it be adopted as quickly as possible. I say this, based upon twenty year's experience in the practical field of construction and real estate financing.

Sincerely,

(signed)

William W. Brill

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN  
OF NEW YORK, INC.

112 EAST 19 STREET NEW YORK 3, N.Y. SPRING 7-3800

STATEMENT ON THE PROPOSED REZONING RESOLUTION MADE BY MRS. MILTON GORDON, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN, BEFORE THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, MARCH 15, 1960.

The Relationship of Good Zoning to the Welfare of Children

It is no accident that juvenile delinquency breeds in over-crowded and congested slum areas. It is no accident that family problems affecting the emotional stability of children start in one room dwellings in older neighborhoods which have been blighted by the indiscriminate cutting up of homes and apartments into small units. Conversely, it is no accident that these problems diminish in open space, light and air.

Apart from the mental and social health of children, the physical health and safety of children is affected by smoke, odors, noise, heat, radiation hazards, and fire and explosive hazards.

That is why the Citizens' Committee for Children is interested in rezoning for the City Of New York.

We are not architects or engineers, and therefore cannot testify to the technical aspects of the proposed amendment. But we can testify to its urgent need.

Because there is unrealistic and haphazard control of land use, many residential areas of the City are exposed to heavy commercial, industrial and trucking hazards. These conditions pose problems regarding the safety and health of our children - problems which can be resolved through modern zoning techniques and the establishment of standards controlling the nuisance and hazards generated by industry.

There are now no adequate controls to prevent overcrowd-

laissez-faire zoning regulations have contributed to population concentrations in certain sections of the City that drastically curtail access to adequate school, transit, recreational and cultural facilities.

A happy and healthful environment for children cannot be found in areas where factories and dwellings stand together, where an open window admits noise, smoke, odors and all sorts of industrial nuisances instead of sunshine and fresh air.

The City must have the tools to regulate the number of dwelling units per acre so that the number of families in any neighborhood - and, therefore, the number of children - can be more accurately predicted, thus facilitating planning for schools, recreation, libraries and other community facilities.

It is almost impossible to correct much of the damage which has been condoned by archaic zoning. Vast areas have sunk into an almost hopeless morass from which it will take Herculean efforts and generations to extricate. Without controls more and more of our City will run down hill and our children will be the principal victims.

Our children are our most valuable assets. Their welfare cannot be measured against the profits of selfish interests. We cannot delay any longer. We must decide whether we are going to leave our children a legacy of slums or adopt the progressive and comprehensive zoning plan proposed by the City Planning Commission.

Butt (statement of)

R 146 Misc.

DOWNTOWN-LOWER MANHATTAN ASSOCIATION, INC.

September 7, 1960

Hon. James Felt  
Chairman  
City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street, New York, New York

Dear Chairman Felt:

We are pleased to inform you that the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association, having considered the proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York, as revised and published in the City Record of August 18, 1960, believes that it is in the best interests of the City to adopt a new comprehensive Zoning Resolution rather than to continue amending the existing one, long since out-moded.

The Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association's consideration of the new Zoning Resolution is appropriately confined to its application to the downtown-lower Manhattan area. The Association heartily endorses the Resolution as it applies to this area. We find the land use regulations generally compatible with the proposals of our Association as expressed in our First Report and we believe that the bulk regulations would serve the long-run, best interests of the area. We believe the proposed Resolution would contribute effectively to the constructive use of land and streets upon which, in the final analysis, the welfare of our City and its people depends.

On behalf of the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association, we desire to express our appreciation of your leadership and painstaking efforts in bringing this Resolution to its present status.

Yours sincerely,

David Rockefeller  
Chairman

John D. Butt  
President

Zakin (statement of)

R 146 Misc.

FAR ROCKAWAY TAXPAYER AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION

September 17, 1960

Honorable James Felt, Chairman City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York 7, New York.

Dear Commissioner Felt:

This Association wishes to express its sincere thanks and appreciation to you and the Members of the City Planning Commission for the courtesy extended to us at the Hearing on Tuesday.

You are to be highly commended for your patience and the clear explanations offered in difficult situations as well as for the dignity and decorum with which you conducted the Hearing. Also for your offers and willingness to meet with any and all who still had doubts or were confused.

As you know, the members of this Association are in favor of the early adoption of the Resolution.

The Honorable James Sweeney has met with our group, giving us advice, knowledge and much of his precious time. I was remiss in not expressing the gratitude of this Association at the Hearing on Tuesday. We would appreciate it if all the above can still be read into the Record.

We would like to bring to your attention that the enclosed portion of map 25b belongs in Far Rockaway and should be part of map 31a. Is it still possible to get your condensation of the changes in the new Zoning Resolution? We do have a copy of the City Record with the changes but it might be more understandable to our members if they could read your compact version. We would also appreciate having a copy of any further changes you may make.

Sincerely,

(signed)  
(Mrs.) ADA ZAKIN. PRESIDENT

MIDTOWN REALTY OWNERS ASS'N, INC.  
450 Seventh Avenue  
New York 1, N.Y.  
CHICKERING 4-4377

September 12, 1960

City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York, N. Y.

Attention: Hon. James Felt, Chairman

Re: Proposed Zoning Resolution

Dear Mr. Felt:

This communication is addressed to you in support of the Proposed Zoning Resolution, the subject of final hearings on September 12th and 13th.

When this Resolution was initially proposed, our Association retained the services of an expert to analyze same with particular emphasis on the impact of the Resolution on commercial property and on the so-called Garment Area of Manhattan. A detailed analysis was made of the specific sections affecting each of our buildings. This analysis was in turn submitted to the owner of each property. In several cases, a further and detailed study was made of particular properties which study indicated in depth, the impact of the Resolution.

As a result of these studies, a rather complete report was submitted to you followed by several conferences. At these conferences we received adequate assurance that certain revisions would be made in the final text modifying those sections of the Resolution which appeared to require attention. In addition, certain map changes in the Proposed Zoning Map were also made.



- 2 -

The final revised Resolution, having now been submitted and being the subject of hearings before your Commission, it is our considered judgment that this Resolution deserves complete support. Obviously, no Resolution with as broad a scope as this could ever be a perfect document. Experience shows that our great and ever-changing metropolis requires a continuing willingness to adopt changes and modifications as circumstances demand in our growth. The attitude of the present Planning Commission, expressed so often to us through its Honorable Chairman, has evidenced to our satisfaction a keen interest and willingness, once the Resolution has been adopted, to improve and modify the Resolution wherever and whenever revision or clarification becomes advisable.

Accordingly, I propose to submit to our Board of Directors for their formal approval a Special Resolution embodying the above thought in support of the adoption of the Proposed Zoning Resolution. I have no doubt of its approval and, in view of the hearings on September 12th, I, as President of the Association, wish to transmit to you the approval and support of the Organization. You and the City are to be congratulated on this ambitious undertaking.

Cordially yours,

MIDTOWN REALTY OWNERS ASS'N. INC.

BY

\_\_\_\_\_  
Abraham K. Kaufman  
President

NEWS  
from  
ACTION, INC.  
2 West 46th Street / New York 36, N. Y.  
Plaza 7-6060

Reported By

A. E. Rosfeld  
Director  
Educational  
Activities

ACTION, Inc. Backs Modernization of New York's  
Zoning Ordinance

Roy W. Johnson, Chairman of ACTION, Inc., the national council for good cities, announced today that ACTION, Inc. fully endorses the proposed modernization of New York's zoning ordinance. Mr. Johnson stated:

"Modernization of New York's ordinance will affect cities all over the nation. Just as New York in 1916 ultimately led most other American cities to adopt zoning, the arduously and carefully prepared new ordinance will stimulate other cities to review and modernize their zoning principles. Final approval of the pending ordinance will be an historic occasion for persons everywhere who recognize modern zoning as vital tool for making our cities good places in which to live well and earn an ample livelihood."

Turck (statement of)

R 150 Misc.

THE PROTESTANT COUNCIL of the CITY of NEW YORK  
475 Riverside Drive Suite 456 New York 27, N. Y.  
RIVERSIDE 9-1214

OFFICE OF EXECUTIVE SECRETARY  
Christian Social Relations

September 19, 1960  
September 6, 1960

Honorable James A. Felt, Chairman  
New York City Planning Commission  
Hon. Robert W. Dowling,  
Hon. Luther Gulick,  
Joint Chairman  
Committee for Modern Zoning,  
25 Broad Street, New York 4, N. Y.

Gentlemen:

On behalf of the Department of Christian Social Relations of the Protestant Council of the City of New York, I am glad to say that we most earnestly and enthusiastically support the revised zoning proposal made by the City Planning Committee. It is obvious to any thinking person that a code for building that is forty four years old and amended twenty five hundred times is no adequate basis for zoning in the greatest city in the world.

The fact that many interests will be affected in one way or another by changes in the zoning law will undoubtedly encourage many short-sighted persons to oppose any changes. But this fact serves only to emphasize the principle that change is an evitable condition of life, individual or social, and that it ill becomes an individual or a group to permit selfish concerns interfere with plans for a better, more beautiful and more efficient City. We hope that nothing will interfere with a project that means so much for the welfare of our entire community.

Very sincerely yours, (signed) CHARLES J. TURCK

SACHS QUALITY STORES, INC.  
330 BRUCKNER BOULEVARD  
NEW YORK

September 19, 1960

Honorable James K. Felt, Chairman  
New York City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York 7, New York

Dear Mr. Felt:

In testimony before the City Planning Commission at both the informal preliminary hearings and the formal hearings on the revised Zoning Proposal, I stated that only by the adoption of a new comprehensive modern Zoning Resolution can the City continue to develop its economic resources in a healthy manner.

The year and a half that has elapsed since the Zoning Proposal was first presented has materially heightened the need for the adoption of this realistic comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution as presented by your Commission. We must end the planless incursions of residential developments into areas planned for and more suitably located for commercial, industrial or manufacturing enterprise. Concurrently, residential neighborhoods must be protected from the corrosive and blighting effects which develop when commerce and industry are permitted to encroach upon the City's residential communities.

- 2 -

Under the existing Zoning Resolution with its excessive multiplicity of Amendments, the City is losing the fight against blighted areas of slum and decay; we are being overcome and strangled by the evermore serious problems of vehicular congestion; New York has failed to realize its potential as a commercial, industrial and manufacturing center; all forms of activity in the City have grown in an aimless, rambling and malignant manner harmful to the operation of stable economic development and clean, healthy residential neighborhoods.

As a businessman and as a resident of New York I was most gratified with the ingenuity combined with realism that is evident in the proposed Amendment. Inherent in the Proposal is the potential for long and short range planning, civic improvement, intelligent land use, gradual amelioration of the traffic strangulation and vast opportunities for urban renewal programs which will also encourage the attraction of stable commercial and industrial enterprises by affording zoned protection to the City's economic lifeblood as well as to its residential communities.

The adoption of the proposed comprehensive Resolution will enable New York City to become a model of civic health, prosperity and beauty. I strongly and without reservation urge that the fullest possible support be given to the proposed Zoning Amendment.

Sincerely,

(signed)

Richard C. Sachs

Bird (statement of)

R 153 Misc.

TWENTY THIRD STREET ASSOCIATION  
INCORPORATED  
FLATIRON BUILDING  
23rd STREET and FIFTH AVENUE  
NEW YORK 10, N.Y.

Telephone GRamercy 5-2397

September 9, 1960

Hon. James Felt  
Chairman, City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York 7, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We appreciate the opportunity you extended to Mr. Wilds, Mr. Benton, Mr. Keller and the writer, Friday, September 2, 1960, to discuss with you suggested amendments to maps which are part of the proposed Comprehensive Revision of the Zoning Resolution, forwarded to you by Mr. Walter A. Benkiser, Chairman, Zoning Committee, dated August 26, 1960, copy of which is enclosed and made part of this communication.

We understand you and the members of the City Planning Commission will give consideration to these suggestions and that, if not practicable to amend map now, for such of the recommendations as you may approve, it will be possible to renew our request during the grace period, after approval is voted by the Board of Estimate.

I am authorized by our Zoning Committee to register approval of the Proposed Comprehensive Amendment to the Zoning Resolution, in principle, subject to affirmative action by our board of directors at meeting on September 21, 1960, expecting, maps, changes of which we have recommended and previously mentioned.

Respectfully yours,

(signed)

William H. Bird

September 12, 1960

The City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York 7, New York

Gentlemen:

On March 11, 1960 Nathan Straus registered with you his emphatic approval of the proposed new zoning ordinance. In connection with your hearings set for September 12 and 13 it may be useful to restate herewith his views on the subject:

"I may claim to know something of the subject, since I have been active in rehousing and urban planning for more than 25 years. During this period, I built the largest low-rent privately owned housing project in New York, I was a member of the New York City Housing Authority, and Administrator of the United States Housing Authority, which made loans aggregating \$800 million to local Housing Authorities for low-rent housing. Moreover, I have been a student of zoning abroad since 1930. Last summer I inspected housing projects and consulted with city officials in charge of zoning in England, Sweden and Holland.

On the basis of such knowledge as I may have obtained over the years, I am willing to say that not only is the rezoning plan for New York essential, but such is its importance that speedy adoption is necessary to save the City from choking itself. Sunlight is becoming rarer, year by year, on the

narrow canyons of the City streets. Not only are subways and roadways crowded, but at some hours of the day the sidewalks are all but impassable because of the crowds. Unless action is taken to rezone the City, provide for keeping business properties out of residential areas and above all, to reduce the bulk and therefore the population of buildings, it is hard to contemplate the continued existence of New York as a metropolitan center ten or twenty years hence.

Of course, there will be selfish opposition by those speculators and builders who are profiting by the present wholly inadequate zoning regulations. One cannot expect cooperation in changing the laws so as to put an end to their practice of building where and in what bulk offers the greatest profits. These are the men who are exploiting the land in the City which is a precious and irreplaceable asset.

When the Real Estate Board of New York announced its solemn prediction that, "The City as a whole would suffer through the curtailment of new construction," let us not forget the record of the bankers and also the security dealers when essential reforms to end abuses in those industries were being considered by the Congress.

When the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act was introduced in Congress in 1933, the then President of the American Bankers



Association condemned it in these words: "American banking needs the abolishment of special laws (for) public regulation and supervision rather than more statutes for its restriction and control." Yet today the banks agree that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation protects depositors and the banks alike. Indeed bank advertising uses the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act as a strong argument to persuade prospective depositors to make use of their facilities.

When the struggle was on in Congress for the enactment of the Securities Exchange Act to put an end to what has been called by historians "a fantastic era in Wall Street," Richard Whitney, President of the New York Stock Exchange, damned the proposed legislation in the following words: (This bill aims) "to establish indirectly a form of nationalization of business." But today, 26 years later, the soundness of the Securities Exchange Act is recognized by every dealer in securities in Wall Street.

One may safely predict, therefore, that we have an exact parallel in legislation to safeguard New York City from further exploitation by builders, which is possible only because present zoning regulations are obsolete, inadequate and ineffective. It is to be regretted that a revised zoning ordinance was not enacted ten years ago.

I wish you every success in bringing about speedy enactment of this proposed zoning ordinance."

I hope the above testimony by Nathan Straus will be useful to you.

Sincerely yours,  
(s) R. PETER STRAUS

Hirsch (statement of)

R 157 Misc.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE  
of the Rockaways

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUILDING - FAR ROCKAWAY 91, N. Y.

TELEPHONE: FAR ROCKAWAY 7-0100  
WALTER D. DOGE, President

September 7, 1960

Hon. James Felt, Chairman  
City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York 7, N. Y.

Dear Chairman Felt:

The Chamber of Commerce of the Rockaways has just completed its study of the revised zoning resolution as it applies to the Rockaways. Basically, we concur with the changes that have been made. The only objection we have pertains to the restrictive residential zoning imposed on our beachfront.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity of maintaining and providing for the expansion of existing commercial establishments on the boardwalk and adjacent area. These establishments, besides providing a valuable service during the summer months when millions of people visit our beaches are also important for the economic well being of the community.

In order to elaborate on this point I would greatly appreciate the opportunity of being heard at the public hearings to be held next Tuesday.

Sincerely,  
(signed)

I. BERNARD HIRSCH  
Executive Secretary

COFFEE INSTANTS, INC.  
2-15 26th AVENUE . LONG ISLAND CITY 2, N.Y.

September 2, 1960

Hon. James Felt  
Chairman  
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
Department of City Planning  
2 Lafayette Street.  
New York 7, New York

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you very much for your letter of August 17th, advising us that our property is proposed for an M1 zone.

We feel that you and your associate Commissioners have reached a most fair determination.

On behalf of our Company, I wish to express our sincere thanks to your Commission, not only for reaching this decision, but for the splendid efforts being made to plan a better New York City.

Respectfully,

COFFEE INSTANTS, INC.

(signed)

Malcolm B. Stark

## ENDO LABORATORIES INC.

84-40 101st Street  
Richmond Hill 18, New York

September 14, 1960

Honorable James Felt  
Chairman  
City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York, New York

My dear Commissioner Felt:

I have had the pleasure of addressing the Commission at the public hearings held in March and also yesterday. I am impelled to write this letter because of the unusual courtesy and patience that you and the members of the Commission have shown, at times in the face of provocation, to everyone who appeared. On both occasions I spent most of the day at the hearings because I was called on late in the day. Both times I found that my long wait was a rewarding experience because I was seeing "democracy in action" in its highest form.

Without doubt, there are many fine public officials, but in all my life I have never seen any group of men exhibit the courtesy, patience and forbearance towards the public that you, Vice-Chairman Bloustein, and other members of the Commission exhibited during these two public hearings. I believe you have set a fine example for all public officials in the United States to follow.

Yours very sincerely,

(signed)

David L. Klein  
Senior Vice President  
ENDO LABORATORIES INC.

Victor H. Abbott (statement of)

25 Dahill Road, Bklyn 18, N. Y.  
September 8th, 1960.Hon. James Felt, Chairman City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York 7, N. Y.

"Dear Sir,

I have for acknowledgement your letter dated August 17th, 1960 referring to the request dated February 23rd, 1960 signed by myself and over 20 residents of this area.

All of the petitioners wish to express their appreciation for your decision in proposing that the property located on Dahill Road, now in a residential area be continued as such and that the Caton Avenue section from East 2nd Street to Dahill Road, Brooklyn, as shown on May 22c, is proposed for a C2-3 zone.

Although your letter states that a C-3 Zone is proposed, with no mention of the 43 feet of residential area on Dahill Road that the Petitioners had requested that you allow to remain as residential, I see on examination of Map 22c that you have restored this 43 feet to its present status in the revised Zoning Resolution.

I repeat, all of the Petitioners are very pleased with the present Map 22c in the Revised Zoning Resolution and as many as are able will tell you so in person at the hearings to be held on Tuesday September 13th, 1950

Sincerely,

(signed)

Victor H. Abbott

## QUEENS VALLEY HOME OWNERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.

FLUSHING, NEW YORK

September 11, 1960

City Planning Commission  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York 7, N. Y.

RE: Proposed Comprehensive Amendment of The Zoning Resolution.

The Board of Directors of the Queens Valley Homeowners Association, Inc, have voted unanimously to support the proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution which comes before the Commission on September 12 and 13 for hearing.

The Association's area in the Borough of Queens, is bounded roughly on the north by Queens College; on the east by Kissena Boulevard; on the south by Union Turnpike; and on the west by Grand Central Parkway. There are approx. 2,800 one and two-family homes in the area, of which more than 1,500 are members of this association.

The need for density controls have become very evident to us.

The proposed Zoning Resolution provides direction to "density control" so badly needed in our area and in much of central Queens which has not been fully developed. It will control the erection of new structures and, just as important, later reconstruction of many portions of Queens.

Under the present Zoning Resolution, a number of builders have erected homes with considerable open space. We approve of this. However, there are a few builders who erect monstrosities on land in Queens, affording little open space and utilizing the land to the fullest maximum of the present resolution.

The Proposed Zoning Resolution, through its controls over floor area ratios, regulations as to lot area per dwelling unit, open space ratios, and minimum lot regulations, all combine to enforce these regulations which are presently practiced by the better

Weisler (statement of)

and more considerate builders of homes.

In our area, our elementary, junior and senior high schools, are overcrowded, many of which have double and triple sessions. It has become necessary to "bus" our children to outlying schools, simply because there are no seats available for them in the schools in our neighborhood.

Transit facilities in our neighborhood have been strained and are close to the saturation point. To permit the erection of huge colonies of sky-scraper apartments, thus concentrating more people in the area, without providing adequate transportation would be the straw that would break the back of the camel of transportation.

Great masses of people would be permitted to spring up in any part of our city without an eye to such facilities or their potential development.

The proposed Zoning Resolution provides a solution to these problems; or, at least attempts a sensible approach to the same.

However, we believe that this is a giant step forward to the better development of the Borough of Queens and the City, and it offers a solution to sensible density control in our city.

We strongly urge its speedy adoption.

Yours truly,

QUEENS VALLEY HOME OWNERS'  
ASSOCIATION, INC.,

Rose Weisler, President

Jacob S. Schulman,  
Walter S. Bolles, Co-Chairmen.