

# Advisory Committee Meeting #4

## Details

- Date: Thursday, August 10
- Time: 2:00-3:00pm
- Virtual Zoom meeting

## Attendees

Council District 35:

- Andrew Wright
- Casie Addison
- Ana Luisa Garcia
- Alejandro Gonzalez

Hester Street:

- Casey Peterson
- Vanessa Monique Smith
- Utsa Ramaswami
- Cinthia De La Rosa

Advisory Committee:

- Mike Fieni, Brooklyn Public Library
- Naima Oyo, Ifetayo Cultural Arts Academy
- Rabbi Eli Cohen, Crown Heights JCC
- Taya Mueller, CB 2
- Dante Arnwine, CB 9

1. Project updates
  - a. Produced draft land use framework for review today using synthesis from all the community engagement, including 1,086 survey responses
  - b. Held third and final public workshop virtually on June 29 to gather feedback on emerging recommendations
2. Draft land use framework
  - a. Hester Street presented the draft land use framework for questions and feedback from the Advisory Committee

- b. Are these criteria the ideals? Or will projects be denied if they don't meet the criteria?
  - i. The framework is not just an ideal – the idea is that the Council Member won't approve projects that don't meet these criteria
- c. Do we know that these criteria are actually possible, especially given high land acquisition costs, high interest rates, etc? Are we going to end up driving development away?
  - i. The proposed area median income (AMI) criteria for one of the affordability options were pulled from a project that was approved in District 35, so we know it's possible
  - ii. If the affordability criteria aren't possible on certain development sites, then the projects still have to meet the baseline requirements and their choice of some of the additional criteria, which should be doable
  - iii. Many projects in NYC already meet these criteria (e.g. heat mitigation, a mix of unit sizes)
- d. This framework should also level the playing field for mission-driven developers, who often can't compete against for-profit developers
  - i. If the criteria make development in D35 less desirable for for-profit developers, then it will free up space for mission-driven developers
- e. One developer in Crown Heights really wanted to do senior and supportive housing, but it just wasn't financially viable
  - i. We want the framework to be flexible enough to make development feasible, but rigid enough that projects that get built in District 35 meet residents' needs in the way that they often currently do not
- f. We're open to any recommendations to make sure the baseline is correct, based on real difficulties in development
  - i. Have you asked any developers for their feedback?
    - 1. They know what it takes to make a deal work, and also know what some of the excuses are
    - 2. Agreed, great suggestion
  - ii. We have a couple of developers in Crown Heights who have already bought very expensive land (based on prior market), and are now stuck - could there be some kind of grandfathering process for these projects so that the criteria isn't as rigid?
    - 1. We can add more specificity around timing
    - 2. Keep in mind this only applies to projects going through Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP)
- g. What about cultural institutions? They should have long term leases as well
- h. What were responses like across income bands? Were there discrepancies / polarizations?
  - i. We can look into incorporating that into the next draft

- i. Great work on a comprehensive demographic breakdown – would be very helpful for our work. When will this be publicly available?
  - i. Andrew: Tentative goal is end of August, early September – will send notice if that changes drastically
  - ii. Advisory Committee will be notified