

Community Board 8
Weeksville Heritage Center
158 Buffalo Avenue
Brooklyn, NY, 11213
June 13th, 2024

Members Present

Akua Aidoo
Sharon Alexis-Pierre
Peter Anekwe
Princess Benn-James
Gail Branch-Muhammad
Robert Callahan
Edward Delman
Dian Duke
Tamika Gibbs
Nizjoni Granville
Jamell Henderson
Frances Langley
Dr. Sarah Lazur
Lisa Maldonado
William Meehan
Kwasi Mensah
Mimi Mitchell
Fior Ortiz-Joyner
Taraya Pettway
Anika Roach
Conor Ross
Ezra Roth
Brian Saunders
Katie Taylor
Dana Thompson
Mark Thurton
Esmond Turnbull
Gib Veconi
Irsa Weatherspoon
Sharon Wedderburn
Robert Witherwax
Deborah Young

Members Absent/Excused

Ammar Elahi
Benny Faygen
Mohammad Hassan
Malik Jabati
Tafari John-King
Robert Lapoint
David Mantell
Courtney Morgan
Robert Puca
Dr. Cadesa Ramharrack
Yahya Raji
Robin Smith
Meredith Staton
Nicole Tetreault
Ethel Tyus
Brana Uwa
Kimberly Watson

Elected Officials Present

Assembly Member Stefani Zinerman, 54th District
District Leader Akel Williams, 43rd District

Elected Official Representatives

Tamisha Thompson, Office of Councilmember Darlene Mealy
Janay Pierre, Office of Councilmember Crystal Hudson
Camille Barbin, Office of NYS Senator Zellnor Myrie
Ethan Nash, Office of Brooklyn Borough President
Leanna Pearson, Office of Assembly Member Stefani Zinerman
Venus Scantlebury, NYC Civilian Complaint Review Board

CB8 Staff Present

Michelle George, District Manager
Julia Neale, Community Coordinator

Chair Weatherspoon welcomed the community and called the June end of season meeting to order at 6:47PM.

Chair Weatherspoon called for a motion to accept the minutes, so moved by Mr. Witherwax, seconded by Mr. Callahan. The motion is accepted unanimously.

With a full schedule, Chair Weatherspoon proceeded to the Action Items.

Environment, Sanitation & Transportation Committee – Robert Witherwax, Chair

The EST Committee met on Tuesday, May 28, 2024 at Crown Heights Center for Nursing and Rehabilitation. The committee presents the following resolution to the full Board:

“Community Board 8 resolves to send a letter requesting that New York City DOT implement daylighting at all appropriate intersections, subject to the following:

- A. *Intersections within Community District 8 which are within a 1,000 foot radius of any DOE-administered school, park, senior center or facility for the disabled should be given first priority.*
- B. *The following intersections were selected based on personal observations and NYC DOT open data collected on crash statistics, and should also be prioritized:*
 - 1. *Buffalo Avenue and East New York Avenue*
 - 2. *Buffalo Avenue and Eastern Parkway*
 - 3. *Buffalo Avenue and Bergen Street*
 - 4. *Rochester Avenue and East New York Avenue*
 - 5. *Rochester Avenue and Eastern Parkway*
 - 6. *Utica Avenue and St. Johns Place*
 - 7. *Schenectady Avenue and Prospect Place*
 - 8. *Brooklyn Avenue and Atlantic Avenue*
 - 9. *New York Avenue and St. Johns Place*
 - 10. *Nostrand Avenue and Eastern Parkway*
 - 11. *Nostrand Avenue and St. Johns Place*
 - 12. *Nostrand Avenue and Atlantic Avenue*
 - 13. *Grant Square (Bedford Avenue, Rogers Avenue and Dean Street)*
 - 14. *Bedford Avenue and Atlantic Avenue*
 - 15. *Classon Avenue and Eastern Parkway*
 - 16. *Washington Avenue and Sterling Place*
 - 17. *Washington Avenue and St. Marks Avenue*
 - 18. *Washington Avenue and Dean Street*
 - 19. *Carlton Avenue and St. Marks Avenue*
- C. *The following guidelines should be adhered to when applying daylighting treatments:*

- *Daylighted spots should be reinforced with sidewalk curb extensions and raised crosswalks to shorten pedestrian crossing distances;*
- *To the greatest extent possible, daylighting implementation should preserve on-street parking spaces;*
- *Bike racks, bioswales, or other useful street furniture should be used to harden daylighted areas, rather than boulders, planters, or other materials;*
- *On commercial corridors, amenities to benefit businesses, such as public seating or greenery, could be provided; and*
- *These extensions should be used to strengthen transportation networks like bike or bus transportation.*

D. The following safety measures should be implemented in tandem with daylighting:

- *Increased pedestrian education and signage as to safe navigation of the daylighted streets;*
- *T-intersections should have daylighting across the avenues where feasible;*
- *Increased enforcement of parking rules and regulations;*
- *Maintenance of all pedestrian crossing signals, leading pedestrian indicators, and push buttons;*
- *Additional installation of these tools where needed; and*
- *Installation of a mid-block crosswalk on Buffalo Avenue between Eastern Parkway and East New York Avenue, to connect the sections of Lincoln Terrace Park.”*

The committee voted with 14 in favor, 2 abstentions, and hopes the full Board supports the resolution.

Ms. Wedderburn asked if all of these intersections have mechanicals like electric crosswalk signs? Mr. Witherwax replies – the city will daylight 1,000 intersections per year, about 20 per district. This is our opportunity to set preferences. Ms. Wedderburn would like to suggest that these are a stronger safety measures and that those without mechanicals should be prioritized.

Ms. Young would like to compliment Alex Randolph particularly for their efforts. She believes that there is an imbalance towards “hardware” rather than education and awareness campaigns which in totality tend towards removing parking spaces and putting the burden on car drivers. That not enough creative thought is being put into this issue, and the default is to reduce parking spaces.

Mr. Anekwe agrees with Ms. Young, believes that elected officials are pushing an agenda of reducing the number of cars on the road. That there is an effort to discourage the purchase of cars, but not enough to think about the people who already own cars.

Mr. Witherwax replies that the resolution has made effort to accommodate the concerns of car drivers, devoting Section C to preserving car infrastructure to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Henderson wants to add Buffalo and Atlantic.

Mr. Anekwe makes a motion to accept the recommendation with the addition of Buffalo and Atlantic, seconded by Mr. Henderson.

Before voting, Ms. Ortiz Joyner asks if the vote is advisory, and if the city will simply choose locations if the board does not put forward a list of priorities. Mr. Witherwax responds that this is likely the case.

The motion passes with 27 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

The EST Committee meets on the fourth Tuesday of the month, next on June 25th at 810 St. Marks Ave at 6:30 PM.

Chair Weatherspoon invited Dr. Raymond Codrington to address the community board. He welcomes the assembled and is appreciative that the space is activated by the board's presence. He appreciates CB8 as a neighbor, and knows that they put in the work. He gave a brief history of historic Weeksville and the Heritage Center. He invites the public to come on Saturday, June 15th for the Juneteenth food festival from Noon to 8:00 PM.

The board proceeded with action items.

Land Use Committee – Sharon Wedderburn, Chair

The Housing & Land Use committee met on Thursday, June 6th at Crown Heights Center for Nursing and Rehabilitation and again on Wednesday, June 12, 2024 at Stuy Park House. In addition to the chair Sharon Wedderburn, present were Nizjoni Granville, Xeerxeema Jordan, Jennifer Jordan, Justin Sherman, Richard Lobel, Audrey Taitt-Hall, Elaine Weinstein, Cathy Iselin, Ezgu Karayel, Nicole Laemmle, Katie Taylor, Mimi Mitchel, Traci Nottingham, Princess Benn James, Jack Robinson, Michael Hanson, Ralph Kowalczyk, Sean McLaughlin, William Meehan, Fior Ortiz Joyner, Pierre Albert, Michael Higgin Jr., Briana Uwa, Sarah Lazur, Conor Ross, Dylan Angarella, Jamell Henderson, Frances Langley, Barbara Cofield, Cheryl Walcott, Dana Thompson, David Turner, Ryan Christman, Robert Callahan, Jordan Fraade, Kwasi Mensah, and Deborah Young

The committee discussed the following:

1. **LPC Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for 891 St. Marks Avenue in the Crown Heights North Historic District.** Application is for a full stoop replacement.

Mr. Michale Hanson of Hanson Architecture appeared on behalf of the owner of 891 St. Marks Avenue. Mr. Hanson stated that the applicant is seeking to replace the badly deteriorated stoop, showing photos of corroded supports and walls leaning precipitously outward at about a 15-degree bulge. He stated that to properly repair the stoop, they need to knock it down and rebuild it, and the goal is to replicate it according to the 1940s historic tax map and original look (based on the photo). The finished product will be very similar to the neighbors on the block that were built at the same time. While the initial stoop was constructed with layered brick masonry, the plan is to build it with concrete and then add back the limestone cladding to retain the same look.

Mr. Hanson reiterated that the property is being maintained “as is” and there will be no changes to doorways or other entryways. Any necessary protections around the project site will be in place to prevent injury to passersby.

On behalf of the Crown Heights North Association, Ms. Ortiz stated that CHNA is supportive of the work, but has imposed the condition/stipulation that the materials used for the stoop replacement are matched stone for stone, and not concrete replacement for the layered brick. The neighborhood organization also asked that a list of materials be provided to verify.

On motion made and seconded, the committee voted 20 in favor to support the application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with the CHNA condition and hopes the full Board supports its recommendation.

Ms. Ortiz-Joyner made a motion to support the committee’s recommendation seconded by Mr. Callahan.

Mr. Witherwax asked if the applicant is in favor – they have met the stipulations.

The motion passes with 28 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions.

2. **FRESH Market Certification for 953 Dean Street (corner of Classon Avenue)**

Representatives for the property owner/developer attended and stated that the 9-story, 240 unit building is nearing completion. Under MIH, 74 units will be affordable. Additional height

*and bulk will **not** be added to the building that is currently zoned R7A. Of importance is that this site was part of the 1050 Pacific Street Rezoning project, where the Board had entered into a community benefit agreement with the developer, who sold and reneged on the CBA.*

*Struggling to understand the application, the committee learned that the FRESH market would replace existing parking in the building. **No new net units will be created** and the trade-off is a supermarket for underutilized parking. 6,500sqft will be used for the market, which will be operated by the kosher market Chestnut Supermarket.*

The project was approved and started while 421-A was in effect. This means that the units are available at around 130% of the AMI using income averaging. The MIH units are available at around 70% of the AMI. The zoning bonus is contingent on the operation of a grocery store in perpetuity of the building's existence. If the property owner fails to maintain a FRESH certified grocery store in the location, there is potential for 10 units of housing to be "shut down" by the city.

Several committee members agreed that it makes no sense to have so many grocery stores within such close proximity to each other (this was the first of two FRESH applications considered by the committee), especially without any legitimate community benefits in the form of more deeply affordable units or anything else that helps to prevent displacement and excessive costs. The novelty of the type of filing—occurring after the building was nearly fully constructed—was noted by committee members as it pertains to the number of units not changing and the only

bonus being that the property owner can collect rent from the grocery store. Committee members recognized that the city shutting down 10 units of housing very unlikely scenario.

On motion made and seconded, the committee voted 22 in favor, 0 opposed, with 1 abstention to withhold support for the FRESH application without prejudice, pending the applicant returning with a proposal for associated community benefits consistent with the letter of intent that was presented as a condition of approval of rezoning under ULURP dated May 1, 2019.

The applicant's representative and attorney Ben Stark asks for an opportunity to respond. He says that last week the team was caught off guard, was not aware of the prior commitments made by previous owner. While they are not meeting the Community Benefits Agreement, the original proposal included 100 units, of which 33 would be mapped to Option 2. The new proposal has 71 units of affordable housing, with 23 one and two bedroom units. 42 units at under \$2,000/mo. This means that the building as constructed has over twice the original residential space, and the MIH options selected are

only at 80% AMI rather than a 50-100% spread. Additionally, this is not going to be an industrial space.

Mr. Delman says that though many people believe there isn't a sense in having grocery stores so close to one another, this kosher grocery store serves a different population.

Ms. Wedderburn points out that the motion was with no prejudice, so the item can come back at the next meeting in August.

Ms. Roach is wary of how developers cheat in new construction. For example, a building at Euclid Avenue with affordable housing is asking tenants to bring their own stove and pay heat. She encourages the board to scrutinize future applications.

Mr. Anekwe asks if the board can table this item until we get more information? Ms. Wedderburn states that there is a maximum 45 day review period.

Mr. Witherwax asks for clarity on whether the board is remanding to committee for final say? The Chair responds that the Executive Committee will take action after the committee acts if necessary.

Ms. Gibbs moves to support the committee's recommendation, seconded by Dr. Lazur.

Mr. Mensah requests clarity: what is the significance of "without prejudice?" This means that the applicant can come back with additional replies.

The motion passes with 28 in favor, 0 opposed and 2 abstentions.

3. FRESH Certification 1034 Atlantic Avenue

Mr. Richard Lobel, Representative, appeared on behalf of the property owner and developer of 1034 Atlantic Avenue. Unlike the previous application of 953 Dean Street, Mr. Lobel explained to the committee that FRESH Certification of 1034 Atlantic Avenue would add an additional 15 feet of height (topping the building height at 185 feet) and 7,200 sqft of residential space. Currently, the building under construction (half of the structural foundation is laid) is permitted for 17 stories or 170 feet of height,

and this application will increase the height to 18 stories. Mr. Lobel also clarified to the committee that FRESH certifications are merely two parts: first the community board, and the final determination is made by the City Planning Commission.

Fine Fair Supermarket will be the FRESH market partner for the application, and the market will be 7,900sqft with additional storage space in the cellar. There will be an increase in the overall number of units in the building due to the added height of approximately 10 units. As this site is an MIH project using MIH Option 3 (the lowest affordability option at 40% of the

AMI at a rate of 25% set aside), 25% of the additional units will also be available at 40% AMI. As such, the community is gaining 10 additional residential units, 2 or 3 of which will be available for families earning 40% of the AMI and a supermarket in perpetuity.

Responding to a question about loading zones and parking, Mr. Lobel stated that the loading zone would be in the parking lane on Atlantic Avenue. There will not be supermarket parking available.

On motion made and seconded, the committee voted 17 in favor, 2 opposed, with 4 abstentions to support the FRESH certification application with the condition that the Fine Fair Supermarket make best efforts to hire locally.

The committee hopes the full Board supports its recommendation.

Mr. Thurton asks if this is the tallest structure in the community. It is the tallest so far, with others to come. Zoning has a height limit in the AAMUP.

Mr. Veconi responds that this zoning on Atlantic Ave is equivalent to the bulk and height of 17 stories. It's typical for developers in places where FRESH is available to take advantage of it.

Mr. Thompson wants to bring up the issue of additional parking – with less parking close by, there might be concerns of safety.

Mr. Lobell responds that there is no required parking as part of the AAMUP plan. One of the goals of the zoning was to increase eyes on the street. Certain amount of glass at the storefront level. The theory is that it is safer in front of the building due to more commercial activity.

A board member asks how many apartments will be in the building. 247. Mr. Lobell also estimates that the development will have 500 “captive customers” in the building who will not need to drive to use the property.

Ms. Muhammad opines that “People of color shop. We don't go multiple times a week, we go once a week. The elderly, disabled, cannot park nearby and must drive.”

Ms. Taylor agrees that elderly need accommodations. Asks if the developer will seriously consider free delivery. Mr. Lobell – in addition to delivery services, they are happy to add on a discussion and request that they offer delivery to the elderly and may consider this amenity additionally.

Ms. Roach emphasizes the number of affordable vs market rate units that are added, wants hard numbers. Mr. Lobell says that this property adds 47 units at 40% AMI, the most deeply affordable units of any rezoning in recent memory.

Mr. Delman moves to support the application, seconded by Mr. Veconi.

The motion failed with 15 in favor, 16 opposed and 2 abstentions.

Ms. Taylor makes a motion supporting the application on the condition that the Fine Fare supermarket require free delivery for all who require it and a hard number for local hiring – as expressed by ZIP codes within Community Board 8.

Mr. Delman notes that there is a Letter of Intent wants to know if there is a way for a developer to alter the lease prior to occupancy? Mr. Lobell – we cannot proscribe or overpromise because Fine Fare has been engaged for 6 months, they can come to the lessee with these recommendations.

Ms. Mitchell – do the operators of this location own any other locations in the neighborhood? Ms. Mitchell volunteers with Legal Hand, she likes this grocery store and believes that this operator does hire locally.

Mr. Witherwax asks if the no voters persuaded by what has been proposed as an alternative motion.

Mr. Anekwe says that he voted no because of the confusion over the number of units.

Mr. Veconi reminds the board that this applicant is delivering more than is required under MIH at deeply affordable rates. This will likely happen again after the AAMUP rezoning.

Mr. Mensah again asks how “local” might be defined.

Mr. Witherwax brings up the history with this program - the first FRESH application the board considered was at Lincoln and Washington, which was voted down. That storefront has remained empty ever since.

The motion is restated, emphasizing points on local hiring and strong advocacy for free delivery.

Ms. Mitchell would prefer to remove a preference for community hiring because it is most likely going to occur without intercession. The amendment is not accepted by the sponsor.

The motion passed with 22 in favor, 10 opposed.

The Land Use Committee meets on the first Thursday of the month, next on August 1st at 1055 St. Johns Place at 6:30 PM.

SLA & Sidewalk Café Committee – Irsa Weatherspoon, Chair

The SLAC Committee met on Monday, June 3, 2024 at Crown Heights Center for Nursing and Rehabilitation. In addition to the chair Irsa Weatherspoon, present were Dian Duke,

Jennifer Jordan, Xeerxeema Jordan, Robert Puca, Nicole Tetrault, Brian Saunders, Gib Veconi, Cheryll Walcott, Robert Witherwax, and Deborah Young.

The committee discussed the following liquor license applications:

1. ***New License for Biarritz LLC, 268 Kingston Ave*** (corner of Lincoln Place) --
Wine/Beer/Cider License
 - a. *Kosher Pizza, former Basil Pizzeria, and Clara Perez (former Manager at Basil) will serve as consultant/manager*
 - b. *Hours of Operation Sunday through Thursday 8AM to Midnight, Friday 8AM to 3PM, Saturday Sunset to 2AM*
 - c. *Sidewalk café with no amplified sound*

The committee voted 11 in favor to support the application as presented and hopes the full Board supports its recommendation.

Mr. Anekwe notes that the sidewalk is very narrow in this location. Mr. Witherwax replies that the previous business had a sidewalk café, that this is not a change.

Mr. Delman makes a motion to support the committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Ross.

The motion passed with 17 in favor, 10 opposed and 5 abstentions.

2. ***Corporate Change application for Crystal Thai, 293 Flatbush Avenue***—
Wine/Beer/Cider License
 - a. *A 20% ownership partner is leaving, and the 80% partner is taking over*

The committee voted 11 in favor to support the application as presented and hopes the full Board supports its recommendation.

Dr. Lazur made a motion to support the committee's recommendation, seconded by Ms. Mitchell.

The motion passed with 29 in favor, 2 opposed and 1 abstention.

The SLA Committee meets on the First Monday of the month, next on September 9th at 810 St. Marks Avenue.

City of Yes for Housing Opportunity

The Housing and Land Use Committee met On Wednesday, June 13, 2024 at Stuy Park House located at 77 New York Avenue. The committee reviewed and made

recommendations on all 15 of the proposals contained with the sweeping zoning initiative. The full Board will vote on each of the individual proposals and then vote on the composite Housing Opportunity plan.

The committee hopes the full Board supports its recommendations on the individual proposals. However, because the committee did not vote on the composite plan at the end of the very long meeting, it does not have a guiding recommendation and instead encourages all members to vote their conscience.

Details are as follows:

Proposal Explanation	Discussion	Recommendation
<p>1. Town Center Zoning</p> <p>Re-introduce buildings with ground floor commercial and 2 to 4 stories of housing above, in areas where this classic building form is banned under today's restrictive zoning.</p>	<p>Does not apply in CB8, only applies in low density areas (up to R5). Allows to build 1-3 stories of residential on top of 1 story commercial spaces. This loosens the floor area ratio (FAR) and height requirements to create opportunities to build 1-3 floors of residential. Requires low density zoning with commercial overlay.</p>	<p>As it does not apply to our district, the HLU committee voted "no comment"</p>
<p>2. Transit-Oriented Development</p> <p>Allow modest, 3-to-5 story apartment buildings where they fit best: large lots within half a mile of subway or Rail stations that are on wide streets or corners.</p>	<p>Does not apply to CB8. Must be within ½ mile of subway or rail; be 5k sqft; at corner/wide street or short end of block. A lot of such buildings exist and were made illegal over time.</p>	<p>As it does not apply to our district, the HLU committee voted "no comment"</p>
<p>3. District Fixes</p> <p>Give homeowners additional flexibility to adapt their homes to meet their families' needs.</p>	<p>Creates a legal framework to ensure that units that have been deemed illegal due to zoning are made safe.</p>	<p>As it does not apply to our district, the HLU committee voted "no comment"</p>

4. Railroad Right of Way

Simplify and streamline permissions for development involving former railroad rights of way. (citywide)

Would not allow capping of existing train lines/routes. This does not apply to CB8.

As it does not apply to our district, the HLU committee voted “no comment”

5. Accessory Dwelling Units

Permit accessory dwelling units such as backyard cottages, garage conversions, and basement apartments.

ADUs: 1 or 2 family homes in any zoning district would allow one ADU up to 800sqft. Can be on top, in a basement, in the back. Have requirements of how far it has to be away from a building.

Vote to support as is 15 in favor, 5 opposed

Attached homes would not be able to build detached ADU. All ADUs will be able to be used for a rental unit, can accept vouchers, etc. they would still have to follow fair housing laws.

ADU vs DU: ancillary dwelling unit—can still be in a single family district and add an ADU and not exceed the number of DUs for the district.

6. Universal Affordability Preference

Allow buildings to add at least 20% more housing if the additional homes are permanently affordable. This proposal extends an existing rule for affordable senior housing to all forms of affordable and supportive housing.

UAP: big one for district 8. Buildings will get 20% additional bulk if the additional is permanently affordable at an average of 60% of the AMI. The 20% additional bonus equates to roughly 15 to 20 feet of additional height or 1 to 2 extra stories (ex: a building in non contextual R6 that is capped at 65 feet or 6 stories will now be able to be 75 to 80 feet or 8 stories should UAP be

The committee voted 19 in favor, 1 opposed to withhold support for the proposal UNLESS UAP is used for 40% of the AMI or whichever AMI is deemed the lowest at the time the provision is utilized.

executed. A building in R6B that is capped at 5 stories or 50 feet can be increased to 65 feet and perhaps 7 stories).

Developers can use income averaging to achieve the 60% AMI meaning that AMI levels can be lower and higher than 60% so long as the average of the affordable units is available at 60% AMI. (Ex: in a building with an extra 12 units created using UAP, 4 units can be available at 40% AMI, 4 units at 60% AMI, and 4 units at 80% AMI.)

UAP is similar to what is available via Voluntary Inclusionary Housing, or VIH, which is the less used version of MIH and only available in areas where there is a senior housing priority. There is currently no bonus for additional senior housing in areas zoned R6B, which is the contextual zoning in CB8 affecting all of Prospect Heights and the area of Crown Heights west of Bedford Avenue (the Crown Heights West Rezoning area). UAP creates this bonus across the entirety of District 8.

Additionally, the proposal will increase affordability levels since it will be available at 60% of the AMI, unlike the

current standard 80% of the AMI for VIH.

Even though DCP believes that 60% AMI is feasible for private development projects, several on the committee believe that developers are already getting a huge financial benefit since UAP adds bulk as of right and prohibits them from having to apply for a variance for a bigger building. As such, the agency should require higher affordable percentages and even lower AMI.

7. Lift Parking Mandates
Eliminate mandatory parking requirements for new buildings. Parking would still be allowed, and projects can add what is appropriate at their location.

This proposal generated opposition and at times testy exchanges between committee members. While there are some that believe DCP's narrative that fewer parking mandates reduce costs which ultimately get transferred as savings to renters, many others disagreed, and instead demanded other community benefits such as greater affordability rates at an even higher percentage set aside.

Voted 17 in favor with 3 opposed to withhold support for lifting parking mandates

8. Non-residential building conversions
Make it easier for underused, nonresidential buildings, such as offices, to be converted into housing.

This proposal allows adaptive re-use by easing regulations on building conversions. It does not apply to areas that do not have residential use written into the zoning (for instance, does not apply to manufacturing districts). This proposal has no affordability

Voted 18 in favor, 2 opposed to withhold support unless affordability requirements are added to the proposal at 40% of the AMI (OR whatever the lowest option for AMI that is used at the time of conversion—whichever is lowest and most affordable)

9. Small and Shared Housing
Re-introduce housing with shared kitchens or other common facilities. Eliminate strict limits on studios and one-bedroom apartments.

requirements as written currently.

with no less than 30% of units set-aside for this purpose.

Quite controversial with a hostile amendment that eliminated the initial motion to not support as currently written under any circumstances.

Voted 14 in favor, 5 opposed to support the small unit portion of the proposal, but not to support the shared housing component.

Note: These are two separate proposals in one unit for discussion. The first proposal is to create even more small units (studios, efficiencies) in housing developments. The second is to bring back undesirable housing types made illegal in the Guiliani era such as SRO's, hotel apartments, and the growing preponderance of shared unit spaces like Common Housing where strangers each rent a room in an apartment and share kitchen, bath, and "common areas in the apartment."

10. Campus Infill
Make it easier to add new housing on large sites that have existing buildings on them and already have ample space to add more, (e.g., a church with an oversized parking lot).

Discussions on what is defined as "not buildable space," with concerns over the loss of green space, open space, light and air, and the increase in heat effects from less air circulation.

Voted 16 in favor, 3 opposed to withhold support due to risk of losing green and open space, light and air, and added density to overcrowding.

11. New Zoning Districts
Create new Residence Districts requiring Mandatory

By default, the committee appreciated that mid-level jump between FARs created

Voted 13 in favor, 6 opposed to support the proposal

Inclusionary Housing that can be mapped in central areas in compliance with state requirements. (citywide)

by this proposal. There was still substantial confusion, however.

12. Update to Mandatory Inclusionary Housing

Allow the deep affordability option in Mandatory Inclusionary Housing to be used on its own. (citywide)

The committee concurred that there was no real sense or value in opposing this proposal as written, but agreed also that the 20% of units set aside for the deep 40% AMI affordability levels should be even higher.

Voted unanimously with 19 in favor to support the proposal with the provision that DCP increase the set aside percentage from 20% to 25% at 40% of the AMI or whichever is lowest at the time.

13. Quality Housing Amenity Changes

Extend amenity benefits in the “Quality Housing” program to all multifamily buildings, and update to improve incentives for family-sized apartments, trash storage and disposal, indoor recreational space, and shared facilities like laundry, mail rooms, and office space. (citywide)

Intense discussion on assurances that residents are not charged additional fees to use the amenities, thus creating spaces that are inaccessible to all residents of a new building.

Voted 17 in favor, 2 opposed to withhold support unless it is in writing that residents will not be charged additional fees to use the common spaces.

DCP also explained that of the 3% of floor space that must be set aside for common areas, a family sized unit (like a 3 or 4 bedrooms) at the end of a hallway will count toward this.

14. Landmark Transferable Development Rights

Make it easier for landmarks to sell unused development rights by expanding transfer radius and simplifying procedure. (citywide)

This proposal only applies to individual landmark churches. It increases the radius for sale of air rights from the lots touching the landmark structure to all of the lots on the same block, all of the lots on the opposite side of the street, and the lots across the intersection.

A motion to support this proposal failed with 4 in favor and 15 opposed.

The committee voted 16 in favor with 2 opposed to withhold support for the initiative citing concerns of abuse of church lands.

15. Sliver Law

Sliver Laws are an outdated height limit that was created before the height limits of today. Height was limited to

Voted 18 in favor, 1 opposed to withhold support for the proposal.

Allow narrow lots to achieve underlying Quality Housing heights in R7-R10 districts.

width of street or 100 feet. Sliver lots are less than 45 feet in width.

Several lots in CB8 are the higher R8 density, currently housing rent stabilized units. There is concern that these rent stabilized tenants could become victim to speculators that would use this proposal to redevelop the sites and eliminate the affordable stabilized units. The committee does not want to make it more attractive to develop such lots.

Given that the committee concluded that City of Yes Items 1-4 were irrelevant to Community Board 8, Ms. Mitchell made a motion to support the committee's statement of "no comment", seconded by Ms. Benn James.

The motion passed with 30 in favor and 0 opposed.

Accessory Dwelling Units

Ms. Maldonado asks: how does this comport with historic districts? Staff responds that it would have to comply with LPC and all building units

Mr. Thurton asks: does this apply to building an additional story? No, this is only detached family homes & basements.

Mr. Meehan makes a motion to support this proposal, seconded by Mr. Delman.

The motion passed with 19 in favor and 13 opposed

Universal Affordability Preference

Mr. Thurton asks: does this stack with FRESH? Yes.

Mr. Meehan clarifies that additional housing under this proposal would be affordable housing.

Ms. Roach wonders how homeowners feel about tall buildings blocking sunlight.

Mr. Veconi responds that as a homeowner he cares more about people not being displaced, that MIH is currently the only strategy that the community has for building more affordable housing.

Mr. Thompson emphasizes that deep affordability is essential to keeping people in the community, creating a sense of upward mobility in the community and keeping black electoral power in the borough of Brooklyn.

Ms. Young – the city is unable to offer evidence that the rate of affordable housing built now is making an impression on the rate of homelessness, which representatives were unable to give a satisfactory answer to.

Mr. Delman is in favor of the committee's recommendation to withhold support in favor of 40%.

Ms. Gibbs makes a motion to withhold support with the committee's stipulations, seconded by Mr. Meehan.

The motion passed with 32 in favor and 1 opposed.

Lift Parking Mandates

Mr. Anekwe makes a motion opposing the proposal seconded by Ms. Young.

The motion passed with 25 in favor and 7 opposed.

Non-Residential Building Conversions

Dr. Lazur emphasized that it is well out of step with the need in the city, there is a need to be aggressive with the language to send a strong message to the city that affordability is needed.

Ms. Roach expressed concern that schools & churches are being targeted for conversion.

Ms. Young makes a motion to withhold support with the committee's stipulations, seconded by Ms. Gibbs.

The motion passed with 31 in favor and 1 opposed.

Small and Shared Housing

Dr. Lazur was opposed to SROs and co-living spaces. Often these are pitched as young tech workers, but this opens the door to landlords illegally rent out rooms as hotels and poor people who are desperate are put into dangerous situations without traditional recourse. She states that the Crown Heights Tenants Union constantly tell developers that

we want family sized apartments, but instead see lots of studios and one bedrooms. Dr. Lazur would prefer that all options within this item are rejected.

Mr. Henderson was not in favor of this because of the possibility for exploitation of seniors. Also notes that many storage units are being built in the area, likely in response to the small units.

Ms. Gibbs is 100% behind Dr. Lazur's suggestion, wishes that the board could divide the question.

Mr. Meehan knows people in the Bay Area who rent one bedroom in a 15 bedroom house. There is an intense shortage of small units in Manhattan which pushes people to outer boroughs.

Ms. Henderson & Ms. Roach both express that the demographics of CB8 are not conducive to this item and are less concerned about the effect on other boroughs.

Ms. Mitchell made a motion to support committee's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Veconi.

The motion failed with 7 in favor and 24 opposed.

Dr. Lazur made a motion to withhold support, seconded by Ms. Gibbs

The motion passed with 25 in favor and 6 opposed.

Campus Infill

Mr. Anekwe made a motion to withhold support with the committee's stipulations seconded by Mr. Aidoo.

The motion passed with 25 in favor and 6 opposed.

New Zoning Districts

Ms. Maldonado asked if this would take away the board's ability to make comment in the future as a community board? Creating new zones would still require a ULURP.

Mr. Anekwe clarifies that this is theoretical, not changing any zones without discussion.

Mr. Veconi made a motion in favor of the proposal, seconded by Mr. Callahan.

The motion passed with 30 in favor and 0 opposed.

Mandatory Inclusionary Housing Update

Mr. Witherwax made a motion to support the proposal with the committee's stipulations, seconded by Ms. Gibbs.

The motion passed with 30 in favor and 0 opposed.

Quality Housing Amenity Changes

Mr. Mensah made a motion to withhold support with the committee's stipulations, seconded by Mr. Delman.

The motion passed with 30 in favor and 1 opposed.

Landmark Transferrable Development Rights

Mr. Witherwax doesn't understand the committee's decision to vote against this item.

Mr. Henderson encourages members to google the Attorney General's suit against a company that was taking advantage of churches in Harlem.

Mr. Veconi notes that this does not make it easier for a church to build on its site, redevelop a church. This is just to allow more flexibility in who they sell to.

Mr. Anekwe directed the committee's attention to New York between Park & Sterling as a property that was repurposed.

Dr. Lazur made a motion to withhold support, seconded by Ms. Young.

The motion passed with 21 in favor and 9 opposed.

Sliver Law

Mr. Thurton made a motion to withhold support, seconded by Ms. Benn James.

The motion passed with 30 in favor and 1 opposed.

Finally, the chair requested a roll call vote on City of Yes for Housing Opportunity as a concept. The board voted 4 in favor, 27 opposed.

The voting business of the board concluded, Chair Weatherspoon called for all elected officials and their representatives to address the board.

Elected Officials

Tamesha Thompson from Mealy's office. See newsletter. June 29th PS 309 visit. 794 Monroe Street.

Public Comment

Venus Canterbury CCRB comes to give a short pitch for the CCRB and leaves literature for Know Your Rights 917-742-4098

Economic Development Committee – Brian Saunders, Chari

Mr. Saunders wishes all fathers a happy Father's Day. On June 15th, the committee will have a Walk of Merchants on Vanderbilt Avenue from 11:00-2:00 PM beginning with Old Brooklyn Bagel.

The Economic Development Committee meets on the second Tuesday of each month, next on September 10th at 155 Brooklyn Avenue at 6:00 PM.

Health & Human Services - Tamika Gibbs, Chair

The Committee did not meet this month.

The Health & Human Services Committee meets on the third Thursday of the month, next on June 20th at 1055 St. Johns Place at 6:30 PM.

Public Safety Committee – Mark Thurton, Chair

The Public Safety Committee did not meet this month because of Memorial Day.

The Public Safety Committee meets on the fourth Monday of the month, next on June 24th at the 77th Precinct, 127 Utica Avenue at 6:30 PM.

Seniors Committee – Gail Branch-Muhammad, Chair

The much anticipated Sip 'n Paint is here at last. In addition to the chair Gail Branch Muhammad, present were Andrea Ferris, Brenda Green, Mary Bonham, Xeerxeema Jordan, Jennifer Jordan, Mildred Smith, Linda Ferrette, Rachel Congal, Gloria Freeman, Clara Odom, Joan Diaz, Essie Spivey, Helen Selby, Frances Langley, Bryina Olivia Starks, Patricia Washington, Jem Scott, Sharon Alexis-Pierre, Cassey McFadden, Jean Simmons, Carmen Martinez, Pat Johnson, Irma Huggins, Anika Roach, Mary Willaims, William Rodgers, Phil Newman, Sheila Ovid, Karen James, Iva Webster, Barbara Cofield, and Jamell Henderson. The chair expresses a heartfelt thanks to Friends of Community Board 8 and the Crown Heights North Association for their support.

The Seniors Committee meets on the first Wednesday of the month, next on September 4th at 1055 St. Johns Place in the Activity Room at 6:00 PM.

The Chair called to adjourn the meeting and the session of the community board for the Summer at 10:32 PM.

Guests Present

Dylan Angarella
Casey Eisenreich
Rem Stark
Xeerxeema Jordan
Jennifer Jordan
Clara Perez
Constance Lesold
Benjamin Rubin
Cheryl Walcott
Richard Lobel
Ralph K.
Jessica Masters
Amanda Blair
Emily Grimes
Anthony Beckford
Barbara Cofield
Drew Gabriel
Alex Morano
Gail Doran
Audrey Taitt-Hall
Scott Weinstein
Roger Myers
A. Wilson-Poyotte
Kim Robinson
Katrina Thomas Markland
Betty Davis
Delores Hutchinson
Phylis Grannum
Jelane D.
Raymond Codrington