

**TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE  
THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MARCH 25, 1960**

in the matter of ....

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

Borough of Richmond

Prepared by Department of City Planning  
C.P. 15278

VOLUME: 7

CP-15278

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 March 14, 1960, and continued on  
March 15, 18, 21, 22, 23 and 25, 1960.

---

CONTINUED HEARING - PROPOSED ZONING MAPS  
FOR THE BOROUGH OF RICHMOND  
Friday, March 25, 1960

---

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

James Felt, Chairman

Francis J. Bloustein,

Vice-Chairman

Goodhue Livingston, Jr.

Robert Moses

Lawrence M. Orton

Michael A. Provenzano

James G. Sweeney

Commissioners

Pauline J. Malter, Secretary

# INDEX OF SPEAKERS - MARCH 25, 1960

<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Bedicini, Genaro	216	MacAndrew, Thomas	57
Brown, Philip J.	110	Maniscalco, Albert V.	221
Buglioli, Paul	188	Marrone, Frank	129
Burney, Leonard	80	Marrone, Joseph	129
		Melniker, Albert	25,140
Cohen, David S.	169	Merrill, Edwin K.	53
Connelly, John T.	189	Milleysack, Catherine	188
		Milnes, Kenneth W.	180
Donaldson, Mrs. Robert	194	Moses, Robert (commun.)	40
Dorfman, George	191	Murray, Rev. H.J., Jr.	85
Dreyer, William A.	205	Nalitt, Sanford	212
		Neu, Mrs. Charles	159
Endress, Henry	133		
		Paras, Vincent J.	126
Ferrence, George	216	Patterson, Mrs. C.G.	74
Fogarty, Kevin	219	Pickard, Raymond	8
Fornari, Mrs. Adele	91	Porcell, Ralph A.	58
Gale, Marland	59	Sailliard, Walter	17
Ginsberg, Irving	171	Scarlotta, James	77
Gogliandro, Charles A.	73	Scribner, William	51
Goodrich, Mrs. Andrew	186	Solor, Abe	96
		Suplee, Lorin	21
Haley, Mrs. Frances X.	123		
Hannon, James	120	Venuto, Jaffee	119
Herrick, Irwin E.	56,209		
Hoare, Elmer J.	151	Weissberg, Robert	202
Hogan, John J.	186	Werh, Louis	146
		West, Mrs. Helen Crosby	116
Irwin, Richard	165	Winrock, Fred	174
Isley, E.J.	137	Winston, Clifford	65
		Witteman, Harold E.	35,166
Jahnke, L.F.	66		
Kane, Hon. Farrell M.	22		
Kauffman, Abe J.	199		
Lagno, Paul	205		
Lasher, Richard	166		
Lovejoy, D.H.	55		

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

SECRETARY MALTER: Chairman Felt, Vice-Chairman  
Bloustein, Commissioners Livingston, Orton, Sweeney, Acting  
Commissioners Constable\* and Sherman. Quorum present.

This is a continued Public Hearing 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 which are a part  
thereof and which are appended thereto, being CP No. 15278.

On December 23, 1959, under Calendar No. 48, the  
Commission fixed Monday, March 14, 1960 for a hearing on this  
matter and, for the convenience of the public, to insure orderly  
procedure, and to permit a full hearing, the hearing was initially  
devoted to the Proposed Text on March 14, 1960, and continued  
on the dates I am about to mention:

Tuesday, March 15, 1960, Proposed Text;  
Friday, March 18, 1960, Proposed Zoning Maps for the Borough  
of The Bronx; Monday, March 21, 1960, Proposed Zoning Maps  
for the Borough of Brooklyn; Tuesday, March 22, 1960,

Felt / Malter

(\*Edward Hoffman, sitting for Acting Commissioner  
Stuart Constable.)

Proposed Zoning Maps for the Borough of Manhattan; Wednesday, March 23, 1960, Proposed Zoning Maps for the Borough of Queens. The continued hearing today, March 25, 1960, will be devoted to the Proposed Zoning Maps for the Borough of Richmond.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I would like to state at the outset that the members of the Planning Commission are honored to have with them this morning, as an observer, Borough President Maniscalco. Obviously, he is very much interested in the views of the people of Staten Island, on the proposed Zoning Resolution and maps, and has agreed to remain with us at least during this morning's session so that these views may be heard by him firsthand.

We are very happy to have you with us, Mr. President, and want to thank you for attending this hearing. I have, on each of the days of the past four hearings of the Planning Commission, read a statement, and I would like to read the same statement today so that you will be able to have the views of the Commission, directly.

As you may know, we have completed two days of hearings on the general text of the Proposed Zoning Resolution. The testimony heard at these hearings both in quantity and quality has given us assurance that New Yorkers have a growing understanding and interest in achieving a modern zoning ordinance for this City. Today's hearing marks the last

of five sessions devoted to the mapping in each borough. These meetings do not really involve praise or criticism of the ordinance but are, in effect, workshop sessions in which the public comes before this body to offer specific mapping recommendations and suggestions which will help us prepare the best resolution possible.

Many have told me that they would like to suggest map changes but they did not want their request to imply any basic dissatisfaction with the Commission's proposal. I do not want anyone to feel that we regard the request for a mapping change as opposition to a modern zoning ordinance. We understand that many of you support the general principles of the proposed resolution but that you have specific questions regarding your property or regarding your district. We welcome these questions and we shall endeavor to resolve them equitably. Criticism and suggestions offered at this and other hearings are accepted in the constructive vein in which they are offered; no request, no matter how small, will be ignored.

We will be spending many weeks working on these recommendations, reviewing the maps, making checks in the field, meeting with groups and individuals, and the results of this effort will be a Zoning Resolution

in which every citizen can be assured that he or his representatives have participated. It will be your Resolution, and I hope that those of you who are present have had an opportunity of seeing the maps at the head of the stairway where you enter the Board of Estimate Chamber. Those maps indicate the present uses of land in your Borough -- the uses as permitted under the present zoning ordinance and the uses as we have designated them under the proposed ordinance. Some of you may be here quite a while today until your names are called and I hope that if you haven't seen these maps, you will examine them carefully because it will be readily apparent that the proposed zoning ordinance, as indicated on the maps, are more in keeping with the type of community and business operations in Staten Island as you want it, and it represents a distinctive advantage from the zoning as you have it today.

Our zoning, we believe, will be of particular significance in Staten Island. It will afford the type of protection that will permit the Borough of Richmond to maintain its suburban character.

The potential onrush of high density development that would change the character of Staten Island, particularly after the opening of the Staten Island Bridge, will be controlled. The bulk permitted under the present zoning ordinance would enable Staten Island to have a population

of seven million people and that would not be possible, of course, under our present proposal. Zoning is an indispensable element for sound planning. As we envisage it, the westerly portion of the Island, facing Arthur Kill probably will be one of the most attractive industrial park areas in the entire metropolitan region. We think it will strengthen the economy of the City and will improve Richmond as a better place in which to live, to work and to do business.

Modern zoning will for the first time enable it to plan for the future. The fiscal uncertainties that relate to physical building of schools, libraries, parks, streets, and sewers cannot be gauged and determined with a degree of accuracy unless we have a modern zoning resolution; and that is readily apparent because in a Borough with a present population of 220,000, how can we judge where these facilities should be, and their order of priorities, if there were seven million people that could be housed on the Island under the present ordinance.

Now, we have since December 21, when we proposed this resolution, made a number of changes that we expect and anticipate to recommend to the Board of Estimate. In that connection, we have thought in terms of industrial areas, of residential areas and commercial areas. For example, many people in some of the boroughs who have spoken to us,



and this applies particularly to Staten Island, have felt that in certain limited sections it would be wise to have a residential district where the minimum size lots for single family homes would be approximately 10,000 square feet.

I want to say to you that we have sympathetically reviewed that item and I anticipate that when our proposal goes to the Board of Estimate, it will include a new district, an R-1A district where the minimum lot size for a single family residence will be 10,000 feet.

Now, there has been some discussion, particularly from people in Queens and Staten Island, about having the R3 District a District where apartment houses would be prohibited. We are giving that suggestion favorable consideration and I am hopeful that at the time our proposal is submitted by us to the Board of Estimate, we will have right in our text a designation which would indicate that apartment houses will be prohibited in districts which we show as R3 Districts.

We have given a great deal of thought to commercial areas and we feel that while these commercial areas should be properly balanced, we do not want to make the mistake that has been made in the past of utilizing or designating too much land for commercial or retail purposes. We have seen what has happened in other boroughs when that has been over-done. We want to make sure that there is adequate space for retail or store development in Staten Island but we do not want to overdo it. I think the time has come, at long last, when we should be

in a position to benefit, control and guide ourselves appropriately, based upon the history and knowledge of what has happened in the past.

The last thing that I would like to say is that we have had a new movement of gasoline stations in residential areas -- perhaps not so much in Staten Island as it has occurred in great quantities in Queens. We think that is improper and, as many of you may have noticed in your study of the Resolution, we have a section in our proposed zoning ordinance which will prohibit the development of gasoline stations in residential districts; the prohibition would keep the Board of Standards and Appeals from giving variances to people which would enable gasoline stations to be situated in residential districts.

My remarks this morning have been extended, I realize, because I think Staten Island is the Borough which will probably have the greatest opportunity to benefit under our proposed Zoning Resolution. Staten Island, with half of the vacant land in all of the five boroughs and with the imminence of the bridge, requires the guidance and protection that our zoning ordinance will make available for its residents and for its people, in general.

The first person that I have on my list is Mr. Raymond Pickard of the Livingston Community Association. Is Mr. Pickard present?

RAYMOND PICKARD: Yes sir, I am.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, Ladies and Gentlemen, my name is Raymond Pickard. I am from the Livingston Community Association; I am a delegate from the Association to the Civic Congress of Staten Island; I am a member of the Board of Directors and Vice President of the Staten Island Civic Congress. I am here to represent the Livingston Community Association and some of the members of the member organizations of the Civic Congress.

The Civic Congress is a parent organization of various civic and community associations. The Livingston Community Association is one of the members of the organizations of the Civic Congress. I therefore will give a more complete report on the zoning of Livingston Community than of the other areas. It is expected that many of the other member organizations will be here to represent their own respective organizations today.

First of all, I will take up the matter of zoning of the area of Livingston Community Association, which is bounded on the north by Richmond Terrace, from the west side of Pelton Avenue to Kissel Avenue; thence south to the south side of Moody Place, thence west to Bard Avenue, thence south to St. Austin Place, thence west to Davis Avenue, thence north to Anderson, thence to the west side of Pelton Avenue, thence north to Richmond Terrace at the point of McKinley. There are about 600 homes within this area, within the boundary line and

Pickard

probably 90% of these homes are one- or two-family houses, containing actually a few two-family houses. This area is now under E-1 or E-2 Zone. I know that this particular area was classified under an E-1 Zone in the early 1950's, during the rezoning of New York City. I later learned that E-2 covered the restricted one- and two-family homes and we wrote to the Planning Commission, I believe, to have our area put within that category.

However, there is an area between Bard and Davis Avenues and 100 feet north of Stevens Avenue, at a point 100 feet south of Livingston Court, which is in an F-1 Zone. Presently, in that one, there are garden-type apartments in an area where there are some one-family houses, and plans are being made to build other types of apartments on the remaining vacant land in that area.

There are also six community stores located on Henderson Avenue near Davis Avenue which is under a retail business zone. This was also blocked out at the time of the rezoning in the early 1950's. The zoning in this area was approved by this Commission at the time of the zoning of the City of New York, I believe in 1951 or approximately during that period, at the request of this speaker and I was assisted by Mr. Pat Santora who was then in charge of the zoning of Richmond County and since deceased.

Mr. Chairman, it is requested by the members of the Livingston Community Association to remain in the same zone

classification as it is now, instead of the proposed overall R3 classification. We believe that the spread between the R2 and R3 is a little too great; it leaves no zone classification which would apply to the one- and two-family homes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Pickard, your area is proposed as an R3, is that right?

MR. PICKARD: Yes, that is right.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Now, as I may have stated, if there is a prohibition against apartment houses in an R3 zone which would enable only the one- and two-family homes to be developed in an R3 -- that is not now R3 zoning, but that's what we are considering -- would that meet with your approval?

MR. PICKARD: That would meet with our approval. Thank you very much. Now of course most of the residents on Staten Island residing in one- and two-family homes, as well as most of the other residential areas on Staten Island would apply to that, too.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In other words, that would apply wherever we had designated R3 on the map of Staten Island.

MR. PICKARD: I probably need not say too much more on that subject if that is the case. We did request that the Planning Commission arrange for an intermediate zone. It will take the place of the present E-1 and E-2 zone, so that our community as well as the other communities throughout Staten Island could be zoned in that classification.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Pickard, I might say that it is the feeling that we have sensed for the last three to five months, not only from residents of Staten Island but from a great many groups in Queens and Brooklyn. Because of that general view, and in view of the fact that the number of apartment houses that would have been built in an R3 district would be very slight because of the low coverage requirement, we are veering toward the prohibition of apartment houses altogether throughout the City in an R3 district.

MR. PICKARD: The members of the Livingston Community Association are also interested in the zoning of the tract of land adjoining our community on the east. This is zoned as Sailors Snug Harbor, an institution for elderly sailors or disabled sailors, and a large portion of that property is owned by the institution although it is no longer used for institutional purposes. The trustees of the institution have arranged to sell a portion of this unused property to a real estate developer who plans construction of a large apartment house, which would be inconsistent and incompatible with the structures of the surrounding neighborhood.

Bordering on the south is Randall Manor which was sold to a real estate developer in the late 1920's; I think, 1926, 1927 or 1928, I don't know, but that was developed. Under the conditions of the sale, a contract was required which restricted the area to one-family homes and it was a minimal price for construction of those homes. Of course, on the west

is the Livingston Association or the Livingston Community area which also consists mostly of one-family homes, particularly in the areas that border this tract of land. We feel that Sailors Snug Harbor or the trustees of that institution would be unfair in constructing or having constructed the type of apartment houses which were planned by this developer, and it would be unfair to the residents of Randall Manor and the Livingston area. We believe that if such an apartment house was to be constructed there it would tend to depreciate the valuation of the surrounding area. Therefore, we would like to request the City Planning Commission to show their consideration in this matter and have it placed in a higher zone classification, perhaps in an R2 or R3 category.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Do you want a general upgrading of that district; is that your request?

MR. PICKARD: Yes.

I now come to the zoning of manufacturing and industrial districts. As I mentioned here last week, overall, we felt that it was a fair and good type of zoning. However, we are not experts on zoning but we are in favor of certain types of industry, which would be of a higher type of manufacturing or industry to come to Staten Island. We do not want the type of industry that would throw off any unnecessary fumes such as toxic gases, smoke, any unnecessary noise or vibrations which in any way or manner would be injurious to the health and welfare of the residents of Staten Island.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Pickard, we covered that in the performance standards.

MR. PICKARD: I also would like to say a few words concerning a couple of organizations which I believe will not be represented today. I am referring to one type of civic organization, a member organization of the Civic Congress. The area is located at a point beginning at Hylan Boulevard and Peter Avenue extending west to South Railroad Avenue and then north to Reno Avenue; east to Hylan Boulevard. The majority of those homes are one-family houses; there are some two-family houses in there and it is now proposed for an R3 zone. They have made a request to have the district changed to an R2 zone. There are approximately 250 homes in this area.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Pickard, I have just been told that the City Planning Commission has recently changed the area to a G1 zone which means that we will automatically change it to an R2 zone.

MR. PICKARD: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: As I mentioned earlier, since the opening of the hearing, many changes and much progress has been made. Whenever it seems appropriate, I will tell a particular speaker what our thoughts are so that there will be greater assurance on your part as to what our planning will be.

Pickard / Felt



MR. PICKARD: Thank you very much. I believe there is a representative from the Decker Avenue Association and I was told that this Association was bounded on the north by Palmer Avenue, on the east by Courtland Avenue and the south to Crystal Avenue, then west to Hillbrook Avenue; east of Richmond Avenue, then north to Palmer Avenue and back to the starting point. It is requested by the Decker Avenue Civic Association that this be placed in an R3 classification.

CHAIRMAN FELT: What is the designation of that zone at the present time?

MR. PICKARD: Decker Avenue is a Civic Association.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, that is right.

MR. PICKARD: It is a member of the Civic Congress Organization.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That is now an R3; is that correct?

MR. PICKARD: I believe that it is now an R3 or part of it is; they want it all in R2.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I understand, Mr. Pickard.

Pickard / Felt

MR. PICKARD: Mr. Chairman, we also have a speaker from the Home Owners Association. I will let him talk to you on that. I believe we have a member of the Butler Manor Civic Association who will speak to you. They are now requesting a zone classification, possibly to an E-1 or E-2, whichever it may be; to be permitted to have one- and two-family homes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: The R3 zone classification will effectuate that.

MR. PICKARD: Mr. Chairman, there are also some representatives present from Fort Hill Circle who are submitting a proposed zoning, which is R2, and they would like to have that approved. Fairview Heights Civic Association requests that their area be zoned to a classification that would limit the area to one- and two-family homes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That is an R3.

MR. PICKARD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That zone would be confined to one- and two-family homes; it is a plan that we proposed this spring.

MR. PICKARD: Next, we have the Community Association. I believe there is a representative present from that Association. I will let him speak because he has been in an R3 zone for many years and he would like to have that area changed to an R2 classification. I think that covers all of the organizations which we have. However, some of them were unable to get here because they could not take off from work, but I think if they do want to have any changes made, I am sure they will write to the Planning Commission as quickly as possible. I will notify them and they will let you know exactly what type of zoning they would like to have in their areas.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Those who are disturbed about that, will you convey our views to them?

MR. PICKARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

I would like to make a brief remark to Borough President Maniscalco. Despite the fact that the people of Staten Island have to travel quite a distance, by ferry and other methods of traveling as well, at 10:30 this morning there were more people attending this hearing from distant Staten Island than there were at the other hearings of the

other four boroughs of the City. I think it reflects very favorably the general civic interest on the part of the people in your Borough, and I think that you and they are to be congratulated.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mr. Sailliard here?

MR. WALTER SAILLIARD: Yes, I am.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Planning Commission, I own a home and I represent myself and twenty-two other home owners. Our problem is an isolated one. You have a petition from us containing their names and addresses. We are concerned with some vacant land which adjoins our property and we want to make sure that it is classified as an R2 zone. Actually, the problem is that our houses are lined up on Radcliffe Road; it parallels Hylan Boulevard and each of the houses have vacant land behind it.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Specifically, which area are you referring to?

MR. SAILLIARD: (Indicating) This is the north side of Hylan Boulevard, beginning at Fingerboard Road and ending at Steuben Street.

Sailliard / Felt

CHAIRMAN FELT: Just one moment, please. We want to be sure as to which area you are referring.

Your area is now zoned R-2; you are thinking in term of a zoning area which would be an R-3; is that correct?

MR. SAILLIARD: I am thinking of the area which is actually on the north side of Hylan Boulevard, from Fingerboard Road to Steuben Street. I believe it is now zoned as R-2.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Sailliard, we will consider the matter thoroughly.

MR. SAILLIARD: We are very happy to hear that, but today I think you will hear from quite a few people who would like to make that commercial property.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Are you anticipating a change of that zone to commercial use?

MR. SAILLIARD: You bet I am.

CHAIRMAN FELT: So that the record will be clear, you are appearing today favoring the zoning as proposed in your area; is that right?

MR. SAILLIARD: That's right.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Hylan Boulevard is in an R-3 District, a classification for residential purposes.

MR. SAILLIARD: You will probably hear people say that the area is becoming very commercial; they will attempt to extend their commercial property, and we are concerned. It is really a piece of property that is about 100 feet deep and about 2,000 feet long but, it is in our backyard. I brought some pictures of our homes and I think they will stand on their own merits.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Do you intend to leave those with us, Mr. Sailliard?

MR. SAILLIARD: If you look at the pictures you would notice that the houses are probably worth at least \$25,000 apiece. This adds up to over half of a million dollars in a very small area. If anyone here today can succeed in getting that R-2 zoning changed, it would most certainly jeopardize our investments. Whoever owns this vacant land certainly could sell it for a higher price if it were business property. Whoever he is, when he bought it, he knew it was zoned as residential so we do not feel that he has any justifiable

complaints. There has to be a dividing line somewhere. Until now, it has been in the middle of Hylan Boulevard and not one of these homes would have been built if the dividing line had been anywhere else. Gentlemen, Hylan Boulevard is a long road; there is plenty of room for frozen custard stands, pizza places and bowling alleys. Surely, you can spare a half mile on the north side between Fingerboard Road and Steuben Street. If you exempt one corner lot in this area, we will lose, variance by variance, lot by lot, until our homes are backed up against a row of gas stations and apartment houses. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Sailliard, do you have a statement?

MR. SAILLIARD: Yes, I do.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Do you wish to leave that statement with us?

MR. SAILLIARD: Yes, I will.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I am going to read a few names at this time. Is Judge Kane present?

MR. KANE: Yes, I am here.

Sailliard/Felt/Kane

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Alfred Milniker present?

MR. MELNIKER: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mr. Suplee present?

MR. SUPLEE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Suplee, you are the next speaker.

LORIN SUPLEE: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, my name is Lorin Suplee. I am a resident of Radcliffe Road who is also happy that the property behind ours is zoned as R2, and I want to add my words to Mr. Sailliard's in that it be kept as R2. A year and a half ago we think we successfully defended the use of one corner of that property that was apt to be changed to allow a gas station by the Board of Standards and Appeals. So far, we have been able to keep it out. We want that whole area kept as R2. When the houses on Radcliffe Road were originally built, they were built up under a restriction which limited the rent to a price to a minimum size lot and so on, so that it would be slightly above average; a middle class residential area which would lose considerable of its value if the property behind it were reclassified.

Therefore, we hope that the Planning Commission

Felt/Melniker/Suplee



will keep that property classified as R-2. Thank you, gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Our next speaker will be Judge Kane.

HON. FARRELL M. KANE: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen and representatives of the City Planning Commission, I represent Perry Austin Manufacturing Company, a small manufacturing corporation on Staten Island. It is located on four and a half acres of land on Parkinson Avenue. It has a cemetery on two sides of it; there is a school yard across the street and very little housing in the vicinity. That corporation has been there since 1903. It manufactures adhesive, marine paint, and allied products and it emits no fumes, it creates little noise, it creates no nuisances at all. Now, that land, originally, had no zoning restrictions when they built their plant. Incidentally, their plant consists of a number of brick buildings. However, around 1940, the back half of the property was zoned as residential and the 100 foot depth front was zoned as retail. About nine years later, they rezoned the whole thing as retail, and I applied to this Commission last year to change the zone of the 100 foot frontage to retail so that we could construct an office building because we were expanding.

(Suplex/Felt/Kane)

That request was granted and we erected a \$60,000 brick office building which now creates a park-like atmosphere at this plant. Now, we are faced with this situation; That property has been put in an R-3 zone. Of course, it means that we cannot expand any further for two reasons:

1) that it is retail;

2) under the Zoning Resolution and under the zoning regulations as they now stand, we would have to amortize or discontinue the non-conforming use of 25 years.

Now, for the past two years, this plan has just been taken over ----

CHAIRMAN FELT: May I interrupt for just one moment: I learned in February 1959, that we rezoned that property in order to accomodate your occupancy. I recall inspecting the property and it seems as if the new map that we have does not take into consideration what our action has been within the last year.

JUDGE KANE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN FELT: You may be reassured that we will review the material in this matter and the studies pertaining thereto.

Kane/Felt

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: We have not been cognizant of all the changes that were made.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We are glad you brought this to our attention.

JUDGE KANE: At the present time, I wish to bring to the attention of the Planning Commission one small situation. This is a small plant who employs 40 to 50 people who live in the vicinity of their employment. They are now ready to expand and desire to employ more people. If amortization of a non-conforming use goes into effect, and they come to me and ask "what should we do?" I would have to advise them not to spend a nickel because after 25 years they have to get out of that location; but that is not only a problem for this small company, but for many others.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Judge, we have that situation, speaking in terms of Staten Island, in a number of cases; we haven't caught up with the changes in our maps. I am referring to situations where the Planning Commission, after inspection, voted to change a zone in order to accommodate a non-conforming use. I recall personally inspecting your plant and you may rest assured that we shall be mindful of the consideration we have given it then in reviewing the matter again.

JUDGE KANE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Judge Kane, will you send us a prepared statement concerning this matter?

JUDGE KANE: I have written a number of statements and I have submitted briefs back in 1959. I will be very happy to submit another one.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Would you send us a note making reference to what has transpired this morning and also, would you attach the 1959 brief?

JUDGE KANE: Yes, I will. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Our next speaker will be Mr. Albert Melniker.

ALBERT MELNIKER: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, I am here as a Zoning Chairman of the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce, including various affiliated groups. Chairman Felt, Members of the Planning Commission, Borough President Maniscalco, Mr. Shirano and Mr. Parisi, I am also very happy to see the members of the Staten Island Zoning Advisory Committee, Mr. Wittemann and Mr. Sutter.

Kane/Felt/Melniker

First, may I say that I rather admire the patience of the Commissioner for having lived through these past three weeks, and I expect there has been a great deal of repetition. Our particular report consists of two parts, and it will only be the map portion that will be emphasized and will pinpoint this problem. We will try to bring out certain specific points and we will attempt an analysis of the text and map and, may I reaffirm, that we will not bear again on the points already brought up in discussions.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We do not want to limit your speech but we would appreciate it if you confined yourself to the map instead of emphasizing the text.

MR. MELNIKER: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what you have gone through the past few weeks.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Committee, this is a report on the Proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York, dated December 21, 1959, by the Zoning Committee of the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce jointly with the Staten Island Real Estate Board and the Staten Island Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, Richmond County, the Society of Professional Engineers, the Staten Island Home Builders Association, Inc.

Melniker/Felt

This report represents the summary of the text material as well as a complete critical analysis of the maps for the Borough of Richmond. The report on the text was given by the Zoning Committee representing jointly the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce, the Staten Island Real Estate Board in conjunction with the Staten Island Chapter, American Institute of Architects, the Richmond County Society of Professional Engineers, and the Staten Island Home Builders Association, Inc.

On behalf of the Committee and all participants may I first say that the study of this proposed resolution, as well as the preceeding study of the Voorhees, Walker, Smith, Smith report have been extremely enlightening. We have attempted, in a limited time, to make a broad analysis and to make broad, as well as specific comparisons between the present resolution and the proposed. We have found this to be an excellent period in which to evaluate Staten Island in terms of present as well as proposed zoning. We have been able to take a long range objective look at our Borough and we have further with the limited time allotted made very broad map reviews in relation to the text.

It is necessary to point out the thinking and objectives involved in the work of a Committee such as this. I have been most fortunate in having been selected as Chairman and though it has meant long hard hours of work in addition to a good deal of analysis and debate, it has brought out one very important basic point. That this Committee, consisting of Staten Islanders who are very much dedicated to

their role in the community have only the interest of Staten Island at heart. There has been no attempt to set up a class system because — Staten Island as a place to live and to work, has been our main consideration. We have, in years past, discussed our zoning objectives with this Commission and it has always been our theme that we need a balanced community. This balance in our minds consists of good residential zoning that will protect the individual home owner, the one-family house district, the two-family house district and will create desirable apartment districts, with no residential areas created to the exclusion of the comfort and privacy of those already established. We have carefully analyzed our commercial uses and needs. We have certainly taken as part of the total community the relative value of industrial uses as geared to a balanced economy, as geared to a State Island that we hope will be our future community without the mistakes of other fast growing areas.

We have been disturbed by one basic omission in the entire study of Staten Island by this Commission. We have been disturbed by the fact that after as many years of zoning studies, and after these many years since the charter of 1938, we still do not have a complete, integrated master plan. We are in a position, moreso than any other Borough, to have a master plan at this time, and certainly it is basic that a master plan would be the framework from which to develop a sound zoning scheme. We are particularly fortunate in being

an Island having an interesting and helpful terrain and in having a system of parkways and expressways which will form the framework of a Borough that has everything physical in its favor. Certainly this implies an immediate master plan, certainly this implies taking advantage of our terrain, our waterfront for both commercial and recreational uses, it implies taking advantage of any man-made features such as our railroad lines and our approaches to the various bridges. It is only with an open-minded approach to the total problem that we can come up with a complete honest analysis. This we have done. This we are presenting to you today.

At this point it is necessary to state that as a result of our deliberations with both the Voorhees Report and the Proposed Comprehensive Amendment to the Zoning Resolution, we are not in agreement with the proposed amendment as solving the zoning and mapping problems of Staten Island. We feel that it is lacking in sound fundamentals and within the scope of our study find that it does not represent an improvement over the present zoning resolution. We find the present resolution simple, workable, and clear. We find it flexible and the experience of this Commission, as well as the architects and builders of this City is that amendments are easily coordinated and have not made this existing resolution unworkable in spite of criticism. We do not intend to be traditionalists, nor do we lean upon the existing resolution out of sentiment. We approve of it because it has done a magnificent job in the



greatest period of New York City's expansion. We know that the present resolution needs modification and we further know that this can be done within its present framework to meet present day standards through an amendment procedure that has been well established. Its years of existence since 1916 have stood the test of time and the courts. We know that the written amendments have totalled less than 300 and there is a doubt in our minds as to how many amendments would be necessary to make the proposed resolution clear and workable.

We are in accord with the theory that residential uses should not be permitted in manufacturing districts. This has been a theory long advanced by architects and builders and we are pleased to see this item included in this proposal.

Inasmuch as Staten Island has been considered a Borough of Homes, we have given a great deal of analysis to the problem of residential zoning on Staten Island. In analysing the residential designations from "R-1" thru "R-10" and in comparing these designations with the maps, we have been extremely upset by a lack of comprehension of the residential needs of Staten Island. We accept the theory of the "R-1" District. We further have recommended that an "R-1-A" district be established to provide for the more exclusive hill areas and large site residential developments. We find no merit in the "R-2" because it will obviously create a one-family house district on comparatively small lots with no distinction.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That is the 40-foot lot.

MR. MELNIKER: The 40 foot lot.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Now, what will come before the Board of Estimate, sir, will be a zone with a 100-foot lot, a zone with a 60-foot lot, and a zone with a 40-foot lot, for private residences. We think this is so far superior to the present requirements that it doesn't bear comparison.

MR. MELNIKER: Then, basically, Mr. Chairman, our objective in this is to assume in the new text something that will give the equivalent of an "E-2".

CHAIRMAN FELT: That, in other words, would be what I referred to in connection, sir, with the proposed change of R3 so as to prohibit apartment houses. R3, as we are now thinking of it, is exactly along the lines of your recommendation.

MR. MELNIKER: In modification of R3?

CHAIRMAN FELT: We expect that that will be done; we cannot enter into any commitments at this time but, usually, when I make a reference of that sort we carry it out.

MR. MELNIKER: WE find a basic lack in transitional two-family house districts, and we therefore recommend that the "R-2" be dropped and the "R-2-A" substituted in its place to permit one and two family dwellings.

CHAIRMAN FELT: R3 would do that.

MR. MELNIKER: Your statement takes care of that. This may be repetition but it's in here and I would like to read it.

Our greatest concern is with the "R-3" districts and we find that most of the residential zoning on Staten Island falls in "R-3". The "R-3" district on Staten Island will pose a serious problem. We see the need for an "R-3" district within limitations but we question its value to the extent that it has been designated on the maps. If Staten Island is to be kept a fine residential community as expressed by the publicity surrounding this proposed resolution then the "R-3" district will not create this.

For apartment uses and investment we find the "R-3" use restrictive. For the creation of a comfortable residential community, we fear for the creation of unimaginative box-car type row house dwellings and FHA-608 type so-called garden apartments. We fear that the "R-3" as now outlined is inflexible and presents a catch-all that does not accomplish its aims for Staten Island.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I know that's in your text. You realize, of course, that my previous statement would cover that, as well.

MR. MELNIKER That has been negated. Again, on the question of residential: in the field of apartment house construction, we note that Staten Island is very limited in residential zones above the category of "R-3". We are not in the

position to discuss the technical details of the multi-story apartment house at this time, but we wish to point out that the areas designated for other than "R-3" are extremely limited and where they do occur they are not adequate for the apartment requirements of a particular community.

We are therefore recommending that "R-7" zones be created on Staten Island, particularly in areas near the St. George ferry and lines of transportation so that proper use of the land may be made and attractive well-developed apartment areas created. This can only be done if enough private building incentive is created.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Melniker, would you be able, within a reasonable time, to send a map to us in which you would outline the area at that core that you think should embrace the R7?

MR. MELNIKER: We would be very glad to do that, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That would be the tall apartment houses. Mr. Melniker, in other words is it your thinking that the R7 should be confined to the neighborhood you refer to?

MR. MELNIKER: Generally speaking.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Then you wouldn't recommend R7 to be spread to other points of the Island?

MR. MELNIKER: I think the critical points of transportation and the cores that develop in certain communities

are ideal spots for the R7. We have studied the R5 and R6, to some extent, and we haven't had enough time to draw conclusions, but they seem inadequate.

We have read the item in the January Newsletter of the Department of City Planning entitled "Staten Island and Rezoning." We are in sympathy with its broad, basic objectives and appreciate the interest and dedication to this purpose by the City Planning Commission. On the other hand, we would like to quote a statement made by Commissioner Moses and published in the February 15, 1960, New York Journal American as part of a series entitled "Staten Island, Borough of the Future:" Mr. Chairman, you and I discussed this at the last meeting and with your consent, I'll read this statement:

CHAIRMAN FELT: Even the gentlemen of the press realize that at times there are sections of a letter or a statement that, perhaps by error or otherwise, are taken out of context. I would be glad to give you the entire letter that Mr. Moses wrote, setting forth his entire opinion, and ask that you read that, instead. If you wish, I will read it for you. The statement that you refer to was taken from this letter and Mr. Moses sent me a copy of this letter so that I would have it available. I think this is a repetition of the repartee that took place previously. This is a letter to Mr. Witteman, is that correct, sir?

MR. MELNIKER: Yes, read them both -- the one I wrote to him and the one in which he answered. That would be the whole story.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well, I will be delighted to do so. This letter is dated February 20th and is written in behalf of the Emerson Hill Association. I assume, Mr. Witteman, that this reflected the views of the Emerson Hill Association?

MR. WITTEMAN: A hundred percent.

CHAIRMAN FELT: "Dear Mr. Moses: In the February 15th issue of the New York Journal American you were quoted as saying that you disapprove of the City Planning Commission, of that agency's City wide Rezoning plan, primarily because of the way it affects Staten Island, we have told that to James Felt until we are blue in the face and we are proud to agree with you. I could write you pages with whats wrong with it but you are a busy man; but would like to go into a few phrases of this pompous, academic unthinking proposed New Zoning Resolution....

Emerson Hill: We asked that a new District be established, R-1-A-No Residence be built on less than 10,000 square feet 100 feet front, at present each dwelling has this footage or more, we like it and we like the way we live and this is upgrading. There is little left of this type except in the Hills, who also like our way of life. Mr. Felt says NO....R1 will allow houses to be built on 5700 square feet"

I'm interpolating now and saying to you, Mr. Witteman, I repeat at this time what I said previously about R1-A. I said that the City Planning Commission is giving favorable consideration, after months of thought, to having an R1-A District, which would

apply to various of the outlying boroughs where the minimum requirements for a single-family residence would be a lot, of approximately 10,000 square feet. But let me proceed with your letter - that is the section of the letter which related to the Emerson Hill Association. Now you continue:

The Staten Island Chamber of Commerce and the Staten Island Real Estate Board and other organizations joined us in this appeal, without avail....

In other words, my assumption is that these groups joined the Emerson Hill Association in asking for the 10,000 square feet, is that correct? Now, we've got that covered and you have the answer.

"Mr. Moses, I don't question Mr. Felts sincerity but I don't think he knows what it's all about on Staten Island....

You just can't draw a straight line and say this is how the community will grow; there's economics, likes, dislikes, and human nature involved and you just can't judge Staten Island with the greater City....

Take the Magnificent development you made at South and Midland Beaches and Seaside Boulevard will lend itself to more than R3 improvements, just look across the Narrows at Bay Ridge and Brighton Beach and we have these beautiful beaches//// Staten Island is low on spending power not all people want to live in dwellings more want to be in apartments. in certain sections are in need (of more than Garden Type).

Take for instance large parts of the east shore from

New Brighton to Fort Wadsworth, most dwellings when I first saw them over 50 years ago were old and still standing only much older, a very large part of this area is proposed R2 and R3 limiting from one family two story garden type....

And, again interposing, it will not have the Garden Type.

If this proposal goes through the area will become more of a spook neighborhood.

In other words, if it's all R1 and R2 and R3, it will be a spook neighborhood."

"Why? Because nobody in their right senses will pay \$16,000 for 40X100 then tear down the old building and build a new one, nor can a builder pay a base price of \$4.00 foot and build only two stories, it would not stand up it should be at least a R5 District.

Staten Island in these areas needs and wants and can support these bringing many thousands of residents to the Island, because of it's many present advantages and nearness to Manhattan and Brooklyn. This is the bolster we need for our economy and yaping about heavy industry which we cannot get and may lose what little we have, this will bring Staten Island from a status of existence to a status of maintenance and growth.

Today we have over fifty stores vacant in Stapleton, more in Tompkinsville, New Brighton and ets. because the economy is weak, what we need is more good people to live and spend on the Island...What difference does it make where they work, whats the use of planning an academic utopia without support.



The King sits on his Throne but has no Victuals.

We have been talking new industry for Staten Island for many years under the proposed zoning no new light heavy manufacturing will be allowed along the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railroad and those existing will be non conforming for extensions from Clifton to the Nassau Smelting Plant at Totteville. The railroad is now being subsidized by the City, if all freight revenue is taken away the railroad will fold. to keep it running the City will have to take it over. MORE TAXES....The people are howling now....The new Staten Island two and one half million dollar Advance Newspaper plant will not conform!

Again interpolating: That is another item where we made a zoning change within the last year, that we're catching up on, so that it will conform.

"S.S. White Co. at Prince's Bay employing 900 personnel will not be able to function...."

Is there a representative here from S.S. White? Will you raise your hand? Thank you, you will have an opportunity to speak.

"Nassau Smelting employs 600...."

Is there anyone here from Nassau Smelting? you will have an opportunity to speak later, if you wish.

"U.S. Gypsum employs 650...."

Is there a representative here from U. S. Gypsum?  
(voice in rear answers "yes, sir")

"Wallenstein employs 450...."

Is there anyone here from Wallenstein? (no response)

"Piels Brewery employs 600...."

Is there anyone here from Piels Brewery?

You will have an opportunity to speak. I assume that you understand the status of breweries now under our new zoning resolution, not just your brewery, but throughout the whole City of New York; and I hope you will speak on it.

"They won't move over to the West Shore swamps....they'll go to New Jersey....reasons....less taxes, tax abatement, better financing 100%...."

Mr. Moses I can keep on going....what we need is a years postponement of any enactment of the proposed new zoning and separate from the other Boroughs to intelligently help the future of Staten Island.

My family and many others have been on Staten Island since the early eighteen hundreds, we love Staten Island....

Please help us.

Respectfully,

Harold E. Wittemann, President"

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing)

Did I read that correctly, Mr. Wittemann?

MR. WITTEMANN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Now, I would like to read Mr. Moses' reply. I wasn't intending to read your letter, but you asked me to, and so I did.

"Dear Mr. Wittemann:

I have your letter of February 20.

The Department of City Planning and their consultants have spent a great deal of time and money on the proposed zoning for New York City. Many changes have been made since the consultants' proposal was first made public and no doubt many more changes will have to be made before the new resolution can be adopted."

I told Mr. Moses what we were doing. You are familiar with that, Mr. Hoffman -- you represent Mr. Moses.

"Staten Island is the only borough where the prompt adoption of a new zoning resolution or reasonable amendments within the framework of the old resolution can be really effective. The rest of the city is built up, and any benefits which are finally derived from changes in the zoning resolution will appear slowly and will not be revolutionary.

Staten Island has a great deal of open territory and its rezoning should be carefully studied. We certainly favor larger plots for single family houses in some areas and have no doubt that other changes in the proposed rezoning are desirable.

You will have a chance to be heard before the City Planning Commission and later before the Board of Estimate and I suggest that you work with others in Staten Island and come to these hearings united on sensible, immediately practical recommendations.

Robert Moses"

Felt/Wittemann

Will you proceed please, Mr. Melniker? I just wanted to clear that up once and for all.

MR. MELNIKER: The reason for the inclusion of this, Mr. Chairman, is to simply emphasize the fact that Staten Island needs special consideration.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

MR. MELNIKER: "The Committee has considered Staten Island as part of a total picture and has analyzed each aspect of Staten Island from its physical and community standpoint. A report, entitled "Staten Island Oceanfront Improvement", indicates that all waterfront property along the South Shore, starting at Fort Wadsworth and continuing to the Outerbridge Crossing, will be publicly owned.

A new item in the March 24, 1960 Staten Island Advance indicates quick approval by the Legislature for this project. Therefore, we find Staten Island well provided for in the matter of recreation uses along the water front. It is, therefore, our opinion that the North and West Shores, historically areas of industrial development should not only be continued as such but should be given maximum use of these industrial areas to take advantage of existing establishments waterfront facilities, rail and road facilities. These should all take into account that industry requires space and expansion. We object to any attempt to curtail present industry and to develop a zoning that

might hamstring the expansion of these industries. It is well and good to designate the West Shore land-filled areas and garbage dump area as manufacturing zoning. This represents industry in the distant future. Our first concern is to protect and provide for existing industry in established areas and to then provide for industry in the future. We know from experience that the garbage filled area will take many years to complete, and many more years to consolidate, and we believe theory should not overlook fact.

We have large industrial establishments and we feel that it is necessary to have the proposed zoning retain these industries and give them room to grow, and what's more, encourage their growth. It is an established fact that industrial and commercial uses are the heaviest taxpayers in any community, receiving in return a minimum of services compared to the residential community. In order to bolster our economy and to relieve the individual home owner of excessive tax burdens, we believe that fair encouragement should be given to business and industry.

To state the position of the Staten Island Advance, we quote from the editorial of March 22, 1960 which reads in part as follows:

"The first step is to root out those items detrimental to Staten Island.

"One of these may affect some of the borough's oldest industries. We realize the man in the street isn't going to rise up to defend industry.

In fact, we still see the borough as a community primarily of small homes. "But there must be industry in the borough. It's hardly conceivable that our transportation system, still mostly dependent upon ferry boats, can handle thousands of new commuters to Manhattan.

"The answer is for the new home owners to find work near home."

"But such a goal faces a threat that the new plan imposes on long-established plants in the borough-- a threat that could limit expansion and might actually say, "you'll have to get out, your type of work is no longer permitted."

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will call on the industrialists and let them speak for themselves.

MR. MELNIKER: COMMERCIAL: In order to properly evaluate Staten Island in terms of commercial needs, it is necessary to know Staten Island historically as well as physically. As we know, Staten Island is a series of about 12 towns that have expanded to provide for commercial and retail needs of the communities they serve. With the present and projected increase in population, it seems inconsistent to reduce the amount of commercial uses, even though they have not been fully exploited to date. We feel it is necessary to first protect existing commercial uses and to give these commercial uses the advantage of

bringing their establishments up-to-date, to provide for expansion, to provide for parking, and to adapt themselves to the services necessary for modern needs. We feel it is unfair to penalize an existing business by the creation of either non-conformance or non-compliance, and we further feel that many of the items incorporated in the text create a penalty to existing businesses. We restate our position as objecting to the theory of permissive uses. We predict that this will become an unwieldy, inflexible, and expensive procedure which will affect the entire commercial community as changes take place in our economy.

We find that the offstreet parking requirements are unnecessarily complicated and restrictive. We feel that the entire commercial section is not consistent with the type of commercial problems on Staten Island.

In terms of mapping, we find that the commercial uses represent a backward step from the present zoning. We feel that if a change is to be made, that strip zoning should be eliminated in the traditional 100-foot depth. The obvious use of a complete block to permit an integrated commercial use with service and on parking facilities is lacking in the proposal. The use of permanent streets as a barrier between commercial and residential uses has not been carried through to providing a consistent pattern. Using Hylan Boulevard as an example, we feel that there has been a lack of study or analysis to properly solve the commercial problem on Staten Island.

NON-CONFORMANCE: We take extreme exception to the method of handling non-conforming and non-complying uses. We are critical of the arbitrary way this is handled in the text and certainly just as critical of the mapping that just as arbitrarily creates non-conformance.

The wholesale remapping of Staten Island by this Commission in June, 1956 succeeded in creating much hardship, particularly to the small investor and the business man who had plans for the future. This pattern is now being repeated with greater penalties.

We oppose the retroactive provisions as to non-conforming uses. The formula proposed is arbitrary and inflexible and, in effect, confiscatory. It does not take into consideration the nature of the business of the property owners, the improvements erected on the land, the character of the neighborhood, and the damages caused to the property owner without compensation.

Obviously, the owner of non-conforming uses is severely penalized because he does not have a ready market for his land and buildings at a fair price and amortization depending on our economy may become purely theoretical. It will stifle initiative and create a static pattern. There will be no incentive to improve, expand, or keep up with the times due to the label of non-conforming use.

CHAIRMAN FELT: May I interrupt for a moment? I'd like to clarify for those here, because there seems to be



some misinterpretation, and I know you will agree with the statement that I read, Mr. Melniker, about the whole story of non-conforming uses. This will just take two minutes. "I would like to clear up some rather widespread confusion regarding the proposed treatment of non-conforming uses.

Termination of non-conforming uses is required in the Residence Districts only for the following types of uses:

- 1) Billboards
- 2) Non-conforming manufacturing and related uses

I repeat: these termination provisions for billboards and manufacturing uses would apply in Residence Districts only. They do not apply to Commercial Districts. They do not apply to any commercial uses including retail stores, service establishments, garages or filling stations, regardless of where they are located. In other words, our resolution, as effecting the discontinuing of a non-conforming use in 25 years or 40 years, relates to a manufacturing building in a residential neighborhood and we think, ultimately, the time should come when residential neighborhoods should not be burdened with manufacturing uses".

MR: MELNIKER: "The home owner who is placed in an R1 district through no choice of his own will find that if he wishes to convert his home to a two-family that he is not able to do so."

CHAIRMAN FELT: I don't think his neighbors will want him to do so, either. We want to protect neighborhoods, Mr. Melniker, and if a one-family house is in an R1 District, we don't want it to be converted into a two-family house.

MR. MELNIKER: Well, if there is a sufficient number of residents in the community who want to convert their houses, a series of adjustments will be made as they are made today.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Then it would have to come as a result of the request of the neighborhood, rather than at the request of an individual.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: I want to say one other thing, Mr. Melniker, and that is on the question of depth of use: you know that the present pattern is only 100 feet deep for commercial use, which is archaic. When you started your statement, you said that you liked the present Resolution. The present Resolution provides for 100-foot depth - that has been the pattern. It's archaic; we agree on that. We started changing it a number of years ago. The proposed resolution makes that a pattern of not less than 150 feet, which we think is a tremendous improvement.

MR. MELNIKER: Mr. Bloustein, you know in Staten Island we have 200 and 250-foot depths for Retail at the present time.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: For some of them, if necessary, we will make it the same under the proposed ordinance.

Felt/Melniker/Bloustein

MR. MELNIKER: The homeowner will also find many restrictive elements against alteration and expansion, depending on building and lot size. Conversely, the commercial and manufacturing areas being placed in residence uses create a very serious problem for both the business and residence. We find on Staten Island that this problem needs correcting and has not been handled with complete analysis. What is to become of these non-conforming buildings in order to eliminate the blight they will eventually create? This can be true of every type of building that is made non-conforming.

One of the most noteworthy objections to the new Resolution is that it is permissive in nature. As a result, it only permits specified uses, leaving little or no room for interpretation and flexibility as the City grows.

We oppose the drastic reduction of the powers of the Board of Standards and Appeals and the transfer of such powers to the City Planning Commission.

CHAIRMAN FELT: At the present time the Board of Standards and Appeals could approve the location of a gasoline station in a residential area; is that correct? But we say that in the future we don't want that done. In other words, we've limited their rights along lines such as those. That's an example.

MR. MELNIKER: The Board of Standards and Appeals is the agency exclusively vested with power to vary the provisions of the zoning resolution, is best equipped to do so,

and any determination of the City Planning Commission on applications of this nature is not reviewable by the Courts.

It is advisable to leave discretion for the regulation and administration of the zoning resolution in the hands of individuals familiar with the day to day operation of the Resolution and in close contact with the people and professions attempting to operate under the Resolution, rather than in the hands of a group of men primarily interested in the policy behind the master planning of the City of New York. General policy making must be divorced from actual administration and at the same time, the administration must be permitted discretion in order to be effective. We feel the Proposed Zoning Resolution does the opposite and is attempting to concentrate the entire power of the Resolution in the hands of the Commission."

Now, gentlemen, before I continue with my conclusion, may I say this: we have a map review on Sheets Numbers 20, 21, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34 and 35. With your permission, I will call on the various men who will give these reports - to follow me.

CHAIRMAN FELT: May we have some interspersions? Suppose we call on them a short time from now.

MR. MELNIKER: "We find that the proposed resolution, instead of being "a simplified more workable zoning resolution," is extremely complex and all of the regulations therein have been presented in far too great detail.

We offer our cooperation in the effort to improve and strengthen the existing zoning resolution, and we strongly recommend that studies preparatory to the adoption of revision of the text, or mapping changes, be arrived at by the joint effort of groups consisting of representatives of the appropriate City authorities, together with representatives of all interested parties including civic organizations, real estate boards, architects, engineers, financial institutions and owners in the several boroughs.

Further, our study of the mapping does not indicate any improvement over the shortcomings of the text. We find serious and glaring faults in the concept of mapping Staten Island under this Proposed Resolution.

We do not find a clear, concise document. We find a complicated, ambiguous attempt to supercede our present resolution. This we cannot accept. We are of the definite opinion that our present zoning law is clear, simple and practical. Furthermore, it is flexible and has kept pace with the times.

As expressed earlier in this report, we acknowledge the need for modification of our present zoning resolution. We recommend the study and revision of the text and map changes. We feel that this can best be accomplished, as it relates to Staten Island, by a joint effort of the appropriate City authorities and representatives of responsible groups whose knowledge would be helpful to a practical solution. We feel that community minded citizens from organizations and professions working in conjunction with City departments could achieve this to the overall benefit of Staten Island and the entire City." Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT. Thank you, Mr. Melniker. Is Mr. Scribner present?

MR. SCRIBNER: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Planning Commission, my name is William Scribner, I represent the S.S. White Dental Manufacturing Company of the South Shore of Staten Island. My firm employs from 700 to 1,000 people.

We have followed the work of your Commission in its effort to improve the existing zoning law. When the Voorhees plan became available, we studied it from the angle of its effect upon our establishment. It was immediately apparent that the proposal embodied many features which were seriously restrictive; however, since we felt that the final form might be substantially altered, we voiced no protest at the time.

When this present Amendment was published last December, we noted that, as our district was zoned, and by text of the Resolution, several of our key operations and processes could not be brought into conformity. Further, as our district was zoned, any orderly expansion of our plant was impossible.

On January 15th, we brought this to the attention of your Commission through the office of our Borough President, Mr. Albert V. Maniscalco. On January 19th, a letter from Mr. Felt assured us that our problems would have your attention, and that appropriate action would result.

We are happy to say that this objective has been attained. Your Commission has made a detailed study of our various operations, has conceded that the original mapping created an impossible situation, and has made the necessary changes to permit us to continue as in the past and to expand

to the limits of our property. In other words, we have found your Commission attentive to our needs and cooperative in your assistance.

What I have said is in contradiction to the substance of an article which appeared in the Staten Island Advance on March 21st. I would like to point out that the conditions as described in the Advance are substantially the conditions which we originally believed were a threat to our continued existence as a local industry. We had not particularly advertised the action of your Commission in affording us the relief we required; and admittedly anyone with a knowledge, even superficial, of our operations, would be lead to the conclusions the Advance described, by the published mapping and text.

I would like to comment briefly on the mapping of the Island generally, for industrial purposes, and I might say that I am now speaking as an individual and a taxpayer. It is my feeling that our Borough, even now, falls far short of a desirable degree of self support.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Scribner, Commissioner Orton did not hear that last sentence.

MR. SCRIBNER: It is my feeling that our Borough falls far short of a desirable degree of self support.

There is a limit to the number of workers which the enterprises of other Boroughs can absorb; there is a limit to the capability of transport to other Boroughs; there is a limitation to travel imposed by those geographical

points of entry which are economically feasible for use to and from our Island and other Boroughs. I believe that we should, in the revision of these maps, make ample provision for new industry - provision calculated to attract a variety of enterprise, which would provide employment for a substantial portion of our ultimate population, contribute to the expansion of local business and to the support of our several transportation facilities. In addition, we should carefully examine the situation of every existing local concern which present mapping may affect; with the sincere intent to see that no presently successful establishment will be "zoned out of existence." Thank you very much, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mr. Rouse present?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mr. Edwin K. Merrill present?

MR. MERRILL: Mr. Chairman and members of the City Planning Commission, I am speaking for the Children's Aid Society, of which I am Executive Director, in reference to the zoning classification of an area containing about fifty-seven acres, owned by this Society and operated as the Goodhue Children's Center and Playground at 304 Prospect Avenue, New Brighton, Staten Island. It appears on the zoning map #21-a and fronts on Castleton, Brighton and Lafayette Avenues.

Prior to February, 1959 this area was zoned as E

FELT/MERRILL



and E-1. In the original proposal prepared for your Commission by Messrs. Voorhees, Walker, Smith and Smith it was classified as R-3, which appeared appropriate to the Board of Trustees of the Society. At the informal hearing held at the Curtis High School on Staten Island, on May 7, 1959, I reported the support of the Board for the new zoning plan and in reference to the Staten Island property, stated that the Society expected to continue and expand its services for Staten Island children on this property, that the Society was vitally interested in the future of this neighborhood as a healthy and sound environment in which children may grow up, and that in the opinion of the Society's Board, the new zoning would prove an important step in furthering the Society's aims.

The Comprehensive Amendment in its present form places this property in an R-1 classification, in accordance with a reclassification to G., effected in February, 1959, on application filed by the Randall Manor Residents' Association covering property owned by their members along with this much larger area owned by the Children's Aid Society. The Board has instructed me to request reconsideration of this classification, believing that it unfairly restricts the possible future use of this entire piece of property. As shown by this sketch map, which is a detail based on your Commission's map #21-a, all of the surrounding property is classified as R-3, R-4 and R-5 with the single exception of the property owned by the Randall Manor Residents' Association,

MERRILL

along with the Cemetery of the Sailors' Snug Harbor and Allison Park.

We submit, therefore, that the classification of R-3 as originally proposed for the new zoning resolution should be restored, which would be in accordance with the zoning of the far greater part of contiguous areas. The Board of Trustees of the Children's Aid Society respectfully requests reconsideration of the classification of this area by your Commission. Thank you, gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mr. Lovejoy present?

MR. D. H. LOVEJOY: Yes, I am.

Chairman Felt, members of the Planning Commission, my name is Lovejoy and I am President of the Dongan Hills Improvement Society, and the matter that we have been discussing with the Commission has, in general, been answered by the Commissioner and that had to do with the creation of an R-1A Zone which required minimum lot sizes of 10,000 square feet and a minimum lot width of 100 feet. Now, in cooperation and in conjunction with the Todt Hill Association, which comprises the area around Ocean Terrace, Todt Hill Road and contiguous areas to them, and our own association which comprises the area from the Richmond County Country Club and the general areas throughout the hills; we have marked a map within the proposed R-1 zone as presently shown on Map 27 and 21 in which we requested that

FELT/LOVEJOY

consideration be given to the establishment of the 100-foot front and 10,000 square feet. Now, we have also included in this map the Emerson Hill area and we believe that, as marked, this contains the area about which Mr. Wittemann has spoken.

I will be glad to leave a copy of this with the Commission and to thank them for the consideration that they have given to us.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much, sir.

Is Mr. Irvin E. Herrick, Jr. present?

MR. HERRICK: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, my name is Irvin E. Herrick and I am President of the Civic Congress of Staten Island. I will make this as brief as possible because we have a number of our groups who will speak later.

The overall position of the Civic Congress has been that, in general, on the basis of the common sense overall picture of the effect of this plan on Staten Island, we say we are in favor of the overall plan.

Just to touch lightly on the industry factor, it is evident here this morning that the Commission is attempting to resolve the conditions affecting our existing industry. We feel that the new proposal provides for the type of industry which we, on Staten Island, believe will be most beneficial to Staten Island. It would provide the type of industrial park

FELT/HERRICK

and the type of industry which, unfortunately at the present time, are being wasted in New Jersey. They, of course, permit reasonably good employment at reasonably high wages. There isn't too much more I can say at this time except that we have stated the Congress' position.

There is one other thing I would like to say: in the overall picture, it is planned that if this proposal is approved by the Board of Estimate, that it be delayed for a year. Now, in discussing this thing over the past period of time, we find that in the overall picture we fail to see the necessity of delaying the effective date of the plan for one year which, in our opinion as laymen homeowners, would give speculators an opportunity to move in under the existing set-up and, possibly, upset the overall picture which we believe to be to our interest.

A little later in the program I will speak for my own organization, and thank you gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Herrick.

Is Mr. Thomas MacAndrew present?

MR. MacANDREW: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, I represent the Northeast Midland Beach Association, the property owners of Midland Beach; our association is on record with your Commission as approving the zoning laid out on Map 27 which takes in Midland Beach. We re-approved it on your revision.

We feel that for three generations we have enjoyed living down there. Those people came from apartments from all parts of New York, Brooklyn and the Bronx to get away from tenements and apartments, to get away from congestion, excitement and, particularly, the automotive age of traffic. We feel, those of us in Midland Beach, that we came here to enjoy the air and the sunshine and the salt water and so that we could have peace and quiet. With respect to R-3, R21-1 zoning for Midland Beach, we are opposed to any multiple dwelling for Midland Beach, and I so want to go on record. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

Is Mr. Ralph Procell present?

MR. PROCELL: Yes, I am. My name is Ralph Procell and I am Zoning Chairman of the Manor Civic Association. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission and Borough President Maniscalco. You are in receipt of our letter dated March 21st whereby we requested the zone change in Castleton Corners as described in the letter, from R-3 and R-6 to an R-2. I wish at this time to correct the matter by requesting the change of R-6 designation, only. I will send you a letter correcting that.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In other words, --

MR. PROCELL: The R-6 to an R-3. After listening

MacAndrew / FELT/PROCELL

to the meeting this morning I realize that --

CHAIRMAN FELT: In other words, the R-6 section that we have zoned in your area, you would wish us to reconsider as an R-3 designation?

MR. PROCELL: That is correct

CHAIRMAN FELT: Will you send us a letter to that effect?

MR. PROCELL: I will, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: So that it will correct the previous letter.

MR. PROCELL: I will. Thank you very much, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mr. A. T. Pouch, Sr. present?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN FELT: Will you please state your name?

MR. GALE: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, my name is Marland Gale and I am from the firm of Hedges, Reavis, McGrath & Downey. This is one small block in Map 21C; I don't want to take up much time because we have written about this. I don't know whether you are strict about the rule for copies but I have fourteen additional copies,

in addition to the three which we gave you before.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Your name is Marland Gale;  
is that right?

MR. GALE: That is right.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Are you speaking for Mr. Pouch?

MR. GALE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well, because we have his  
name and your name.

MR. GALE: I am speaking for the corporations  
involved in this particular one block.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Does that include the American  
Dock Company?

MR. GALE: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, I just want the record  
to be clear.

MR. GALE: I am speaking for four corporations;  
one involved in a Map 21C, two involved on a Map 21C and the  
block of Vine Street, Daniel Hill Terrace, Belmont Place and  
Ford Place. In that connection, the Winston enterprises has  
a similar protest and Mr. Winston, who is in the audience,  
told me that since we had the same deal that I could state

it for him, also. That is one matter.

The second matter involves waterfront property about which I would like to speak very briefly at the end. Now, this one block of Vine Street, part of the way up the hill, has been zoned for apartments since the original Zoning Resolution in 1916. Since that time --

MR. BLOUSTEIN: What is the location of that block?

MR. GALE: It is the block of Vine Street, Ford Place and Belmont Place. This is a blown up map showing the neighborhood. This is in the St. George area which has developed, you know, to be one of the civic centers, apartment center, parking lots and other areas. This property, since the original 1916 Zoning Ordinance, has been treated as first "B" and then "E."

MR. BLOUSTEIN: That is the area where you have a tremendous change in grade.

MR. GALE: That is right; when you go part of the way up the hill.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: That matter was brought to the attention of the Commission about a year and a half ago.

MR. GALE: Not this particular matter, I don't think.

BLOUSTEIN/GALE



MR. BLOUSTEIN: But this particular area was brought to our attention. Please proceed, I am sorry.

MR. GALE: Not on behalf of the people for whom I speak.

Now, this whole area was originally one of the old single family detached houses in Staten Island, it is right down near St. George, the center of transportation, near the ferry, near everything and it just hasn't been possible for people to maintain private houses there. They have moved away. This has become -- what private houses are there now have been converted into two-family or four-family houses or they have been torn down, and apartment houses are going up. This one area, which has long been zoned for apartments have got vacant land there, would be seriously affected if they were treated as a non-conforming use. It was originally zoned R-6 and all that we ask is that it be carried as R-6.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Do we now have it in an R-2 district?

MR. GALE: Yes. It makes it a gerrymandering section. I don't believe we are going to find any place within one corner as R-2 on one side and R-6 on two sides and C-4 on the fourth side.

BLOUSTEIN/GALE

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Yes, I see it.

MR. GALE: Now, on the matter of the terminal properties about which we wrote a letter to you the other day. I want to make one more statement here. This map that we handle; I can give you another copy if you like, shows the actual existing use-not the type of apartment house for which it was first built. There are many former single family houses here.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Would you give that map to Mr. Friedman?

MR. GALE: Do you need another copy, Mr. Friedman?

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Do you have another copy?

MR. GALE: Yes.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: That is fine. Thank you very much.

MR. GALE: In the other matter, I merely wanted to point out an inequity between the terminal properties owned by American Dock Company in Tompkinsville, Docks 1 to 4 --

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Is that in the Freeport zone?

MR. GALE: That is on Map 21C and 21D. One is

BLOUSTEIN/GALE

treated as M-1-1 and the other is M-2-1. Right across the bay, similar properties in Brooklyn -- the Bush Terminal on the map is M-3. These are competitive enterprises.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Do you want it to be M-2?

MR. GALE: I want it M-3, as in Brooklyn.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Both the M-1-1 and the M-2?

MR. GALE: Yes, I would like to have the same --

MR. BLOUSTEIN: You mean classification.

MR. GALE: Yes, because they are competitive industries. Thank you very much.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Thank you.

Mr. Gale, would you indicate which corporations you represent, please?

MR. GALE: On the one block, I represent Alken Realty Company and Low Terrace Realty Corporation. Mr. Winston, who is in the audience, said that I should speak for him to avoid duplication of argument, and his corporations are Winston Enterprises, Inc. He has written separately on this. I do not represent him.

On behalf of the waterfront properties, I speak for American Dock Company and Pouch Terminals, Inc.

BLOUSTEIN/GALE

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Thank you, sir.

MR. GALE: Thank you.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Then Mr. Winston, you have already been spoken for?

MR. WINSTON: I might add --

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Would you please give your name?

MR. WINSTON: My name is Clifford Winston. I might add that the two corporations that I am involved with are Clifford Winston Enterprises, Inc. and 107 Daniel Low Terrace Corporation. This is now proposed for R-2 from R-6; it's just one square block and, perhaps, if the Commission would entertain another look there, we have had a conference with Mr. Friedman about a week ago with a group that sponsored this change and they did go on record as saying that they got more than they bargained for, which was quite a concession, and we feel that this is out of line with the general contour of the whole neighborhood there because it has gone from the estate type of home, and it has been torn down.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: This information you gave to Mr. Friedman and he has a copy of that map?

MR. WINSTON: Yes.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: We will examine it, Mr. Winston.

BLOUSTEIN/GALE/WINSTON

Thank you very much.

MR. WINSTON: Thank you.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Is Mr. Jahnke present? He represents the Fort Hill Park Civic Association.

MR. JAHNKE: My name is L. F. Jahnke and I live at 31 Fort Hill Circle and I am speaking for 85 property owners in the Fort Hill Circle area of St. George. It is on Map 21 and the area is zoned as R-2 at the present time so you can quickly identify it. These eighty-five property owners have tendered their signatures showing that they approve the department's classification of this area as an R-2 zone. I have here a copy of that and I am going to hand it to your Commissioner in a moment, the supporting file on this.

These people are 90 percent of the owners in the area. They own 80 percent of the land in the area; the value of that land, of their homes and their gardens is \$1,500,000 by the most conservative estimate.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I am sorry, I did not hear your last statement. I was answering an aside to the Vice Chairman. Does your group favor the designation of R-2?

MR. JAHNKE: We favor the continuation of the R-2 designation, and that is the point that you mentioned. Do you remember that?

WINSTON/BLOUSTEIN/JAHNKE

MR. BLOUSTEIN: I recall a hearing we had on that.

MR. JAHNKE: That is right.

The petition I referred to is now in your hands, it is dated March 28th and it was presented to Mr. Friedman on March 16th. We are attaching to this file a note, that we wish that petition to be made a part of this proceeding. We are also attaching a copy of a letter for identification, indicating the position we are taking with the respect to the matters covered by Mr. Gale and Mr. Winston. We are also attaching twenty photographs of our neighborhood, showing the best houses, the worst houses and everything in between so there is a cross section.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Those photographs are of houses in the proposed R-2 district?

MR. JAHNKE: They are all within the proposed R-2 district except for one thing, which is adjacent to it, which I wish to speak of separately. We are also attaching all the recent sales data that we can find in the area, showing the cost of homes that have been sold, not vacant lots, but homes. I present that as a part of the record at this time so it will be in your hands.

Your technical staff can evaluate this in relation to the information that they have, and I believe

BLOUSTEIN/JAHNKE

that it will show that this is strictly an R-2 area now, and that it should remain an R-2 area; that the majority of the homes are single family homes and that the complaints which have been made, a week ago Wednesday, and currently, about the deterioration of the neighborhood, are not justified.

I have also been asked to present this separate petition by the people on the other side of Belmont, closer to the ferry, closer to the Kill, who wish to be joined with this same R-2 zone and have the line drawn along their homes. This area is on the other side of the area --

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Is an R-6 proposed?

MR. JAHNKE: Presently, an R-6 is proposed, and it is on the Kill side, the ferry side of the property spoken of by Mr. Winston. These people have added their names and sent their petition and I wish to present that.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Is that between Belmont and St. Marks?

MR. JAHNKE: It is between Belmont and St. Marks. That is right, you have identified it.

These people have traditionally been part of our community and we, within the area, would very much like to see them with us because by background, by character of homes, by long association they are part of the community.

BLOUSTEIN/JAHNKE

I would like to say a few words in response to the contention that this is a deteriorating area, an area of apartment houses, an area of rooming houses and is on the downgrade. Actually, there is one apartment house in that entire area, which is the Ambassador. At one time, the Ambassador was the outstanding apartment of the Island. At the present time, it is somewhat deteriorated.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: That is the building before you go up the hill.

MR. JAHNKE: That is right, sir. It is at the brink of the hill.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: That apartment building was built in --

MR. JAHNKE: -- in 1932. There have been no apartment buildings built within that area since 1932. On the other hand, there have been a great many homes built there, -the last being built less than 10 years ago -- fine homes of the sort that is shown in these photographs, some of them are there. They have spoken of it as a rooming house neighborhood. There are no licensed rooming houses in that neighborhood, nor are there any licensed rooming houses on the adjacent streets. Now, there are some uses which may be illegal and irregular but I do not want to go into that here,



this is not the proper place. They said that it is a deteriorating neighborhood, going downhill and giving a very unhappy picture. The photographs I have shown you will indicate something quite different. The neighborhood is not deteriorating, because it is inhabited by lawyers, doctors, dentists, engineers, writers, professional people of every sort. In a spot check we took of the first two pages of the petition I held up here, in 32 homes there were 33 such people, professional people of very high grade.

Now, you do not zone by people, I will admit, but I think it is a point which you can consider; that people such as that, do not remain in a neighborhood that is deteriorating. The neighborhood has been stable for the last 30 years. It is a good neighborhood and the people who live there want to maintain it that way. A statement has been made that this is a gerrymander; that there is somehow, something cut out of this area. I think if you will look at your maps you will see that the area does make a solid hold, and what they are asking is that there be a gerrymander constructed, that they be moved back into the heart of this by 300 feet, along the edge of it by 600 feet and out the other side (indicating).

I also want to point out that within that area, the three parcels of property, two of which were

represented this morning, are also joined by a third parcel which -- the representative of which feels the same way as these two gentlemen who have spoken, but there are four other parcels; one is owned by a church that wishes to build a little chapel for people who go in before leaving for work in the mornings, and three owned by residents within this block who wish to hold the old R-2 zone area, and they have signed their names to this petition.

So, by no means is there a sentiment in the area to go in the other direction.

Now, I want to speak just a few moments more in terms that are not boundary lines or streets; they are not terms that may be -- can be translated into dollars, but they are terms that may be of more meaning. An area like this is not the area where crime is bred. It is not the area where your people are on relief rolls. It is not the area where social ills occur. It is an area of people that contribute substantially to the City, and I think in places like Emerson Hill, which has been heard from; the Dongan Hills area, the country club area and places like that, you have communities of people and those people in those communities are the heart; they are the very heart of the City; you cannot substitute brick and stone and building as well as commercial enterprises for that heart. If you take it away, if you build an apartment on Emerson

Hill, the people on Emerson Hill are going to disappear. If you build an apartment in the country club district, those people are going to disappear. If you build apartments in the Fort Hill Circle area, those people are going to disappear, and you have destroyed the community. They are going to join the trek away from the City of New York into the suburbs and elsewhere, and they are going to be replaced by apartment house dwellers, who have their right in the sun without a doubt, but people who do not contribute so substantially to the soundness of the area.

So, gentlemen, we think that the City Planning Commission, in its proposed plan for Staten Island, Borough of Richmond, should consider their hopes for maintaining the heart I speak of, the type of people, the type of community that really puts their heart into things, and we hope that there won't be a retreat from your position in this area, or I may speak for any of the other similar areas in the Island where you now have a community of homeowners. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

Earlier in the morning, I read the names of several people who were not present and I would like to keep to our order. If they have arrived, we will hear from them now.

Is Mr. Gagliandro present?

JAHNKE/FELT

A VOICE: He is outside.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Would you call him in, please?

Is Mr. Rouse present?

(No response.)

Mr. Gogliandro, we called your name earlier.

MR. GOGLIANDRO: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, I am the President of the Todt Hill Civic Association, covering an area generally along Ocean Terrace from Todt Hill Road to Little Clove Road and all the streets adjoining thereto. Mr. Don Lovejoy of the Mongan Hill Improvement Society has already covered our area. I just want to make two points:

I want to thank you very much for the kind consideration you have given to our problem and would like to say that anything we do to keep this area the best in Staten Island, since it is the most scenic, should be done. We also think that the zoning plan should be put into effect as quickly as possible in order to protect our area further.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

Is Mr. A. T. Pouch, Sr. present? I called his name earlier.

A VOICE: I think we have been heard.

FELT/GOGLIANDRO

CHAIRMAN FELT: Do I assume that Mr. Gale spoke for you?

A VOICE: We have been represented.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

Is Mrs. Patterson present? The two names that I will call after Mrs. Patterson are Paul Lagno and James Scarlotta.

MRS. PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, my name is Mrs. Charles G. Patterson, Secretary of the Staten Island Citizens Planning Committee. The Staten Island Citizens Planning Committee is a group of individual citizens, residents of the Borough of Richmond, pledged to work for a comprehensive approach to the problems of growth on Staten Island and to express, at appropriate times, reasoned conclusions regarding such matters. Therefore, the Staten Island Citizens Planning Committee urges the adoption of the proposed comprehensive zoning resolution for the City of New York, with suitable minor modifications.

The following are reasons why we feel that the proposed mapping system would be advantageous to Staten Island.

The present resolution provides a three map system with separate maps designating height, use and area regulations. Besides referring to the text of the resolution

and its many amendments it is necessary to correlate the three maps. The proposal contains a single set of maps, which provide relevant symbols with regard to all applicable restrictions, including parking space regulations. Ready reference is possible to the sections of the text giving full explanation of the symbols.

The proposed maps are far more desirable because they limit the maximum possible population of Staten Island to roughly 850,000 whereas the present maps would permit a maximum population of roughly 5,000,000. Such growth would allow for densities greater than the most congested areas of other boroughs of the City.

The upgrading of residential neighborhoods is to be commended for it because it assures the continuation of our traditional patterns of residential growth.

Restriction of the permitted uses, according to the type of zone, are as beneficial to industry as they are to residents, for they create homogeneous areas for industry, free from the demands of other demands of other users that industrial activities be unduly curtailed.

Also the maps show a decisive attempt to provide buffer zones, thus protecting residential areas from other uses and separating extremes of uses from one another.

Conflicts of uses which arise from spot zoning have been avoided in the less developed sections of

the Island. Large geographical expanses are similarly zoned, permitting areas of sufficient size to develop pleasant neighborhoods or to attract modern industry.

There are, however, two general points in the mapping which we believe deserve further consideration and change.

The first of these is the intensification of the population in those areas of the Island which are already most densely populated. Development has tended to concentrate in the area closest to the Manhattan and Brooklyn ferries. The map proposals concentrate the high density zones in this area where provision of adequate community facilities would be extremely difficult. A large part of the Island now has access to Manhattan through New Jersey and with increased population and the new expressways, all areas may be expected to be equally accessible.

The second matter, one of grave concern, is that of M-3 nuisance potentials from low-performance industries. As we pointed out at the hearings in May, our prevailing westerly winds require that particular attention be given to zoning for non-noxious uses. We are especially disturbed by reported relaxation of performance standards since all manufacturing on Staten Island is in the west or in valleys below our hill-top homes. Our residential areas would be blighted by air pollution from

low performance industries.

The detailed changes made by the City Planning Commission in the proposed maps indicates an admirable willingness on the part of the Commission to work with the people of Staten Island, to create the kind of community which they themselves want. The Staten Island Citizens Planning Committee has been among those who have suggested such specific changes, some of which have already been incorporated into the maps. Others are still under consideration. A few additional suggestions will be presented for similar direct discussion.

Summarizing the position of the Staten Island Citizens Planning Committee, we wish to state that from our study of the proposed mapping system we conclude that its adoption would be advantageous to residence, commerce and industry and would promote sound, long range growth of the Island. We therefore endorse the proposal.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mr. Lagno present?

(No response.)

Is Mr. Scarlotta present?

MR. SCARLOTTA: Yes sir, I am.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, my name is James Scarlotta and I am President of the Clovina

FELT/SCARLOTTA



Park Civic Association. We, the tax-payers, homeowners and residents of that part of Sunnyside, Staten Island, known as recorded in the old maps of Ward 2 as Clovina Park and whose boundary lines are within the following named streets:

Victory Boulevard to Labau Avenue to Clove Road; Clove Road from Victory Boulevard to Little Clove Road; Little Clove Road -- from Clove Road to Northern Boulevard; and, Little Clove Road to Labau Avenue, and Labau Avenue from Northern Boulevard up to Victory Boulevard.

We respectfully petition you for all the property within the bounds of the above-named streets from its present classification of R-3 to classification R-2, which is requested by the Clovina Park Civic Association.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Would you say, sir, that you would like an upgrading from R-3 to R-2?

MR. SCARLOTTA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Would you say that the majority of people in that designated area R-3 would want an R-2?

MR. SCARLOTTA: Yes, R-2.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: What is the nature of their houses?

MR. SCARLOTTA: Well, sir, one and two-family

FELT/SCARLOTTA/BLOUSTEIN

homes are in that whole area.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: Are they attached or semi-detached?

MR. SCARLOTTA: No, attached; just one and two-family homes.

MR. BLOUSTEIN: I see, free standing homes.

MR. SCARLOTTA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: A two-family home in an R-2 would be non-conforming. An R-2 is just for one-family homes. Mr. Scarlotta, what I mentioned earlier this morning, I don't know whether you were present, was this: our present thinking is to see that in an R-3 no apartment construction would be permitted. If that were the case, would your people be satisfied with R-3?

MR. SCARLOTTA: Yes, they would be satisfied with no construction of new apartments.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In other words, if that is the designation that we ultimately decide on, and if our recommendations to the Board of Estimate is that no apartment houses be permitted in an R-3, then your people would be satisfied.

BLOUSTEIN/SCARLOTTA/FELT

MR. SCARLOTTA: They would be satisfied.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I think your people would then be better off because otherwise the owners of two-family houses would be non-complying.

MR. SCARLOTTA: I see. I will also say that the association also agrees to support the proposed zoning and for the resolution to take effect July, 1960 instead of 1961. Thank you, gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

Is Mr. Burney present?

MR. BURNEY: Yes sir, I am.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Then, after Mr. Burney is Reverend Murray, Jr.

REV. MURRAY: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Then, Mrs. Adele Fornari.

MRS. FORNARI: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well.

MR. BURNEY: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, my name is Leonard Burney and I am the Secretary of the Clove Lakes Civic Association. Our

Association consists of over 100 families in the Clove Lakes - Sunnyside section of Staten Island.

The membership feels that, in general, the proposed resolution is a good one and will help to preserve the character and general development of the Borough. However, we do feel that the resolution can be improved. While the membership has not made any detailed analysis of the resolution as it affects the Island in general, if the articles that have been appearing in the Staten Island Advance this week are to be believed, we feel that the Commission should give further consideration to the manufacturing and commercial districts. We do not believe, as do some areas of Westchester County and New Jersey, that our salvation lies in 100 percent residential areas. We feel that manufacturing and commerce are important to the economy of Staten Island.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I would like to interrupt for just a moment. Principally, as a point of reassurance to you, the Planning Commission feels that it is of great importance to see that proper opportunity is given for business and industry in Staten Island.

What we are endeavoring to do is to see that the uses are compatible uses; that the performance is a satisfactory performance. I read earlier from a statement

this morning in which we expressed our belief that a goodly portion of the westerly section of the Island facing off the Kill could definitely be utilized very beneficially for the whole Island.

MR. BURNEY: May I continue?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, sir.

MR. BURNEY: Industry serves to provide jobs for the residents and also helps to pay our taxes.

Therefore, we believe that industry should not be dealt with too harshly and should be given an opportunity to expand with the economy.

We are interested in one specific proposal in the proposed resolution that we feel is extremely detrimental to our neighborhood; that is, the proposal to surround Clove Lakes Park with narrow R6 districts.

Apartments of the nature permitted in an R6 district are clearly inconsistent with the development of the areas within the proposed R6 districts themselves.

All of the areas surrounding these proposed R6 zones have been proposed for R2 or R3 districts. Most of the present development in these surrounding R3 areas meet the restrictions and requirements for the R2

zone. This is also true of the present development within the proposed R-6 areas.

I have made a land-use study of the present use and development of the land within the proposed R-6 areas. I believe that you will agree that to plunk an R-6 type apartment house into the few remaining lots, is extremely bad from an aesthetic point of view, from a City Planning point of view and from a school - use point of view.

The land within the three proposed R-6 zones is presently used as follows:

First, the area along Victory Boulevard is occupied by one-family residences for a total of 221,300 square feet, which is 61.5 per cent of the total. Vacant land is 130,600 square feet for a total of 36.3 per cent. Commercial use is 8,100 square feet or 2.2 per cent.

Along Brookside Avenue, that is along the westerly side of the park, one-family residences occupy 242,000 square feet or 67 percent. Two-family residences occupy 28,000 square feet or 7.8 per cent. Vacant land is 57,000 square feet or 15.8 per cent, and a church occupies 34,000 square feet or 9.4 per cent.

Along Clove Road, which is along the easterly side of the Park, one-family residences occupy

223,600 square feet or 16.2 per cent. Vacant land is 581,000 square feet or 41.2 per cent.

I might point out in connection with this vacant land, that 351,000 square feet of that area technically, is vacant. However, it is owned by a riding academy and has been developed with bridle paths.

There is another stable and riding academy in there, occupying 72,800 square feet or a total of 5.3 per cent. Commercial use is 39,000 square feet or 2.9 per cent. A cemetery occupies 410,000 square feet or 29.8 per cent, and a church occupies 67,500 square feet or 4.6 per cent.

If the proposed R-6 zones are permitted to remain, the children from the apartment houses that would be built, would go to P.S. 29. This school is now overcrowded and on triple session. To build an extension to the school is unlikely and impractical because there have been two additions built already. There is no place to put another extension, except on top of the existing building. The substructures and columns probably were not designed to take the additional load.

The normal growth of the neighborhood will place enough of an additional strain on the school facilities without the added burden of apartment construction.

I hope that the foregoing will help your Commission understand the problems peculiar to our neighborhood.

BURNEY

I hope that it will bring out to you the impracticability and undesirability of R-6 zones around the park.

Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission for your time.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

Reverend Herbert J. Murray, Jr. will be our next speaker.

REV. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission and Mr. President of the Borough of Richmond, I am Herbert J. Murray, Jr., Pastor of the Park Baptist Church in Port Richmond, and I am speaking for the Church Planning Committee of the Staten Island Division of the Protestant Council. I am the Baptist member of this Committee and, for the last year, I have been Chairman of the Subcommittee on zoning. May I just say who we are and why we think we are prepared enough to speak. I think that may answer some questions.

The Church Planning Committee is part of the Protestant Council and its purpose is to survey the Island. We published some studies already and our master plan will be out the 15th of April, which we hope will hold us until 1975. We also have carried on discussions which seek to adjust any conflicts between denominational churches as to the locations and new sites, and all that



type of adjustments and problems. We try to keep abreast with real estate happenings and the theories as well as zoning and planning as it affects the churches and neighborhoods where our people live.

A year ago as to preparation, that when the Voorhees, Walker, Smith and Smith Report came out we got a copy and we began to study, and we also studied both text and the maps and sent it to all our churches, listings of just what the changes were, as against the present law and what this recommendation of what that company made would be. We consulted with the various ones about the changes. We also read extensively in the text, not understanding all of it because we are not professional people at this level, but thinking that we pretty well got the sense of it. Our subcommittee, which is made up of three members, one from each section of the Island -- the east, the north and the south. Since December, when your Proposed Comprehensive Amendment has come out, we purchased a copy of that and had gone through it again, trying to check the changes, both those announced publicly in the press and so on but things which we were particularly interested in. We compared this with -- and may I say, we have also done some work on the Harrison Proposal to see what some of the background of the study was.

We evaluated during this period, since

December, all criticisms that we could gather which were coming from various quarters, and we checked the facts, specifically with some of the heads of industries which were often mentioned. I called them and talked with them to learn just what the facts were. Our Subcommittee reported to the full Committee; they had asked us to do this over a month ago and we reported this week, and on Wednesday, the full Committee made up of the denominational representatives, prepared the statement which they have asked me to read today. So we feel that we are about as up-to-date on this as we can be, and being just lay people in this field.

This is a statement of the Church Planning Committee of the Staten Island Division of the Protestant Council on the Proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York.

The Church Planning Committee approves in principle the purposes and substance of the proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution and desires to express appreciation for the constructive civic leadership manifested by the Mayor and the members of the Planning Commission.

The Church Planning Committee affirms the desirability of good zoning, which works for the welfare of the community and its people. It serves to protect

their homes and their commercial and manufacturing establishments, assuring wholesome and orderly development for the benefit of this and future generations.

The improvement of zoning regulations in a community as old and well developed as Staten Island will inevitably be less than satisfactory for some people. Inadequacies may be expected. However, the interest of every resident and business and industrial establishment should be protected as far as possible. The extent of this protection should be limited by the welfare of the community as a whole, which is the primary consideration.

The text of the proposed amendment is an improvement over the present zoning resolution. The Committee observes that the Proposed Amendment would maintain and establish:

1. Better physical settings for wholesome family living.
2. Improved traffic flow by the extension of requirements for off-street parking, facilitating participation in community activities.
3. Consistency and balance in land use.
4. Controls to prevent deterioration

of residential and commercial areas and the development of slums.

After communication with and response from member churches, the Committee affirms that all of the mapped zone designations affecting these churches are reasonable.

This is the end of our statement, adopted March 23rd., of the year 1960. How many copies would you like to have?

CHAIRMAN FELT: How many copies do you have available, sir.

REV. MURRAY: Well, I think I have about 18, or something like that.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, if we could have 14 copies, we would appreciate it.

REV. MURRAY: Very well, sir.

We also passed a resolution on Wednesday, which affects an item in the text. It has to do with the clarification of definition of which seats are to be counted when figuring the parking spaces for the churches, because we always have more chairs than we have people. One hour they would sit in one chair and the next hour they would sit in another chair.

FELT/MURRAY

CHAIRMAN FELT: If you submit that material with your other report, I think it will suffice.

REV. MURRAY: It will not be necessary for me to read it? Do you want it read?

CHAIRMAN FELT: You may.

REV. MURRAY: The Resolution of the Church Planning Committee, Staten Island Division of the Protestant Council on the Proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York.

The Committee on Church Planning calls to the attention of the City Planning Commission that the requirement of off-street parking for churches in the Proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution should specify which seats are to be counted in the unit of measurement.

The present Proposal could be interpreted as including seats occupied by children in Sunday Church School rooms. The unit of measurement should be seating available in the nave of a church. For example, it is suggested that the wording on page 31 pertaining to churches be changed to read as follows:

1 per 10 seats in nave

1 per 20 seats in nave

FELT/MURRAY

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much, sir.

REV. MURRAY: You are welcome.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mrs. Adele Fornari present?

MRS. FORNARI: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Then after Mrs. Fornari will be Mr. Abe Soler and then Mr. Saul Brown.

MRS. FORNARI: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, my name is Adele Fornari. It has been my privilege to hear you speak, Chairman Felt, on numerous occasions at meetings held on Staten Island regarding the rezoning of New York City and I feel you are sincerely trying to do this big job for the benefit of the City as a whole. This will undoubtedly hurt some people and I realize that it is unavoidable.

However, I also feel that the Commission would not intentionally cause hardship even to one person if it were not necessary to benefit the majority.

My request, if granted, would be conforming - not injuring the character of the neighborhood and would hurt no one.

For that reason I am here regarding a piece of property 40' by 100' on Norden Street, Dongan Hills

FELT/MURRAY/FORNARI

Colony. This property has been in Zone E since I purchased it twelve years ago, permitting any type residence.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Pardon me. What is the address on Norden Street?

MRS. FORNARI: Norden Street? It is 49; it is the block that takes in 100 feet of commercial right now or retail, rather. It is Richmond Road, up on Norden Street. It is on Map 27 -- oh, I see, you have the map.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, I have your map.

MRS. FORNARI: Well, it's right from Richmond Road, and it is Block 7, down at the bottom of Richmond Road.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, I see it.

MRS. FORNARI: Now, if you will see, I have the only piece of vacant land left there marked in red, on Norden Street, 40 by 100.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, we see it.

MRS. FORNARI: You have that; now, it has been in Zone E since I purchased it twelve years ago.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That is near and shown as 120 feet from Duchess Avenue?

FELT/FORNARI

MRS. FORNARI: That is right.

All the buildings in this zone, as you will see by those little blue markings there, are one and two-family houses, and they are all on 40 by 100-foot plots.

Now, the assessment on this property has tripled in the past two years; yet if the new zoning is passed, I will not be permitted to build a two-family house which conforms with all other houses in this area.

CHAIRMAN FELT: What is the proposed zone for that area?

MRS. FORNARI: It is R-1.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes.

MRS. FORNARI: It is R-1 which permits one-family houses on 60 by 100 only, I understand?

CHAIRMAN FELT: R-1 --

MRS. FORNARI: It is 60 by 100.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I see.

MRS. FORNARI: Now, this property is on the same block, as I said, with that part which is zoned retail; that is Richmond Road, one hundred feet up. That is the same block. Do you have that?

FELT/FORNARI



I understand there has been a request concerning the property in Dongan Hills Colony, which is a very nice section, be zoned R-1. I believe some people do want that. However, that refers to the property in the northerly part that is just being developed. The rest of this map is all developed; every house is built with the exception of one or two pieces of property left, and they are 40 by 100, and they would really be confiscated that is, if they couldn't build on it.

There really isn't very much I can say about that except that I would respectfully urge you to reconsider the zoning and place the property presently in the Zone E, which is just that one block that is circled in red, that takes Duchess Avenue down to Richmond Road.

MR. ORTON: Did you say what the present zoning is?

MRS. FORNARI: The present zoning is E, and the next block is E-1. The present zoning from Richmond Road to Duchess Avenue is E. It would have permitted an apartment house, really, any type residence at all.

MR. ORTON: Even if it were an R-1, there is a special provision so that a single, smaller lot can

be built on, -- but I am not pre-judging your other request.

MRS. FORNARI: Well, the only thing is that expenses being what they are today, a one-family house would be out of our reach.

MR. ORTON: Yes, but I just wanted you to know that it is legally possible to do that.

MRS. FORNARI: Well, that would be if the present owner has it but if I were to give it to my daughter, she couldn't build --

MR. ORTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will consider your statements --

MRS. FORNARI: Now, the idea is that in the other little map that you have in the book there, if you will notice that property way up there, most of the people have been talking about hill property, well, they are restricted, and all of them are anxious for 80 by 100 and then I understand why they want that. However, near Richmond Road, I can't see that it should be so restricted.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well.

FORNARI/ORTON/FELT

MRS. FORNARI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Our next speaker will be Mr. Abe Solor.

MR. SOLOR: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, Mr. Borough President, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Abe Solor and I am representing Birlor Realty Corporation on the Foxhills tract, of which I am Chairman of the Board and the Kings Mercantile Corporation on another parcel on Vanderbilt and Tompkins Avenue, of which I have an interest.

I will speak on a general concept of the overall zoning and mapping of Staten Island insofar as residences go, as a builder, developer and real estate man of 35 years standing. Insofar as Map No. 21D, embodying the Foxhills tract, which you gentlemen have put in an R-5 zone, which is much less than the present E zone we have today, and the business districts which have been taken off over a period of years, to which we didn't object because of certain plans we had which did not develop because of not obtaining the variance. We still feel that this is exclusively today an apartment house zone, having the main trunk line sewers, I mean 8-foot sewers running along Garden Street; drainage maps already approved for Palmer Drive in sewage from 48 inches to 18 inches and

school facilities with Public School 14, at one end, a P.S. 12 at one end a Junior High School being developed next to P.S. 14.

And at the same time, may I say at the outset that anything that we do within our 100 and some odd acre tract, we will arrange with the Board of Education for a site, either for a new P.S. 12, or for school facilities for the population that will be embodied within this tract.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Before Mrs. Fornari leaves, is Mrs. Fornari still here? Mrs. Monson, will you please speak to Mrs. Fornari? We want to explain something to you, which I think will solve your problem.

MR. SOLOR: We are willing to accept the R5 zone up to a point on the north side of Osgood Avenue, adjoining property which we developed in previous years. We are willing to accept the R5 zone south of Palmer Drive, from the southern side of Palmer Drive, but we want an R6 zone in that area between Vanderbilt Avenue, Targee Street, Osgood Avenue, Palmer Drive, and Mosel Avenue. The reason for that is this: When you take our "E" district, and give us an R5 zone in all of the property, you are cutting our coverage in half. We have owned this property

for 14 years. We have been stymied from developing it for the first seven or eight years because of its occupancy by the State Housing Board for Temporary Housing for Veterans. After that we had planned a shopping center on part of this, and we were stymied in the next 3 or 4 years from developing it.

When you today put it in an R-5 district entirely, you are doing something that has cost us to carry, in these years, over a million and some odd dollars.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Does some part of it go into R-6?

MR. SOLOR: That part that I just said goes into R-6. Exclusive of the blocks between Targee Street, Parkhill Avenue, Sobel Court and Palmer Drive, which we discussed with you people informally for a retail shopping center, which is a whole lot less than the 50 acre shopping center that we tried to get.

CHAIRMAN FELT: And everything north of that is in R-6?

MR. SOLOR: R-6 and the entire frontage on Vanderbilt Avenue, which only includes a plot of 160,000 feet and another block on Parkhill Avenue of 140,000 feet,

Felt/Solor

and of course we have a master 50 acre block there which will not have any City Streets through it, but will be developed as a whole, as one housing project.

We think we are very fair in asking this in view of this fact; also, that the City of New York thought well enough to raise us in our assessed valuation this year, the phenomenal sum of \$1,070,000 a 270% increase.

Of course we reserve the right, which we are appearing before the Board of Assessors for the unequal rise on Staten Island and for many other purposes which we will do at the hearing to protect our equity in the property.

But this is one section that lends itself for proper apartment-house development. And we don't want to be restricted. While the R-5 gives us a better 2 story coverage than we may need to properly develop the thing with a mixture of both two story buildings and possibly six, and possibly some high-rise buildings using small percentages of the land.

Your R-5 district for two story buildings and for three story buildings, let me say, isn't very good to us because the minute we go into three story buildings under the multiple dwelling law, even the two and one-half story building that is being built in Chicago, and all around Chicago today, which is the trend today, would not allow us to

build it except at a cost for 12 inch walls, instead of eight inch walls, and that would make it economically unsound. So you have many reasons why the property in an R-5 district will not be good for our development.

That is as much as I want to say about Foxhills, and I hope you gentlemen will consider it from the economic standpoint, as well as from the zoning standpoint. In my experience, economics in the future is going to have a very, very, important place in the building of rental housing, because if you are going to build it to a high rent, economically it's going to be wrong. Now, we must be in a position of a free-standing decision as to whether we want to go high-rise or low-rise, because the six story building, in my opinion, is going to be outmoded in the next few years because the cost between a six story semi-fire proof, and a fire-proof concrete arts construction building is getting closer and closer together each day.

So, six stories will be out, and so will two stories, if the zoning code is built, you'll have three story and high-rise buildings.

Now, as far as the corner of Vanderbilt and Tompkins Avenue, that is the northeast corner, opposite the Safeway Supermarket, which we happened to have owned and it was sold to Safeway some years ago, and it is owned by Metropolitan

Life today. We have the only plot on all the four corners. We had the plot on the corner where the apartment house is built, and while it was zoned for business, we only built professional suites on the Tompkins Avenue side.

When the business zoning was taken off, I had no objections. Safeway developed on the other side of the street, and we have had from the last time I owned the property, before that, a business zone of 380 feet by 100 foot in depth on Tompkins Avenue.

Today you will eliminate that business zone. We had in mind to come in to stretch that business zone to a 200 foot depth to properly develop that piece. It is the only piece between the United States Marine Hospital, the U. S. Public Health Hospital, today, and the Mariners Home, and our piece is that one tract of 175,000 feet.

We would like the 380 feet on Tompkins Avenue, which you zoned as an R-5 now put back in the retail district, the same as the Safeway Store opposite it to a depth of 200 feet, and the balance of 100 and some odd thousand feet be zoned R-6, so that we can properly develop that 100,000 feet with a six story, or higher building. The Marine Hospital is a 15-story adjoining us.

We will only use about 20 or 25 percent of the land of that 100,000 feet for any type of building we



we develop. We will have a frontage of 249 feet with a depth of 500 feet.

CHAIRMAN FELT: What will you use it for?

MR. SOLOR: Apartment house construction. That was always zoned for apartment, and in fact the Federal Housing Administration is willing to insure Co-operative housing.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, what do you want?

MR. SOLOR: We want an R-6.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That adjoins the Marine Hospital.

MR. SOLOR: That will adjoin the Marine Hospital, and there is plenty of light and air and there would be permanent light on 4 sides, of any building ever built there, between the taxpayer plot and the Marine Hospital. In fact, at one time we were planning a hotel until the cost went up to \$20,000 a room. And I request that for this reason. Let me say this, in all fairness:

Down at Thompkins Avenue and Broad Street there was a site condemned for a housing project, and it was to be a certain type of a housing project. By the time they

got ready to build it, it turned out to be a different type. By that time all the tenants, the store tenants were put out of Broad Street on the condemnation, and last year, while I didn't come in to object to it, there was a request for a rezoning at Tompkins Avenue and Broad Street for retail and manufacturing. It didn't smell good to me, because it was done to let one gas station that was there within the property and give them a preferential treatment to allow them to keep the gas station there.

Then you go on and take our business off of 380 feet on a block up - that doesn't sound like good planning.

We have developed the neighborhood where people can shop. We brought Safeway in there. We have done things to help both the economic life and everything in Staten Island, and I think that we shouldn't lose that, and we shouldn't be forced to go in a hurry and file a plan on the 380 feet, which we can do today, and put up a taxpayer building which may not be the proper building that should go up on that plot, because of this change of zone, in a hurry. We don't want to do that within the one year time if we don't have to.

Coming back to Fox Hills, in something I appeared on in the last week: in that plot between Mosel Avenue and the railroad, I've checked with the Con Edison Company

as to what they are going to do on the other side of the tracks. I have no objection. They bought property for a purpose, they need more room, I have not objection to that.

They are going to put up a sub-station there, not of the ordinary type that they are putting up all over the Island, but one large building at a 20-foot height that will take voltage from the new ninety-two million dollar plant, running into 13,000 or 130,000 volts, to feed other sub-stations along the whole area. They fortunately have an underground line running along the railroad and going across the Narrows to Brooklyn, and that will eliminate one thing that I was objecting to -- having high tension wires running through that.

I expect to get a letter from the Con-Edison Company confirming their position of what they are going to do there. At the same time when you put my property in an R-5 district, in a residential zone for apartments, and I'm going to face that 20 foot sub-station. And it's not only the sub-station, but on the exterior land they have these aluminum condensers that are going to be as high as 20 foot in height also.

You don't think that any lending institution, or any finance institution will ever give me financing for apartments to be built on the other side of the track facing that.

Therefore, I ask you gentlemen to let that stay in an

equivalent zone to the "C" zone that it is in now or an M-1 zone, where we can probably perhaps induce some of the dress manufacturers, and put up modern 1-story factory buildings with gardens around them, plenty of parking, possibly only 2 buildings, so that we are not restricted to put apartments up of any type facing the condensing plants or the sub-station on the other side, because you would be confiscating our property if you do that.

Now, as to the general over-all picture of Staten Island: I happen to be a member of the Builders Association; I've heard the Builders Association represented here, Truthfully I disagree with the motion that was passed at our builders' meeting, giving that right to the Builders Association, going along with the thinking of the Chamber of Commerce. I did not want, the time was short - I did not want to make any disruptions in our organization because of that. I was one of the organizers of the organization. I've been a national director for 9 years, and I know the thinking of those who believe in doing things in a hurry. They sometimes follow the sheep too quick. The shepherd goes along and the sheep follow.

Gentlemen, the way you zoned Staten Island, as far as residence is concerned, was the best thing that could

ever happen to Staten Island from the point of economics and future development. I also disagree with your statement that I've heard this morning, eliminating apartments from the R-3 zone, because generally the only thing you would get in those areas would be a two story garden apartment, and there is nothing in my knowledge and concept of zoning that would make a residential neighborhood any worse with a beautiful 2 story garden apartment among the 1 family homes.

It's being done all over the country. This is not a local situation. This is a national picture. However, if you feel that is so, I have no objection. But I have an objection, if there is anything that is going to be done, and it's come out in an editorial in Advance, that attached houses create slums. I now publicly ask the Advance to show me in any place, in the Bronx or Queens or Brooklyn where attached houses have created slum areas.

Because if I remember during the depression years in Queens, before that, they were kept up in appearance, were kept well landscaped. Everything was just so, but I could take you into Forest Hills Gardens, and show you the weeds growing on the 60,000 dollar homes. Now gentlemen, if we eliminate attached house zoning like the Advance wants for your R-3 districts, what you're going to have is no development

on your vacant land in Staten Island and on the outskirts and for this reason, for economic reasons, and for reasons of fact.

Prices of land are up to its limit, not only here, but all over the country. A builder should have a free mind to be able to say, well, the land cost me a certain price, the economics are that the buyer for homes are in this price category. I should be able to decide what type of a home, whether detached on 100 foot plots, detached on 60-40, semi-detached or attached houses.

People in medium income, have as much right to live as people in higher incomes, or people in the high-middle income brackets. I would rather have an attached home and live in it than in a home built on a 40 foot plot, with 4 foot on one side of the building and 8 foot between houses so I can see and hear everything of what my neighbor is doing.

Now, gentlemen, if we don't do that and we have a bridge in 1964 or 1965, here is what is going to happen. North Jersey, adjoining the Outerbridge, is building up, and builders like Levitt are buying land right through there, and operations between New Brunswick and Perth Amboy are going to be even greater than they are today. And, if we can't produce on Staten Island, a home for the person

who wants to buy a 15 or 16 thousand dollar house or a 13 or \$14,000 house, then we are only going to put ourselves in the category that we're in today from \$18,000 up, and I don't think you can even build them for \$18,000 at the price that land is going on today.

What's going to happen? We're to have just that part of the tract that we improved, but we are going to lose all the potential of the explosion of the population from Brooklyn and other parts, that would eventually come to live in Staten Island, they will just cross another bridge, still have their businesses in Brooklyn, still have their acquaintances and their relatives where they want to live close to, and they will all be buying homes in Jersey, because the price of homes there are going to be much less than we can produce in detached houses only.

Now gentlemen, think about that, because there is an economic picture involved here for the whole life and survival of Staten Island.

Unfortunately, after hearing some of these arguments, I'm surprised, and I'm wondering whether all the members of the Chamber, and all the members of the Real Estate Board, and all the members of the builders realize that

taking such a short view of things; and when they come out and say, only in St. George could we have R7 apartment houses, I kind of laugh to myself.

We all know as experienced real estate men that the hill sections of any borough are the last to develop because a person living in an apartment house hesitates about climbing a hill to get to his home, and I for one as a real estate man can't see much development of apartment houses in the St. George section even though you're able to walk from the ferry. Brother, you can't climb that hill to live in apartments so easy, you can't even climb the hill to get to the parking lot today so easy, especially if you're over 40 years of age; so let's not worry about what will be developed there. If you want it changed to R7, I guarantee you - you can change it. You wouldn't have too much taking place, because the financial institutions look at it the same as an old real estate man does.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Solor. Is Mr. Brown present?

Solor/Felt



PHILIP J. BROWN: I am the President of Richmond Storage. I appeared before your Commission at Curtis High School to explain our position. You said you would give us consideration, and in the last edition of your resolution, I see no change in your position.

We hereby request a change in the proposal of the New York City Planning Commission that includes all three of our properties in residential zones.

To explain to those that are here, they were not residential zones originally, but you are ruling us out and putting us in residential zones.

This would deny the present usage at the end of 25 years. These parcels and their buildings are located as follows; a three story fire-proof constructed building at Victory Boulevard, map 21, I don't know whether it's "A" or "B", a two-story office, salesroom and auction room at 947 Castleton Avenue, also map 21, two, 2 story fire-proof constructed warehouses and garage at the southwest corner of Taylor Street and Kerry Avenue, also map 21. An estimate of replacement of these buildings is \$1,055,000 at today's cost. Now I don't say they're worth that, but that is what we would have to pay if we built similar structures

Brown

somewhere else in the zones that you have specified.

This company has been a family held corporation, since incorporation.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Did you say one of the buildings was an office building?

MR. BROWN: That's right.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That would not have to terminate.

MR. BROWN: Well, you have ruled it residential.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, that could remain there indefinitely. It's only manufacturing that would be affected by termination under our proposed zoning resolution. You misunderstand it. Mr. Smith will discuss that with you when you conclude your remarks.

MR. BROWN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I'm going to have Mr. Smith speak to you, but under our resolution, a commercial building - such as an office building - doesn't come under the category of manufacturing and there is no retroactive limitation of years, even if such a building is in a residential zone.

MR. BROWN: Well, I hope that's true.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That, of course, based upon your statement, would only apply to one of your properties; so you should speak to Mr. Smith about the warehouse, in any case.

MR. BROWN: All right, sir.

As I said, this Corporation was incorporated March 22nd, 1900. We just had our 60th birthday last Tuesday.

Prior to that, it was known as Brown's Rapid Transit Delivery, and Brown's Vans, and was started in 1885. Today it does a gross annual business in excess of \$300,000.

Twenty families on Staten Island depend on this business for support. The work force is increased in the busy season to 35. The payroll for the year, for both labor and management, is in excess of \$162,000. The balance of its gross receipts goes back into the economy of Staten Island. I want to impress you on that - except for long distance over-the-road expenses which are, of course, spent out of the state. Only one dividend has been paid to stockholders in its 60 years of existence. All of its earnings are reinvested in plant and equipment, and that plant and equipment you want to take away from them. These

buildings that would be declared non-conforming if this resolution is passed, would have to be demolished at the end of 25 years if I understand your resolution. They would not be marketable at their worth to us. If they are declared in the wrong zone, no one would want to buy obsolete buildings, except at a fraction of their worth.

We would have little equity to borrow against, to set up new plants in the limited areas where our operations would be permitted according to your resolution.

We respectfully suggest to the Planning Commission, first, that these properties be excepted from the resolution as drawn, and left with their present usage until abandoned, or if this is not possible, and the good of the community warrants destruction of this company's property, that the community get its relief by a fair condemnation procedure. In case this, too, seems improbable of accomplishment, then upon the passing of this resolution, that we have our tax assessment reduced by the value of the building as assessed at that date and that the assessment of the land be reduced by the cost of the demolition of this building. May I point out that to demolish fire-proof construction is not cheap?

This relief should continue for 25 years to afford some relief to enable the company to exist. We think it's grossly unfair to destroy the savings of four generations, deprive workers of their livelihood, and a community of a needed service institution.

May I put another hat on? I am here representing another corporation which is affected also.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, sir.

MR. BROWN: This is a petition of Margreen Realty Co., Inc., to be allowed to continue use of its properties in the present category and to protest a proposed resolution of the City Planning Commission to include the properties of Margreen Co., Inc. in a residential zone.

These properties consist of a group of buildings leased to Stapleton Service Laundry. The lease expires in 1970. The Home Insurance Company has presented us with their appraisal of the entire group and it's \$326,700. This does not include the boilers and the excavation.

If this resolution is passed in its present form, the City of New York immediately limits the sale or lease of these assets to advantage. We must cease this use on or before 25 years. This means abandonment of the buildings

Felt/Brown

and sale of land at a figure commensurate with the cost of the demolition. Banks will not lend any amount of money required to replace these facilities in the area suggested for this type of operation. Investors will not pay for the value of the building when declared for abandonment.

We respectfully request an exception to the resolution to permit the existing use rights of this property until abandoned. Should this be impossible we ask the same relief be provided in the form of fair condemnation proceeding by the City.

If this is not feasible, we suggest that the tax assessment be reduced by the value that the City assessors have placed on them and that the value of the land be reduced by the cost of the demolition until abandoned, or 25 years.

It is obviously unfair to deliberately destroy values in this manner without a fair adjustment to those whose years of savings are invested in this property.

CHAIRMAN: Are both these properties adjacent?

MR. BROWN: No, they are both on map 21 but they are about 3 blocks different.

Brown/Chairman

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Brown, if you will just step over to your left, Mr. Smith will come down to you. He wants to check on further information regarding your situation. Is Mrs. West of the Women's City Club present?

MRS. HELEN CROSBY WEST: Mr. Felt and members of the Commission, I feel a little embarrassed at speaking from the point of view of the City as a whole, because we have been so interested to hear about the point of view of all the people who are immediately affected by this in Staten Island, but the Women's City Club has been interested in zoning for a great many years. We began by studying the Harrison, Ballard & Allen zoning proposal, and we are very interested in having an opportunity to study this.

We go on record as approving the proposed zoning map of the Borough of Richmond. Staten Island offers a unique possibility for planning and zoning in the City of New York. This is an area where newly developed zoning techniques can be used more effectively than anywhere else in the City.

Staten Island represents one half of all the vacant

Felt/West

land in New York.

Of its 60 square miles, 40% are vacant. It includes beaches, lakes, shorefronts, hills and woods in such variety that the space lends itself to recreation, industry and to private homes and to small apartments.

It boasts 3 colleges, and furnishes the possibility for interesting educational expansion. All of these factors indicate the importance of the speedy development of a comprehensive master plan for Richmond.

In the meantime, zoning regulation is immediately necessary to establish suitable land use pattern, and to hold buildings to moderate bulk and density.

The construction of the Narrows Bridge will open up Staten Island to the risk of exploitation and short-sighted planning, as well as to desirable building. The Bronx and Queens, when subways were extended to those Boroughs, are lessons as to what might happen to this Borough.

Restrictions, as imposed by this zoning regulation, will not stop development, but will control unplanned development with its accompanying over-congestion, and blight.

It is not too soon to initiate planned controls against pressures for dense building which will inevitably develop.



In the light of the great opportunity which good planning can bring to Richmond, and to the City as a whole, The Women's City Club urges the prompt adoption of the zoning map of the Borough, along with the new zoning resolution. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you. Is Mr. Venuto present? Will you step forward please? And then after Mr. Venuto, is Goodwin Anderson present? Mr. Anderson, just one second, please. James Hannon, Is James Hannon present? Mrs. Frances Haley. Is Mrs. Frances Haley present? We usually have recess of 1 hour at 1:30, but in order to accommodate the group here, if you don't mind, we would just take a recess of half an hour, so that we would have more time for these hearings.

We will continue the hearings until everyone has had an opportunity to be heard. So, we will recess at 1:30 until 2:00 and then return at that time. I think the names I have now are Mr. Venuto, and Mr. Hannon, and Mrs. Haley.

I would say that the likelihood of going beyond these names of 1:30 is remote; so that if any of the others wish to leave now and have a 45 minute period for lunch they may do so. Mr. Venuto, will you proceed?

JAFFEE VENUTO: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Planning Commission, Mr. Borough President, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Jaffee Venuto. I represent over 1,500 property owners of the Decker Avenue Civic Association.

I believe that our Association hasn't any bones to pick with the Planning Commission. What we have adopted was a resolution, and may I read it?

From Watchogue Road on the south, 200 feet from Forest Avenue on the north; from Willowbrook Road on the west, to Crystal Avenue on the east; - it has been recommended that this area be R2. From Forest Avenue and Decker Avenue on the easterly side, north to Catherine Street, and east again to Forest Avenue, - it is recommended that this zone be R2.

For the rest of our area - north of Catherine Street to Palmer Avenue, and west of Decker Avenue to Richmond Avenue, it has been recommended that this area be R2.

From Watchogue Road on the south to Palmer Avenue on the north; from Richmond Avenue and Willowbrook Road including Willowbrook Court on the west; from Cortlandt Street and a line extending south to Froest Avenue and Crystal Avenue on the east - this area, our Association and membership recommends be zoned R2.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Do you have, sir, in front of you - what we have it proposed as?

MR. VENUTO: I believe we have. There is one area which has been proposed to R5 and the other one, I think is C2.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Do you have that memorandum in writing? Very well.

MR. VENUTO: As I said, this Organization concurs with the Planning Commission recommendation of the zoning, in effect. I believe that it will be a benefit to the people of Staten Island. I am authorized to recommend that we concur wholeheartedly with the Civic Congress of Staten Island and their remarks made previously, and we believe that when this is adopted, with all the necessary changes, we hope that it will be made effective immediately. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much, sir.  
Is Mr. Hannon present?

JAMES HANNON: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, Mr. Borough President, my name is James Hannon and I am representing the Butler Manor Home Owners Association, comprising 60 families, 60 homes. The area to which I direct your attention is contiguous to Mount Moretta on the south shore, just west of it, and it runs west to Page Avenue and north to Amboy Road, bounded on the south by Raritan Bay.

We are presently in an "E" zone, although we presently have a petition pending to have it upgraded under the present zoning plan to "E1".

Now, it is the sense and the feeling of the homeowners, that we would like an "E1"- the buffer idea of one and two-family homes - I believe the prior speaker mentioned it. We do not want multiple dwellings.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, what did we propose, sir, for your area?

MR. HANNON: R3

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, the R3 based upon what I stated earlier, would accomplish what you would like to have done.

MR. HANNON: Except, and this is the important exception: it is not an uncommon practice down in our area for people to convert from a one to a two-family home - a mother-in-law comes in or the husband dies and the wife needs some income, and it is rather common practice down in that area. Right now we have two-family homes and one family homes; two-family homes are in a decided minority.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Did you say that two-family homes are in a decided minority.

MR. HANNON: Yes, there must be approximately, in that 60 home area, perhaps eight two-family homes built by the builders. However, the other members are all in one-family, and they would like to have a buffer zone or else a proviso or amendment written in the R3, that they could convert because, as I

understand, they could not do even under the R3 classification.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That they could, or could not, convert?

MR. HANNON: Could not, is our understanding.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well then, as I see it, those who have the one-family homes would really like R2.

MR. HANNON: Well, yes, in effect.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That would mean that eight of your neighbors, or the eight buildings - probably having 16 families - would then be non-conforming buildings. Now, what we originally had in R3, which I think you understand, would have permitted multiple dwellings in the R3, too, which I do not believe we ultimately would have, so that there may be a predominant group of your members that would like R2, but if you give them R2, you will at the same time be developing a problem situation with your neighbors who now have two-family homes. Our inclination, in the Planning Commission in areas such as yours, is to up-grade them. We would like to know from you what your group would really like done under the circumstances, because there two separate situations.

MR. HANNON: Yes, what we would like, in essence, is to provide us with a new classification; 1 and 2-family homes, similar to the present "E1" and "E2".

CHAIRMAN FELT: That would be R3?

MR. HANNON: That's R3; however, under R3 you have row homes, and you can have multiple dwellings if you come within the bulk height.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I said earlier that we are giving sympathetic consideration to an amendment of our proposal which would prohibit multiple dwellings in R3 districts.

MR. HANNON: Right, glad to hear that.

CHAIRMAN FELT: And it was my feeling after hearing your earlier remarks that with such a prohibition, your people would probably be agreeable to an R3.

MR. HANNON: That sounds pretty good to us. One other point I want to get on the record: we want to have the zoning resolution passed as quickly as possible before the carpet-baggers make it academic, and with that we support the Civic Congress wholeheartedly and Mr. Herrick who spoke previously. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: All right, thank you, sir.

Now, Mrs. Haley, and after Mrs. Haley, the gentleman who was absent earlier - I think Mr. Paras.

MRS. FRANCES X. HALEY: Mr. Felt, Members of the Commission, I am Mrs. Frances X. Haley, representing the Grymes Hill Estates Association, Grymes Hill, Staten Island.

We are now zoned "G1", and will be zoned R1 under the new zoning resolution, page 21 on the proposed zone map.

This Association consists of 44 families, and these 44 homes are assessed for over \$1,000,000. This is one of the most highly taxed areas on Staten Island.

In addition to the zone restrictions, we are also governed by deed restrictions which compel us to meet such requirements as 100-foot frontage, 30 foot set-backs, no flat roofs, no overhead utility wires, and many other restrictions.

These deed restrictions plus the constant effort to properly maintain our homes, has made this one of the most attractive neighborhoods on Staten Island. The area also includes Notre Dame College with its stately buildings and well-kept grounds. We are surrounded on three sides by very attractive homes on tree-shaded streets.

The character of this entire vicinity is in serious jeopardy because of a piece of unoccupied land that adjoins Grymes Hill Estates on the remaining side. This strip of land, 100 feet deep, bordering Victory Boulevard has been zoned R-6 on the proposed map. This will permit a tall apartment house to be built, which will be entirely out of character with the surrounding homes. This property has access to our roads and will degrade the Grymes Hill area by causing it to be used as a parking lot. We are aware that garages must be provided for a percentage

of the tenants but there is no law that forces the tenant to pay for the garage and use it. Where there are quiet side streets in the immediate vicinity, experience has proved, the majority of tenants prefer to pocket the money and park on the side streets. Many families own two cars and this crowds the streets further.

Referring to the proposed zoning map on page 21 we find we are the only R-1 zone joined to an R-6 zone. Our R-1 zone is completely unprotected by a buffer zone in this instance.

It takes many years and the labor and dreams of many families to create a community like ours. It takes only a few months for a speculator to destroy, for his own profit, what we have worked so hard to achieve. We earnestly request that you rezone this 150 feet to R-1 zone so that adoption of the New York City Planning Commission's Proposed Zoning Resolution will function to maintain the character of this neighborhood. As a community of individual home owners we recognize and appreciate the proposed zoning resolution as a total plan to keep Staten Island a desirable community.

Our organization joins with the Grymes Hill Neighbors Association in vigorously opposing the R-6 designation in the area between Eddy Street and Silver



Mount Cemetery, fronting on Victory Boulevard.

On behalf of the Grymes Hill Estates Association I wish to express my thanks to the Commission for hearing me and your attention to our problem will be greatly appreciated.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mrs. Haley. Is Mr. Paras present? Mr. Paras will be the last speaker before our recess.

VINCENT J. PARAS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, my name is Vincent J. Paras. I am President of the Fairview Heights Civic Association. Our group, affiliated with the Civic Congress of Staten Island, has taken a stand as, in general, favoring the proposed zoning laws as relating to Staten Island's residentially developed and undeveloped areas. However, it has taken a more protective stand regarding existing industry on Staten Island. We wish to see this industry have the opportunity to grow and expand freely and not be strangled in 25 or 40 years hence.

CHAIRMAN FELT: May I just mention this once more: the only provision for terminating industry on Staten Island in the period ranging from 25 years to 40 years is, if it relates to a manufacturing plant in a residential area. The reason I say that, and you may not agree with us to be sure, but many people have had the feeling that this termination related to industry, in general, but it does not. It only relates to industry that happens to be located in a

residential area.

MR. PARAS: But which comes first, the chicken or the egg; which was there first, the industry or the residential area. I mean a well established large industry on Staten Island should be considered. I mean, you say if they are placed in a non-conforming zone, they are given 25 or 40 years, but there are many industries which might be placed in that position now.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, I might say this, Mr. Paras, that we are going to consider all of these situations. That is the purpose of these hearings so that we would obtain the views of individuals living on the Island, the business people on the Island, the civic groups, the chambers of commerce, and then after hearing your statements, review the situation and see what might be done on an equitable basis, and still not be offensive to the general welfare of the City and the Island. I'm sorry for interrupting, but I wanted to clear that point up if I could.

MR. PARAS: Why not encourage present industry by zoning for its needs, and thus encourage other industry to build around it. In effect, then, you will be concentrating industry and separating industrial areas from residential. Is this not one of the basic reasons for zoning regulations?

It might be pointed out that in general our industry is situated on the perimeter of Staten Island, leaving the inner area for residential development. We submit that, essentially as far as possible, this pattern to be continued without undue pressure being exerted on established industry in the way of zoning.

In regard to the R3 designated areas, our group favors the up-grading of this zoning designation so as to prohibit apartment house construction, which is something I heard discussed today, and I'm perfectly in favor with that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir. We will now recess until 2 P.M.

SECRETARY MALTER: This hearing will stand in recess until 2 P.M., when the hearing will be continued on the Richmond maps.

\* \* \* \* \*

2:00 P.M.  
Friday, March 25, 1960

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

SECRETARY MALTER: Roll call after recess:  
Chairman Felt, Vice Chairman Bloustein, Commissioners Livingston, Orton, Sweeney, Acting Commissioner Sherman, Acting Commissioner Constable.\* Quorum present.

This is a continued public hearing in the matter of a Proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York; and specifically, in relation to the proposed zoning maps for the Borough of Richmond.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mr. Marrone present?

FRANK MARRONE: My name is Frank Marrone and I represent my mother and my father. We have a piece of property that is located on South Beach; it's on the corner of Sand Lane and Robin Road. Now, they have made this residential; across the street we have a kiddy land and all the play area that goes with that. We have restaurants and all the other things that go with it. I brought a picture with me and, if my brother could point to you, as I am talking, I think you could get a better idea.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well, your brother can point out the area as you are speaking.

JOSEPH MARRONE: My name is Joseph Marrone. I spoke to you in the May hearings at Curtis High School. It seems that this piece of property - right now - is a C, or it's going to be zoned, C1-1. Excuse me, it's going to be zoned R3 and across the street it is going to be zoned as C1-1. We feel that it is not the place to put residential homes. Right now, we have across

Felt/ Marrone

\*(Edward Hoffman, sitting for ACTING COMMISSIONER SQUADRO CONSTATO)

the street from us an amusement area which attracts quite a few people, and we also have across the street from us a night club which I think a few of the Staten Islanders would know.

We have also businesses on either side of us and the proposed zoning would more or less hinder us, as far as building homes, first of all, and secondly, in selling them, and so the property as far as I could see would be comparatively useless. Now, there is one little observation I made while sitting here; it seems that everybody is talking about business, residential and recreation, but no one has mentioned amusement. We all know that all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy.

If anyone were suggested putting amusement areas in either Todt Hill, Great Kills, New Dorp, Four Corners, Clove Lakes, I think he would be tarred and feathered and sent out of the State. But I guess we are all guilty in this room, at one time or another, of packing our wives and children in the car and sometimes if we have to, our mothers-in-law, and taking them for a little joy-ride on a Sunday down to the amusement area.

Well, I feel that if we were to do something like this, let's keep the lepers with the lepers. In other words, an amusement area with an

amusement area. It would be a little more congenial for everybody if we all knew where to go and what to do.

Now, we have going on at present quite a large investment by the government of putting in a new road, parks, recreation areas again in South Beach. I think you are all familiar with that. And, I don't know if you're familiar with this, but on Sundays of last year it has been noted that there have been more cars and more people attracted at South Beach than at Midland Beach and that was due to the rides.

Again I say that it would be a help to the City and ourselves if it were zoned , not business, not R-3, but something that would keep it within the scope of what the area is now designed for doing.

Therefore, in conclusion, I would like to recommend that the Planning Commission review their findings and help the children, because that is who we will help, the children, secondly the parents, because they get a little time out too; also the automobile industry because we sell gas and cars, and also the photographic industry because we all go down and invariably take pictures of our children sitting on the rides.

Well, that is the only thing I think that if the

Commission would rehash the situation they would find it more convenient, not to put residential homes, or businesses restricted to 100 feet, but amusements, which I think everyone has neglected, which we do need. Thank you.

A VOICE: I don't like to interject, but I represent the property owner adjacent to the Marrones and I thought it might save time if I were permitted to speak at the present time. I'll only be a few minutes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I think we would prefer to follow the regular procedure. We will be mindful of the views they expressed when you appear. Have you concluded your remarks, Mr. Marrone?

MR. MARRONE: I just want to make one other point, a very good point. With this property with business, you are only allowed to go 100 foot deep. Well, people are talking about, how about my neighbors, how about these people and with this piece of property, there is nobody behind us, because the railroad is there. Presently it's a family thing. And I'd like to point out one other thing while we are talking. You saw the picture. Now, these rides have been in existence a few years, if we were to put them up, we could have done it a few years ago and not necessarily

have come up here and argued this all out and rehashed it. But the thing is that it has taken so much to fill just that little bit of it. It's impossible to even put up homes because a home right now, if you put it on property like that, it would sink, and pretty soon a two family dwelling would eventually wind up into a one family dwelling. Now we have the railroad tracks, directly in back of the tracks behind the property, which I think would affect no one. It would only affect the railroad in the sense that the people coming down would have a better view of things to come, and not the swamps. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you. Is Mr. Endress here? Step forward please and then E. J. Isley and after E. J. Isley, Jack Friedland.

HENRY ENDRESS: My name is Henry Endress. I represent The Grymes Hill Neighbors Association, and the property we're discussing is found on map 21-B. The same property by the way, was referred to this morning by Mrs. Frances X. Haley. Mrs. Haley did present the point of view of the Estates Association and I'm here to present the point of view of the Neighbors Association directly adjoining the area under discussion.



The Grymes Hill Neighbors, an association of home owners on the western side of Grymes Hill, Staten Island, a community of one-family homes in an R-1 Zone, wish to protest the intrusion of an R-6 zoned strip of land, permitting tall apartment house construction, on the western boundary of this area--the only instance on the whole of Staten Island where an R-6 Zone would abut directly upon an R-1 Zone. The R-6 strip referred to extends along Victory Boulevard in the area of Silver Lake, for a depth of approximately 200 feet, from Thressa Place to Eddy Street. We joined in this protest by the home owners of the more inland streets of this area who are represented at this hearing by Mrs. Haley for their association, The Grymes Hill Association.

The indicated R-6 Zoning of this strip of land violates the principles, we believe, of good zoning which the City Planning Commission itself has otherwise followed in laying out plans for the future. This strip for apartment houses is utterly incompatible with one-family housing. It comes back-to-back with almost half the homes of this area, hence providing no "buffer space" between it and these homes, either natural or man-made.

Endress

In effect, this proposed R-6 Zone of apartment houses would constitute a "Chinese Wall" cutting off this residential community from Silver Lake Park, a project of special interest and concern to the neighborhood, to the Island as a whole, and to the Honorable Mr. Moses, as well.

The proposed R-6 violates the intention, we believe, of the City Planning Commission to preserve the individual home-owning character of Staten Island, fails to reflect the existing character of development of our area, and plays havoc with the family interests and the economic well being of long-time residents who have home and family purposes rather than speculative interests in the area.

As citizens of New York City we recognize, of course, that time must bring change and growth, and with it the need for multiple housing. It is for this very reason that city planning is being done now on such a broad scale on the basis of very specific principles. A study of the City Planning Commission proposals for Staten Island shows numerous places for apartment houses, but always in these instances there are "buffers" -- in the form of schools, park lands, or intermediate zones -- between R-6 Zones and the one-family R-1 Zones.

Attached to this report, Mr. Chairman, are maps which outline other areas in which we indicate these buffer zones that exist between the 1 family homes and multiple housing or tall buildings, as planned.

To conclude, we protest and appeal for reconsideration of this abnormal intrusion of an R-6 Zone into an R-1 community of 1 family homes. The violation, we believe, is incompatible with the rest of the planning under consideration by your committee.

We appreciate your courtesy in having us present this point of view which, in some ways, repeats what has been said before, but these are feelings of the residents of this particular area.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I think our staff has been in communicational meetings with either your group or other groups that have the same point of view insofar as those R - 6 proposed designations are concerned.

MR. ENDRESS: Groups in this area Sir?

CHAIRMAN FELT: That's correct. Back about 2 weeks ago I replied to several of those groups making reference to a consideration of their views.

Chairman/Endress

MR. ENDRESS: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Will Mr. Isley step forward?

E.J. ISLEY: Chairman, members of the Commission.

I am E.J. Isley and I represent the Thornycroft Civic Association, which is a small organization of approximately 45 homes. Now, we are tentatively zoned as an R3 zone, and we felt that we would like to be zoned as an R2, being that our homes are minimum lots of 50 by 100. We are also bordered by an R2 zone.

Now, Commissioner, I believe your comments earlier take care of this problem and I'm sure that our group would be satisfied with an R3 zone, with the exception of prohibiting apartment type multiple dwelling. However, this was not the primary purpose of my appearance today.

While our Association is a member of the Staten Island Civic Congress who supports the rezoning plan in principle, I'm here today to go on record for our group, and I might mention that several other groups have contacted me and have indicated that they would like to be here today. Of course, there's the problem that many folks have to work and they could not get time off.

However, as well as speaking for our own group, I am speaking for several other civic groups -- The Emmet Kelly

Isley

American Legion Post in Great Kills and I've also been contacted by the President of the Young Republican Club who I know feels the same as our group does.

Now, if they could, they would have been here today to join us in endorsing wholeheartedly the proposed rezoning plan. The people who I'm speaking for are not the various pressure groups who have so vehemently opposed the overall plan. We are cognizant of the fact that there are many individual areas that need review, and based on the Commission's actions to day, we are confident that these areas will be given just and fair consideration.

Now, as small home-owners, we support the Commission's overall effort to protect and provide for the one and two-family home-owners.

Contrary to the criticism of opponents of the plan, we do not feel that the Commission has rushed the plan and, as a matter of fact, we would like to congratulate the Commission for the number of explanation hearings that have been held on the Island. We realize that the Chairman's position was mentioned at one of these meetings; that the rezoning plan should be held off for approximately a year before final adoption. On this we acquiesce, but actually we would favor immediate adoption of the plan.

Isley

Now, in conclusion, we strongly urge the Commission to continue their position and we are hopeful and believe that you will not compromise with these various pressure groups to the detriment of the small home-owner. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

I would like to mention that at these hearings you will often have statements made with which you agree and feel like applauding, and some people will say things that you don't like to hear and you will feel like hissing or booing. We've heard a good deal of that in the past but during all of our hearings on the Zoning Resolution we've received the full cooperation of those present. It is difficult at times to contain yourself, but try not to applaud, and not to hiss or boo so that we can have proper decorum at these hearings.

Is Mr. Friedland present? Jack Friedland?  
Rocco C. Florio. Is Mr. Florio present? Mr. Terrence Benbow.  
Is Mr. Benbow present? Mr. Thomas Walsh. Is Mr. Walsh present? Mr. Melniker, you're listed. Is Mr. Melniker here? You were listed for another item. Mr. Melniker, do you want to speak on that item now?

For those who aren't present -- I am going to

Felt / Isley

call their names later, so they'll have their opportunity -- and for that matter everyone in the room will have an opportunity to speak before the hearing is adjourned.

ALBERT MELNIKER: Mr. Chairman, my name is Albert Melniker, Architect, 55 Central Avenue, Staten Island.

I am wearing two hats today, and I've completed wearing the Chamber of Commerce hat this morning. I am now representing several clients who have asked me to come to make a statement in their behalf, if I may.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I have been asked by the Secretary to state whom you represent and to mention the property involved slowly, so that it can be correctly set forth on our mechanisms.

MR. MELNIKER: The first item is the property known as Arlington Terrace. I have an authorization by the owners, The Gail Construction Corporation, to present this statement before the Commission.

The property involved is on sheet 20c. It is generally that area that is bounded by Holland Avenue, running north and south, and the property south of Richmond Terrace, from the intersection of Holland and Richmond Terrace.

Felt / Melniker

This, by the way, is a copy of a letter that was sent to the Commissioner in the last several days, It's addressed to the Chairman, The Honorable James A. Felt.

This letter represents a statement of objection to the proposed rezoning of the area generally known as Arlington Terrace, Staten Island, New York.

The property in question is bounded generally by Richmond Terrace on the north, Holland Avenue on the west, Arlington Place on the south, and Northfield Avenue on the east.

This project was approved by the Board of Estimate on September 17th, 1959 after approval by the City Planning Commission. The project provides for a 198-apartment development of two and three-story buildings on an  $8\frac{1}{2}$  acre site. In the interim, final plans have been prepared and the plans and specifications have been processed through the New York State Division of Housing, Limited Profit Housing Bureau, pursuant to Article XII of The New York State Public Housing Law.

This property is presently zoned as Residence - Use, Height - 1, Area D. The buildings as proposed are well under the limits permissible by present zoning both in percentage and coverage, and in bulk.

Melniker



The zoning proposal by the City Planning Commission would put this in an R3 District, and we find that our three-story buildings would be non-complying and further find that the R3 proposal is inconsistent with the plans as developed and approved for this project.

Therefore, may I respectfully request that the City Planning Commission give serious consideration to the revising of the proposed zoning from R3 to an R4.

This would be particularly consistent with the adjoining zoning on sheet 20c which represents a continuous pattern of R4 for the entire area. This would also be consistent with the proposal of the buildings to be erected, thus eliminating the possibility of non-compliance and non-conformance.

Thank you. I'll leave several copies with the clerk.

May I take the second one? I have three of them.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well, are you reading from prepared statements? Do you think there would be any specific purpose in that?

MR. MELNIKER: I can condense those in a few sentences.

Felt / Melniker

CHAIRMAN FELT: All right, please.

MR. MELNIKER: The second one refers to the Sylvie Funeral Home, 33 Decker Avenue. This is merely a reiteration of a previous statement made to the Commission by letter, that the building which has been in this location for 22 years, and a business which has been in operation on Staten Island for 65 years, and has always been in conformance with the zoning resolution and has a certificate of occupancy, is now being made either non-conforming or non-complying.

We also find that the Sylvie Funeral Home has had an excellent reputation, and a signed statement by several adjoining property owners to that effect is attested to by their immediate neighbors .

It merely reiterates our request that we would like to put this in the proper designation for the conduction of a funeral home in a conforming use.

The third one involves the Manor Holding Company. I'm glad to see our Borough President is here because this was the subject of a vote yesterday by the Board of Estimate on the change of zone on Manor Road from retail to residence.

Felt/Melniker

May I read the few paragraphs involved in this?  
I don't have the map number at hand. It's one of the 21  
maps.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We know the location.

Mr. Melniker: You know the location.  
I'm authorized by the owners, Irving and Gertrude Goldwyn, of  
the Manor Holding Company, to make the following statement.

The location of the property is Manor Road on the  
west, Gannon South on the north, and it is a piece of pro-  
perty that represents approximately 14 acres.

Under a decision by the Board of Estimate yesterday,  
the entire property is now in Residence "E" District. Under  
the proposal by the Commission it would be an R3.

The statement submitted by the owners is as follows:

In order to return a consistency between the present  
Residence Use zoning, and in order to relate to the type of  
buildings being erected by Todt Hill Houses on the east side  
of Manor Road, it is respectfully requested of this Commission  
that the area in question, owned by Manor Holding Company, be  
zoned under this proposal as R7.

Felt/Melniker

The reference in question is Chapter 5, Subdivision entitled, "Large Scale Residential Developments"; the area in excess of 3 acres.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In other words, that would bring it into a zone comparable to the housing project on the other side of the street, and incompatible with the private homes on the side of Manor Road.

MR. MELNIKER: There are private homes to the south of this property but combined between this and the adjoining piece there is a total of 18 acres.

MR. MELNIKER: One other point: In terms of location, in terms of the large site involved, 14 acres plus, and in terms of the value of the property when purchased, it must be borne in mind that one third of this property was zoned business "D" with a history of business use of approximately 100 years.

Consideration was asked to be given to the fact that two thirds of the property is in a residence "D" district, and we feel that the proposed resolution would destroy area ratio and bulk requirements; it would make it equitable as R7

and would not penalize the owners to the extent that a change to R3 will effect. In terms of present value, in terms of increased assessment, and in terms of the desirability and uses of this property and size and location we feel that the future development of multi-story apartment houses is related to some of these and is a reasonable request to the Commission.

May we therefore respectfully request that the proposed zoning be changed to R7 for the causes and reasons given above. I will submit a copy of this plus a photograph and map. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is James E. Reynolds, Jr. present? Mr. Reynolds, President of O'Brien Brothers Shipyard Corporation. Is Joseph K. Grainger, present, the attorney for the Company? Is N. Adler of the Clearview Association present? Mr. McConnacky, Clearview Association, Harold Alexander; Randall Manor Association; Louis Werb, Bay Vista Corporation.

LOUIS WERB: My name is Louis Werb and I'm appearing for Bay Vista, Inc. As you gentlemen are doubtless aware, this Corporation is interested in the most westerly 600 feet of the tract known as Sailors Snug Harbor, and that parcel has been sub-divided from the rest of Sailor's Snug Harbor; approximately

Melniker/Felt/Werb

2000 feet running up from the Kill Van Kull to Henderson Avenue and has a width of 600 feet. On its most easterly side it is bounded by the other land of Sailor's Snug Harbor. There is a private road and a retaining wall starting with an elevation of possibly 2 feet of Richmond Terrace and probably 25 to 30 feet at Henderson Avenue. There is a very sharp physical demarcation and that is the reason why it was sub-divided in that manner.

Now the 3 acres are closer to the water as you are well aware because we have just recently made an application and we have it designated for shopping use for the reasons which have been brought before you on many occasions. We feel that we need it not only that, as it has been pointed out before, but that parcel is marginal, except for the one purpose.

There are 60 to 65 feet of peat moss below the fill, and it will be impossible to put any heavy weight bearing structures on it so far as our engineering shows us.

Now, we are aware that upon completion of the project, or, our architects tell us that at some point toward the completion of the project we will receive as a large scale development some rights to build shopping facilities, and that this right will probably give us sufficient square footage to build what we propose to build.

However, we wish to service our tenants as soon as we can and we would like such appropriate zoning for that portion of the tract that would permit the building of a shopping facility at least simultaneously with the first several buildings. We feel that is important to our tenants and we wish to be able to give them this service.

Now with respect to the balance of the tract. Now the original 100 foot E-1 buffer zone has been extended to 200 feet as an R-3. The balance of the tract which would be approximately 1800 feet by 400 in width with frontage only on Richmond Terrace is in an R-5 Zone. Our architects have conferred with us on numerous occasions. We do know that the zone lines run through the buildings.

Because of the length and narrowness of the parcel as it presently exists, without considering zone lines, just taking it as a 600 by 2000 foot parcel we have engineering difficulties in getting good access roads and parking without making the use of the area at or near Richmond Terrace and that has been something we are very desirous of doing.

I'm sorry that at this time we are not in the position to submit additional site plans. There have been many changes since we originally submitted plans.

CHAIRMAN FELT: What is the height of your proposed development on the basis of your present thinking?

MR. WERB: Present thinking calls for 9 stories, fire-proof building.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, what was it originally when you first spoke to us?

MR. WERB: I think we had 20 odd stories. Now the present site plan and the present zoning unfortunately do not seem to agree with one another. We don't propose a far greater coverage than your zoning would permit us but because we would be operating within the maximum within the R-3 district, and even within the maximums of the R-5 district makes for very difficult planning. As a result of 2 years work and a number of site plans and building plans, we are now engaged in our final site plan, and the only ones that we have printed are at the present time obsolete, and that's why we are making no submission of those plans or any other written submission at this time, but we will as soon as they are completed, and we expect that will be within the next week to 10 days. We will submit those site plans to you



together with our comments as to what changes we feel are necessary in the zoning to permit these structures. The structures which we now propose will accommodate approximately 1,200 families. Considering that, I believe, we got a figure of 1,042 which would presently be acceptable - I don't know how accurate it is - but subtracting the area which we proposed to use before the zoning goes into effect and subtracting the families which will go into those several structures, as a practical matter, the density which you propose coincides with the density which we propose.

But the zoning, I must say, is wholly inadequate. At this time we respectfully request that the tract be zoned R6, but out of consideration to the area and since we have no plans, present or future, to come too close to the streets, either Kissel Avenue or Henderson Avenue. We have no objection to a 100-foot buffer area of any sort being put in so long as we can get a coverage on the area we are using for approximately 1,200 families. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you Mr. Werb. You represent the Bay Vista Corporation; I have Jacob Friedland's name listed here. Is Mr. Friedland present? Does Mr. Friedland expect to be here, do you know?

MR. WERB: No, sir, he does not.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Werb. Is Mr. Hoare present? Would you step forward, please?

ELMER J. HOARE: My name is Elmer Hoare, and I represent the Hylan Mill Holding Corp., which owns a plot of about 56 acres in the area bounded by New Dorp Lane, Hylan Boulevard, Tysens Lane and Mill Road, which appears on map number 27d.

I don't know whether you have with you now a copy of the protest we filed to which are attached some diagrams and aerial photographs which give you a graphic picture of the property.

The total area within the four streets mentioned is about 76 acres, of which we own 56 acres. Now, I don't know whether we are in the same category as that which you mentioned to Judge Kane this morning with respect to prior re-zoning. This property was re-zoned by the Commission four years ago as a shopping center.

CHAIRMAN FELT: May I say, sir, that I believe I'm correct in recalling that I told Judge Kane that the zoning changes made by the Planning Commission within the last year - I think he referred to a zoning change made in the early spring of 1959, and that occurred in another instance as well - that we would be mindful of those. I don't want to make a definite statement but we cannot assume that the Planning Commission will adhere at this point to what they may have done four years ago or eight years ago or twelve years ago.

MR. HOARE: Well I just wanted to clarify that point, Mr. Chairman, because if that isn't so then I think we have a very strong moral grievance against the proposed re-zoning. At the time the Commission granted the re-zoning, the

owners were required to enter into a contract with The City of New York for wholesale development of the whole street area, which required the owners to close existing paper streets.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That was the Witteman parcel, wasn't it?

MR. HOARE: That's right. They were required to cede some five acres of land which, conservatively, was worth \$50,000, to the City for street widening and for sewer easements. They were required to grade, curb and pave the adjoining streets and to install sidewalks, which actually cost the owners over \$150,000.

They were required to indemnify the City against condemnation costs for street widening and for sewer easements for which the City is now claiming over \$16,000. They were required to agree with the City to bid at least \$23,000 for a portion of City owned property, at the corner of Mill Road and Tysens Lane which they actually had the bid in for \$33,000. The aggregate of all that is, that to accomplish this existing shopping center use, the owners were put to the expense of over \$250,000, and it's a little bit rough on them at this period of time, in less than four years, to see all that money gone down the drain, and nothing to show for it.

Your proposed re-zoning would limit the Hylan Boulevard frontage from New Dorp Lane to Ebbitts Avenue to C1 and would classify everything else in the whole area as R3. Now in view of the remarks the Chairman made this morning, I take it that we are worse off than we thought we were because if it's going to be R3, then we will have nothing but single or two-family dwellings.

This shopping center development has been moving along very satisfactorily. There is now in course of

Hoare

construction at the corner of New Dorp Lane and Mill Road, a 6-acre plot on which A & P is to have one of the largest supermarkets in the east.

We think that the effect of the proposed zoning will be this, that you will scrap the already well advanced development of this 76-acre parcel as a shopping center.

You are going to reverse your judgment of 1956 and I would like to read to you your own comments at the time that change of zone was granted. You said, "A request for the rezoning was submitted and recommended by the President of the Borough of Richmond on behalf of the owners of the major portion of the property involved in order to permit the construction of a major shopping center with extensive off-street parking facilities. The amendment comprehends the establishment of a retail district, where not heretofore established, for a rectangular area of about 76 acres in extent bounded by Hylan Boulevard, New Dorp Lane, Mill Road and Tysens Lane. A portion of the area adjoining Mill Road and New Dorp Lane is proposed to be changed to a business district. No change in the area district zoning is involved. The amendment is designed to meet the requirements of a borough-wide shopping center, abutting Hylan Boulevard, a major north-south traffic artery of the Borough, and is to be bounded on the remaining side by thoroughfares 80 feet in width." That street widening is what the owners paid for. Some commercial development has already taken place upon the

portion of the shopping center presently zoned retail, as well as on the retail areas of the opposite side of Hylan Boulevard. The shopping center project envisages the introduction of department stores, food markets, national chain stores, banks, professional buildings, variety stores, restaurants, a bowling center and a motel in the portion for which the business designation is proposed.

Building coverage is estimated to be about 20% of the project area, and off-street parking for upwards of 4500 cars is contemplated.

Consideration of all the factors involved leads to the conclusion that the site for the project appears to be suitably located and that it will be capable of providing necessary and desirable merchandising facilities for the Borough, consonant with the present need and prospective expansion of Borough development.

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: When did your client acquire title?

MR. HOARE: Something less than two years ago; and we bought under the condition that the change would be made.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I vaguely recall it because the action took place prior to my coming on the Commission, but as I recall it. . . .

MR. HOARE: I don't want to interrupt you, Mr. Chairman, but the resolution bears your signature, and so I assumed that you participated in the decision.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That is correct; but the hearing took place prior to that time. I don't mean to try to protect myself from what I have written -- I just want to clear this point up. The entire frontage based upon that report, the entire frontage along Hylan Boulevard, from Tysens Lane to New Dorp Lane, that entire frontage was zoned so as to accommodate a shopping center.

MR. HOARE: The entire property was zoned for that purpose. It was zoned "Retail." The only thing that was zoned for business was the property at the corner of New Dorp Lane and Mill Road which is roughly the space now occupied by A & P -- I would say approximately five to six acres. Everything else was zoned retail.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Which is the property you now represent?

MR. HOARE: We own everything within the four streets that I described except for .....

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is that Tysens Lane and Ebbitts?

MR. HOARE: No, the four perimeter streets that I'm speaking of are New Dorp Lane, Hylan Boulevard, Tysens Lane and Mill Road, and you have a bisecting street in there, Ebbitts Avenue. That was the street which the former owners, in their contracts with the City, were required to grade and pave and curb. That is the only bisecting street in the whole area.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Which is the section that you do not own?

MR. HOARE: The section we do not own is the frontage on Hylan Boulevard, running from a point about 500 feet north of Ebbitts Avenue. In other words, if you look at your map, I would say that it represents - the portion that we do not own - about two-thirds of the Hylan Boulevard frontage that you now propose to zone C1.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Now I understand.

Mr. Hoare: And there is a small three acre parcel fronting on Mill Road, I would say about a third of the distance south from New Dorp Lane, on which there is presently constructed a bowling alley, backed up against the Tavern on the Green.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, but insofar as the Hylan Boulevard frontage is concerned, you do not own two-thirds of the frontage that we have designated as C1.

MR. HOARE: That's right. I think we have roughly 500 feet of Hylan Boulevard frontage which would be classified C1.

CHAIRMAN FELT: And approximately, then, a balance of 1,000 feet in other ownership?

MR. HOARE: Everything north of what we own is in other ownership, and everything south is in our ownership,

with one exception which I forgot to mention before - there is a piece 250 feet square at the corner of Hylan Boulevard and Tysens Lane which we do not own. I think there is, oh, somewhat in the area of three acres there.

Well, at the present time there is on the property, fronting on Hylan Boulevard, within the area that you propose to classify C1, a Food Farm Supermarket, the Tavern-on-the-Green, which is a restaurant with accomodations for about 500 people; a Pontiac sales and service agency, and then a Safeway Supermarket. Now, in the rear of that property, as I pointed out before, at the corner of New Dorp Lane and Mill Road is the new A & P Supermarket, which has an area of about six acres, and then next to that a bowling alley which has an area of about three acres.

Now, your proposed zoning automatically makes the A & P property and the bowling alley property a non-conforming use.

Now, we think that the suitable zoning for this area, for the entire property within the four streets, which I mentioned, should be C4. That would be consistent with what you've done in the area, because New Dorp Lane all the way from the railroad to Hylan Boulevard, you propose to zone C4. Then directly across the street from this property, south of New Dorp Lane, you're going to zone C8.

There is a vital need in this area for a shopping center such as was originally conceived, and everything that has transpired since the time that you granted the original rezoning, the area construction serves to confirm and reinforce the wisdom of the decision



that you made at that time.

This proposed shopping center would serve this whole South Shore area. There is at the present time nothing of that nature, and it will be a very badly-needed improvement. Now, to supplement the material we have already given you, I'd like to leave with you a large scale map which shows the condition of the property at the time of the re-zoning, what has since been done in the way of new development, and then an architectural rendering of what we think would be the desirable development of the remaining vacant land.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: How far have you gone with the improvement itself, other than the agreements that were made - with the physical improvement?

MR. HOARE: Well, the A & P is now under construction, and will probably be open in a matter, I would think, of four or five months time.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will go into a thorough review of this entire situation.

MR. HOARE: Well, I'd just like to re-emphasize that we think we have a moral complaint as well as a legal one.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much. With Mr. Hoare's statement now, we have completed the list of people who communicated with us prior to this morning, who wished to be heard.

I now have an additional group of names of those who gave us requests for appearances this morning, and I'll call the first five names: Mr. Dreyer, Mrs. Neu, Mr. James Whitford, and Mr. Harold Wittteman.

Is Mr. Dreyer present? (no response)

Is Mrs. Neu present?

MRS. CHARLES NEU:

I am Mrs. Charles Neu; I reside at 44 Hillside Terrace, Great Kills. I am here with reference to Map 33d. Until three years ago, I was a secretary in Mayor Robert F. Wagner's office. I now am a home-maker and mother. I am also the Chairman of the Citizens' Committee on Zoning for Great Kills. I represent a group of approximately 80 home owners.

Our complaint particularly revolves around the fact that our residential area has been deleted in the comprehensive proposed zoning and is now included in a commercial zoning.

Now, the reason we formed this committee is because of the comprehensive proposed zoning resolution

and the fact that it has absorbed our homes into a commercial zone. We bought our homes in a residential zone because naturally we wanted to reside in a residential neighborhood, and we wanted it so zoned.

The area affected by this zone change is bounded by the SIRT Track, Seely Lane, Lindenwood Road, Scarsdale Street, Hillside Terrace, Nelson Avenue, Locust Place, -there was also one other place in there. All right, the inclusion of our homes in this C4-1 zone is really not necessary, and not all advantageous to the individual home-owners.

There are many home owners affected by this unwise zoning. Why should we suffer because of the few speculators who are only interested in making money? For this, undoubtedly, is the underlying motive. Also I understand zoning is first and foremost for the protection of the individual home-owner, and I rather hope that it will continue to be that way for all of us on Staten Island, because as you know, and you are very familiar with the fact, that Richmond is primarily a Borough of home-owners, and I think it should continue to be that way.

However, we do need industry, I agree, and we need commerce, and we need retail areas as well. Now our Great Kills area, and the area is small enough that actually

It shouldn't even be a commercial C-4-1 area because the radius is too tiny. It should be a retail area, however, be that as it may, I'm primarily interested in the re-zoning of our area to residential again, as it was previously, so that cumulatively - as a group, we stand to lose in the neighborhood of well over maybe \$100,000 or more, and this would be on an individual basis. We'd all stand to lose financially. Our pocket-books would be hit very hard by this change, and for one specific person's interest. I can't see it being done. It's not a democratic thing, I don't think.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mrs. Neu, I might say this, that you and I have spoken at the meeting that we had over at Staten Island; that there is a zoning matter before us involving this very thing. Now, I don't think it's right for you to anticipate any conclusions on our part. And I really don't think it's right, either, for you to give the slightest thought to the fact that we are motivated by helping any particular property owner.

MRS. NEU: Well I sincerely hope not. That is not my purpose. My purpose is my interest as well as the interest of all my neighbors.

CHAIRMAN FELT: When we met, as I told you, Mr. Lindsey, who, in some way was involved with your group, met with us; we endeavored to work out some amicable situation. We haven't been able to do it yet, but we are still endeavoring and I hope we will work out something that will be fair and equitable.

MRS. NEU: May I inject this one thought? As far as an amicable situation is concerned, the only way that you will please us is to abide by the map we have submitted to you in your City Planning Commission office on Monday, setting the boundaries as we desire and that shouldn't be too much to ask from us.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, Mrs. Neu, that was Monday of this week, so that we are working with you.

Mrs. Neu: And actually, Commissioner, we are not asking very much of you. We are merely asking that you retain our individual homes in a residential neighborhood, and it was up until now so zoned. And there is no reason and need for our homes to be changed. You promised, perhaps, we would win our case. We, however, want to go on record to that effect, and I feel thus far we haven't come to a satisfactory conclusion, but I hope we will.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well, but you see there hasn't been any conclusion on anything relating to our proposed ordinance. We will, I think, within a reasonable time, be able to submit our final recommendation to the Board of Estimate and I think you can feel assured that we are certainly mindful of the position you have taken.

MRS. NEU: All right, and may I say one more thing to all of you here. National statistics indicate there are 3,300,000 women who are going to vote this year, in excess of the vote by you men, so therefore, we will have quite an influence on the voting this year and I think both the Republicans and Democrats are very much aware of it. And if you just give us this thing we are asking, and which is really not a favor, you are not doing us a favor. You are only returning our homes which we are rightfully entitled to in the first place, and you as a group here, I don't feel that you can sit up and decree that this and this and thus are so. You are, as far as I am concerned, an administrative body, necessarily a legislative body, and for my part I think you do have a little bit too much power.

If you can just say right out and out this, this and this is so, and then we have to come pleading to you for what is rightfully ours. Now don't you go along with me and wouldn't you feel the same way if you were in my position? I bought my home 4 years ago and it was zoned residential, and that's the way I want it to remain. Also, it was easily accessible to communication. It was easily accessible to churches, schools and to the retail area and, of course, that indicated the price of the home.

Why should we bend or be penalized for being near a retail area?

CHAIRMAN FELT: All right, you asked me a question. All I can say is this. We bend every effort to reach equitable decisions. People have their right to be heard by us and to meet with us, discuss their problems with us, and in the final analysis, we do not have the last say. The Board of Estimate does. And I also want to say, Mrs. Neu, that this Planning Commission is a completely non-political body, so that no matter how people vote or whether more men or women vote really doesn't influence us. Our responsibility is to do the right thing as we see it and I can assure you we shall try to do that here.

MRS. NEU: Well, I have nothing further to say, except that I hope you will grant us favorable consideration in this action and abide by the boundaries that we have set. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I was told, that Mr. Whitford is not present this afternoon. If he has any statement that he would like to make, and if he submits it to us, or gets in touch with me and tells me orally what his views are, we shall be happy to hear from him. Is Mr. Witteman present?

RICHARD IRWIN: I would like to make a statement here because we have four people who were supposed to make map reports, and since it is quite extensive and time is growing short and there's still a lot of people to be heard, we wonder if we can submit these statements and then ask for a meeting, as soon as possible, with representatives of the Commission and the staff.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Fine, I will be glad to meet with you and other Commissioners and members of the staff, probably not next week but within a week or so thereafter.

MR. IRWIN: Very well, that's good enough for us.

CHAIRMAN FELT: While I know your name, the secretary would like it for the record.

MR. IRWIN: Richard Irwin, Executive Vice President of the Staten Island Chamber of Commerce.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Irwin. Is Mr. Wittemen present?



HAROLD E. WITTEMAN: My name is Harold E. Witteman, I am President of the Emerson Hill Association. There is nothing personal about the little squabble we had this morning; We just don't agree; but being that the boys and girls on the other hills over there have all wanted R1-A, can we presume that you plan to give that serious consideration?

CHAIRMAN FELT: You can presume that we plan to give it serious consideration; yes, sir.

MR. WITTEMAN: Quite serious?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, sir; is there anything else you would like to say, Mr. Witteman?

MR. WITTEMAN: No, that's all.

CHAIRMAN FELT: All right, thank you very much. We'll part friends.

Is Mr. John R. Herne present? Mr. Herne. (no response)  
I might add that some of those who sent in their names before today may have been absent when I called the list previously, and that on concluding the names I have before me, I'll go back to the prior list. Is Mr. Richard Lasher present?

RICHARD LASHER: My name is Richard Lasher. I could probably spend the next four hours, discussing the various ramifications of the proposed zoning, as I see them. I'm here this afternoon on behalf of my client, Mr. John Rembo. This pertains to Map 21.

I am speaking on behalf of Mr. Rembo's objection to the proposed zoning of his property to R-3 from its present zoning of unrestricted use and business use.

The property is specifically located on the south easterly corner, along Richmond Terrace, 225 feet, more or less.

However my objection here is for the area in general, known as the southerly side of Richmond Terrace, bounded on the west by Clove Road, on the east by Alaska Street.

This area is proposed to be R-3, of which my client's property is a part. This area is presently designated as unrestricted and part business. The character of this neighborhood definitely lends itself to industrial and commercial purposes.

At the present time, there exists in this area, commencing from Clove Road, a recently constructed gasoline filling station, a recently constructed glass repair shop, tavern, automobile supply depot, repair shop, plumbing supply establishment, insurance, real estate office, radio repair shop, used car lot, automotive body and fender repair

shop, a truck garage and depot, electrical contractor's shop, power manufacturing business and supply establishment and many other businesses.

This area, as proposed in your resolution, proposes to be an R3 area. I might add, that on the opposite side of the proposed area and surrounding it the...

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Is that Richmond Terrace?

MR. LASHER: The area in question is the southerly side. The northerly side is M1-1, which is contemplated by the Commission to be set aside for industry and manufacturing establishments. However, in recent weeks, the City of New York has announced that  $8\frac{1}{2}$  acres of that, in addition to what they have taken already, will be taken for sewerage treatment plants.

Now, on the northerly side, directly across from this particular area in point, we have a garbage disposal plant, several oil depots, oil companies, and motor repair and railroad sides, etc. Therefore, it would not be inconsistent to put this particular area in the same category. However, in addition to that - in this proposed area of R3 the Commission has seen fit to recommend a C zone on one side, an M zone on the other side. Therefore, our request, in substance, is just a mere extending of either the C or the M, in conformance with the present commercial establishments located there.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Either one of those would be agreeable to you?

MR. LASHER: Yes, sir, I believe they would be.

As was stated all morning and afternoon, I don't think the zoning in general is objectionable as a whole, however, the question that arises in most cases is the non-conforming uses. This is my opinion -- even though permission may be granted in many cases for non-conforming uses, there is always the problem of the people moving in these areas conforming with the designated zoning; and therefore, the designated zoning creates a problem in those places where there are non-conforming uses. It puts the people under a terrific strain, being in a non-conforming use in this particular area.

It is therefore requested, on my client's behalf, that this area in general be retained as such and put in a comparable C8 or M3 zone. I trust that my client's request will be given favorable consideration. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir. Is Mr. Cohen present?

DAVID S. COHEN: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission: my name is David S. Cohen, 2160 Hylan Boulevard. I'm speaking with reference to Map 27a. I came to ask specifically for a change of Block 869, Lot 344 - Richmond Road and Delaware. I would like to change that back to a business zone. It is now R1. I would like it to be zoned C1-1, for this reason: that up to the property it is zoned for business; across the street you have R5; surrounding both sides, R3. This is on a main thoroughfare, with plenty of traffic going by.

If you were to take the house and put it on Richmond Road, it would be next to impossible to either sell it or get out of the garage for that matter. I don't know whether you have taken that into consideration on a lot of these main thoroughfares, but there is a problem on this particular piece. I do think that with the R5 across the street, that there will be a great need for additional business properties.

For this particular piece, I believe that the R1 designation is an error; that whole area there should be R3, if anything. But as far as the 250 feet along Richmond Road, I do believe that should be rezoned for business use.

With reference to Map 20d, that's Richmond Avenue and Jules Drive - that is now designated as R3. If you will look through that whole map and the adjoining one, you will find that there is very little area for business. There is a large cemetery in the area, and I do think that this particular wide street would make a good street for business use, that you should consider the particular street - 250 feet or thereabout - for business use. It is one of the streets that will come off the Expressway, and that is a good shopping area.

To go into it generally, I believe that a previous speaker spoke of the economics of Staten Island - that it has not been properly considered. You take a person earning from \$100 to \$125 per week - if you put him into the category of an \$18,000 house, he will not be able to maintain that house. With the present financing, taxes, and everything that goes with it, it will run from \$175 to \$200 a month. That will be beyond his means.

I do believe that when you talk of making R3 - no apartment houses - that it is an error. Here is an area where we might be able to do approximately the same thing that has been done in Queens in the Clearview section, up along Bayside, in through there, where you have the cooperative housing, two stories, where a man puts in about \$1000 and pays about \$110 a month. That is the kind of place and the kind of thing we need for that particular homeowner. All through the day, I have been hearing people maligning speculators - what they do to an area - that the only one that should be considered is the person that owns a house within that area. He is within the area and, therefore, there is nothing much that there can be done for him; but the open territories in the area should be properly planned. I think, in listening too much to them, you overlook the possibility of doing a good job in the open territories.

I must remind these people that if the Dutch didn't speculate with that \$24, when Manhattan Island was bought, we would be in pretty bad shape today. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir. Is Mr. Ginsberg present?

IRVING GINSBERG: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my name is Irving Ginsberg. I represent Mr. Frank Barbara; he is the owner of the property on the southeast corner of Seaside Boulevard and Sand Lane. My remarks are particularly addressed to the proposed change of the east side of Sand Lane between Seaside Boulevard and Robin Road. By the way, that is on Map 27c. I would like to familiarize the Commission with the area in general. Seaside Boulevard is the peripheral new highway that is going to adjoin the new South Beach development.

The property I am talking about is on the east side of Sand Lane and Seaside Boulevard.

Sand Lane is the main artery of traffic to South Beach to this new Seaside Boulevard.

During the summer and on weekends, that area near Seaside Boulevard is traversed literally by thousands of people. That's the main entrance to the Beach. As a matter of fact, directly opposite the property I'm speaking about is the turn-about for the bus stop, and all the people going from Saint George to South Beach get off at that point.

I have a photograph showing the property on the west side of Sand Lane. May I hand this up, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, would you please?

MR. GINSBERG: The property on the west side of Sand Lane is presently proposed to be in a C1 District. The present proposal calls for the zoning of the property immediately across the street from our property into a commercial or business zone,

Now, the property that I'm interested in is on the east side of Sand Lane. The photograph shows the west side of Sand Lane which you proposed to retain in a

C1 District. We are directly across the street from that, on the main artery of traffic, which has thousands of people traversing it; and the proposal is to put the property directly across the street - in the photograph there - into an R3 District. According to the Commissioner's information this morning, R3 would be for one and two-family houses. I am sure that if you people were cognizant of the situation of South Beach at that point, you would know that Sand Lane and Seaside Boulevard at that point is no place for one and two-family houses.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: What are you suggesting, Mr. Ginsberg?

MR. GINSBERG: I am suggesting that it be rezoned consonant with the area. I would like to see the same sort of thing that you have on the other side of the street. As a matter of fact, up the street there is a kiddy park, but I don't know whether you go along with that.

However, the least that should be done is that this area should be zoned C1, the same as across the street, because otherwise my client, who bought this property some 10 or 15 years ago, when it was always zoned Retail, is out of pocket all the taxes and the waiting he's done; and he will have a useless piece of property.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: It is not presently improved?



MR. GINSBERG: There is a small bungalow on the corner, a two-family house, but that is a mere temporary thing. He has been carrying this with the idea that it is business property, and the mere fact that it hasn't been improved to date -- as far as the future is concerned, if what we have across the street is C1, in this area, which is a very busy, heavily-traveled location in the summertime, it certainly should not be R3.

I would also like to state that across the street, not only is it C1 for 100 feet but it's C1 for the first block, but the second block has also been put in C1. It would be manifestly unfair to put the area across the street in an R3 district. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Fred Winrock. Is Mr.

Winrock present?

FRED WINROCK: My name is Fred Winrock. I represent myself, with three different hats. I'm a home-owner; I'm a builder; and I'm also an investor in real estate, in Staten Island.

In my particular case, I seem to have gripes in all three cases. I'm going to give them to you, each one of them

I happen to live on Flagg Place; that is, I think, in Map 27, I'm not sure, in your book. Flagg Place is zoned R4 - where I'm living right now. That's between Richmond Road and Flagg Place, that is south of Flagg Place to Richmond Road.

There are a number of very substantial homes there,

of which mine is one. That's a case, in my opinion, of very poor zoning. That should be a R1-A, the highest one.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Are you sure that's on Map 27?

MR. WINROCK: Maybe I've got the wrong one - either 21 or 27. I don't know which one it is.

I say for the first 100 feet south of Flagg Place, or splitting the property in half between Richmond Road and Flagg Place should be zoned the highest type zoning.

My particular piece happens to go down the Richmond Road, but that's not the point.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In other words, it should be zoned to take care of homes of a similar character to the homes across the street. Your thought is that something approaching the mid-line of the block between Flagg Place and Richmond Road ----

MR. WINROCK: Yes, that should be the dividing line.

Now, I'm going to come to the next one, which is the Ettingville area - that's where I'm building. I's Hylan Boulevard west of Richmond Avenue. As a builder, I have built several hundred homes in that particular area on Winchester Avenue, Thornycroft Avenue, Pacific Avenue, and Beach Road. It was an "E" Zone and "E1" Zone, and the homes there are built on, originally, 60 to 100 feet, when land was cheaper - five, six years ago and then to 50

feet, and then this last year to 40 feet; but the homes are all fairly decent. It's a middle-income neighborhood, and homes have been selling, oh, in the last year, say \$16,500 - the past year.

Now, I bought this land on west of Richmond Avenue - Woods of Arden Road, about 6 blocks west of Richmond Avenue, running down to Hylan Boulevard. You've got it now in an R1 zone. It's quite a big area; in fact, it crosses Richmond Avenue, too. Richmond Avenue is a "G1", and right to the left of that is a "G". I'm talking of the Hylan Boulevard section. That is a very ridiculous zoning there. Now, I'm not blaming you people for that because it was a "G1" and a "G" before.

CHAIRMAN FELT: What do you think it should be?

MR. WINROCK: You want to know what I think it should be? Exactly the same as the three blocks I bought to the east of that, which is an "E" there.

CHAIRMAN FELT: You say that's an "E"?

MR. WINROCK: That would be one and two-family houses. Let's put it that way.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That is R3.

MR. WINROCK: Now, I'm talking of an area far more than my own there, that isn't all my own there. There's

a tremendous piece there that's completely zoned wrong. I'd like to talk to you Commissioner, on the economic point -- why I'm saying that. That land is running \$1,200 a lot right now, unimproved. I got tremendous field-work to do there, cutting of trees, putting in sewers, paving it, everything else. I can't sell a house for \$16,600 this year, not at that price of land. It's over \$18,000, and the average fireman, policeman, or city employee -- to whom I've sold an awful lot of homes and people making that kind of money -- I can't sell them this year.

If you make that an R1 or a G1 district -- you're talking about houses like my own house up in the hill, where you made it an R4. They are reversed, that is what I am getting at -- that whole area, on Arden Avenue itself, for example, you'll see houses there that cost no more than five or six thousand dollars, really shacks, on Arden Avenue, not Woods of Arden, there are a few of them like that.

There are a lot of them in there that are \$10,000, \$12,000. It certainly does not belong in an R1. Now, do you want to know the history of why it is that way?

CHAIRMAN FELT: I'd like to hear anything you wish to say.

MR. WINROCK: Well, there was a former Borough President, lived just down below, on Wakefield Road, down below, near the water there; and to preserve the land -- and keep it in a country-like manner, I believe he had some influence in changing

that into the zone that it is. There was never any other reason for it.

CHAIRMAN FELT: What zoning would you suggest?

MR. WINROCK: The present R3, one and two family houses - what you were talking about before.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Winrock, do you have a memorandum on that?

MR. WINROCK: I've written you a letter about it a long time ago - to you and to Mr. Smith and I spoke to him about it.

CHAIRMAN FELT: When you've concluded your remarks, would you mind filling out one of those sheets which would tell us in summary just what your thoughts are?

MR. WINROCK: All right, that's two points I've told you about now. Now - my investment property -

I own a piece of property on Manor Road and Victory Boulevard, Four Corners. That's the north-east corner of Manor Road and Victory Boulevard.

It's about 150 feet on Victory Boulevard and 696 feet on Manor Road, about a depth of 200 and some odd feet, having an area of just about four acres or maybe slightly over.

Ten years ago I had this re-zoned 100% for retail, in other words for a small neighborhood shopping center.

I had it leased out to somebody a few years ago, and he ran into some trouble. He had filed plans for this thing. I'm trying hard to get this thing up. It's been a financing matter all this time, and right now, the money is, I have tenants as a matter of fact.

Right now with the financing matter what it is, I can't get the money to put it up. Now this zoning which you've changed completely now, you've only made it 200 feet business on Victory Boulevard, nothing on Manor Road. You've changed the rest to an R3. This has been a very expensive piece of property, I mean I've carried it for 14 years now, since 1946, and it's zoned in depth for good parking. It's a busy spot up there. You probably know that section. I'm sure; and it's certainly laid out perfectly for a small neighborhood shopping center. If you change the zoning, I will have a non-conforming district first of all, if I do get it up this year; and if I can't afford to get it up this year because of financing and your zoning goes through, I've lost the whole thing.

Victory Boulevard and Four Corners, in my opinion, is about the busiest place in all of Staten Island. That's a very strong statement, but you can check it by counting the cars there. There is a terrific amount of traffic there, and they can't park on Victory Boulevard; they can't park on Manor Road because it's too narrow. In my proposed parking lot - there and the shopping

center, I aim to widen both streets in front of property - Victory Boulevard, and Manor Road, with off-street parking. So, it is a thing which is of benefit to the entire neighborhood for a shopping area as well as the fact that I have the zoning I want now and I'd like to keep it.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will review that matter. When I say that, I mean we will review all three matters that you referred to. Is Mr. Milnes present?

KENNETH W. MILNES: My name is Kenneth W. Milnes, 2081 Richmond Terrace. What I have to say here, Mr. Chairman, is not in relation to the maps or the resolution, but in my capacity as President of the Staten Island Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

We have affiliated ourselves with the Chamber, so I think that everything has been said in that matter that could be said.

We are also affiliated with the Architects Council of New York City, the ruling body of the seven

architectural organizations of the City, and I think you're well aware of their opinion.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to be here today, to meet Mr. Bloustein again, and Commissioner Orton, when he was here. I worked with them some years ago on the old Harrison report and may I say at this time that I am glad to see them again.

There is only one or two things that I would like to say. I have no personal axe to grind; I have no property, represent no civic organizations except myself.

I do think that the Commission could take into consideration one or two things.

In the strictly residential zones you set up, whatever they may be, we think that some consideration should be given to small retail areas within some walking distance of these residential areas.

Everybody doesn't have a car, and if there is a car in the house, it might be away and somebody has to go to the store. It must be within some reasonable walking distance. I think it's something that ought to be provided in almost every residential area.

There is a drug store that is always needed, a small store of some sort for staples, a delicatessen,



something like that. And it doesn't do any great detriment to a residential neighborhood.

The main thing I want to just ask you, gentlemen, for consideration: I have been in practice for 32 years on Staten Island, I was born there, my practice is there, and it has been mostly a commercial and industrial practice.

I am sorry to see that any commerce and industrial areas are down-graded on Staten Island. I think it's a serious mistake.

We have 40,000 to 45,000 commuters leaving our Island every day and coming home every night. The more business that we could provide, or industry, to keep those people working on Staten Island, would mean more to the economic life of Staten Island than anything else we could do.

As far as the cursory look that I have had at the maps, a great many of our industries will be out of place in the coming few years. They will not be able to continue in the type business they are in. I think we ought to make industrial areas and invite business to Staten Island.

We don't want to make Staten Island a bedroom of New York. That's a cliché that has been used a lot of times, but I think it is well taken.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Milnes, as I said earlier this morning, and as I said at a meeting before your Society and many other groups, the City Planning Commission and each Commissioner on our staff, have great hopes for the future of Staten

Island, both as an industrial area, and with proper barriers and projections as a residential area. We, in the Planning Commission, surely do not want to weaken Staten Island's industrial base; on the contrary, we're trying to do everything we can to protect it.

MR. MILNES: Well, I realize that, Mr. Chairman, you people are very dedicated to your work, and I certainly admire you for that, but I have heard a great deal about the west shore of Staten Island. I think the north shore of Staten Island is probably the most heavily industrialized area that we have, from South Ferry all the way, you might say, to Manitoba Place.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Milnes, we assure that it will be that way for many years to come.

MR. MILNES: We hope it remains that way because it's a great place for industrial development.

CHAIRMAN FELT: The reason I emphasize the west shore is that we think that there is room for considerable growth and expansion on the west shore. In other words, the west shore hasn't caught up with the north shore, yet.

MR. MILNES: I don't think it will catch up, with the highways they're putting through there. I think it's ruining the west shore potential. Of course, that's neither here nor there. It has nothing to do with this discussion.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Sometimes when we have an opportunity, you and I could have a talk about that, Mr. Milnes.

MR. MILNES: Fine, now, I want to say one other thing. As an architect, I really do not advocate that the architect, as a professional man, should get into the zoning problem. I don't  
Felt/Milnes

think it's within their province to come in here and discuss zoning, except as it affects a client.

If a client has a problem, if he has a certain piece of property and goes to an architect and wants a certain piece of building done on it, the architect with his knowledge of zoning maps, tells him what he can do. I don't think it is within the province of the architect to come up here and fight just for the sake of fighting on zoning.

I do think though, that the people of Staten Island have a very special problem here, and which you are recognizing and, of course, in all Boroughs with these hearings; but I think, speaking in my capacity as President, that the adoption of these maps by the Board of Estimate, which of course is problematical until the matter comes up, I don't think that the resolution or the maps should be presented to the Board of Estimate for at least a year.

Now the reason I say that is because we have been working on the present zoning resolution from 1916 to date, 54 years. It hasn't done too bad a job in the development of the City. It has been amended.

CHAIRMAN FELT. 44 years..

MR. MILNES: Well, what's 10 years between friends.

Milnes

It has done pretty well under the present resolution.

We feel that a year would make no great difference. We also request that in that year, The Planning Commission take such recommendations as they are receiving today or will receive in the year, sit down with the individuals or the companies or the property owners and work out just what the Planning Commission will give them or will not give them; and before it is presented to the Board of Estimate, let these changes be incorporated in the maps. Now it's not that I don't trust you gentlemen in the job that you're doing. I do, but many a thing like this is lost in the shuffle afterwards.

I admire you very much, Mr. Felt, that you say you will take these things under consideration, but you can't remember them all, neither can any of the Commissioners.

I think that the solidified changes in the maps should be made before the item is presented to the Board of Estimate, and I respectfully request that you give your earnest consideration to a delay of at least a year in presenting these maps to the Board of Estimate.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

MR. MILNES: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I'd like to call the following names now; and so that I know you're present, will you please raise your hands. Is Mr. Preston here? Mr. Preston. Goodrich, is Mrs. Goodrich here? John J. Hogan. Is Mr. Hogan here? Paul Buglioli? Bruce Hotsup. Is Bruce Hotsup here? Mr. Preston. Mrs. Goodrich.

MRS. ANDREW GOODRICH: Mr. Felt and members of the Commission, I am Mrs. Andrew Goodrich of 40 Browne Avenue, Great Kills, Staten Island.

Our property borders the opposition property. Should he be successful in having his property re-zoned as commercial, we will be absorbed. This will cause a substantial financial loss to us as residential property owners. We want to remain residential, and we are opposed to the proposed zoning change.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much, Mrs. Goodrich. Mr. Hogan will be our next speaker.

JOHN J. HOGAN: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am a home-owner in the respective community. The area is Great Kills, as identified on map C-33 of the proposed zoning plan. I'm going to be very brief on this, and I'm going to speak primarily of that area which is now residential, which has been proposed to be changed to commercial. Now

Goodrich/Felt/Hogan

I've walked around the area, practically all of the area affected, and that area which is now residential comprises approximately 90% of residential homes, and there is very little vacant area within that section.

Now the proposed change, and again I speak only of that area which is presently residential, would place a wedge in the surrounding community and thereby it would down-grade the community.

There are schools and churches in the adjacent area and the introduction of commercial facilities would change the areas to where it might be dangerous for children and others.

Now you have advised us, or you had stated that this proposed change was under consideration. Well, I would like, as an individual, to protest because I feel that a change of this type affects us so dangerously, I mean as far as our homes are concerned, that an additional protest would be in order.

Now I object, and I respectfully recommend that consideration be given to changing the zoning whereby the present residential areas will remain as they are.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Hogan.

Felt/Hogan

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Paul Buglioli.

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

I want to be specific about the vacant land there on Locust Place, fronting also on Nelson. I think it would be advisable for you people to check the possibilities, if a food market should take over that ground- and Nelson Avenue is a very narrow street with a bus route, and a 2 way street, and a firehouse on the same street.

And the building itself would not be in keeping with the small retail area there. I think we should spend some consideration on that . Thank you.'

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you Mr. Buglioli, Is Mrs. Catherine Milleysack present?

CATHERINE MILLEYSACK: I'm Catherine Milleysack of 24 Locust Place, and I represent myself, although I'm along with the zoning committee in Great Kills.

I wish to repeat, as we did on December 9th, that we realize that our property is in danger of devaluation because of the Strand Theater across the street. If the theater is to be used as a food store, we visualize a future of trucks loading and unloading at all hours of day and

night, heavy traffic and congestion of all surrounding streets in the area, waste of all sorts, inviting health menaces.

Nelson Avenue is too narrow for present-day cars. Because of this fact, there was no zone planning in the past, so any big business should be taken to the wide highways.

We realize the advantage of the zoning, but in this case, it just doesn't fit. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir. I will read the next group of names: John T. Connolly, George Dorfman, Mrs. Donaldson. Is Mr. Connolly present?

JOHN T. CONNOLLY: Chairman Felt, Members of the Commission: I have had the pleasure of ironing out much of my problem with Mr. Smith and, accordingly, I am probably going to delight the Commission by saying that I will not go into my extended remarks.

At this time, I am going to offer for the

Milleysack / Connolly



record and to the Commission a letter, a petition in the form of a letter.

My name is John T. Connolly, Attorney at Law, representing Delaware Chemicals, Inc., at 50 Murray Street, Staten Island; that's Tottenville, the town where New York State begins.

Briefly, our problem is the same as the Nassau Smelting. We're zoned into an M1, and we feel that for expansion purposes, we're going to need M3.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Have you discussed that with Mr. Smith?

MR. CONNOLLY: I have and I'm well satisfied, and Mr. Smith and I, at a future time, will iron out whatever differences we have in connection with it.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

MR. CONNOLLY: May I put on just one more hat at the moment? Since we had a group here from Great Kills - I might say that I live in Great Kills, and may I suggest that the Commission visualize this C4 area, which you have proposed as a hub, which will be reached by roads, five or six roads, all of which are far too small to accomodate any extended commercial enterprise in the area. Thank you very much, Mr. Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN FELT: You're welcome, sir. Is George Dorfman present?

GEORGE DORFMAN: My name is George Dorfman. I am President of the Dorfman Realty Corporation.

Mr. Felt, gentlemen, I would like to refer to Map 27. You are rather familiar with this - this is in reference to the opposite side of the property that Mr. Hoare of the Hylan-Mill Corporation spoke about - the shopping center that is proposed in the New Dorp - Oakwood area. Gentlemen, are you acquainted with the area?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, Mr. Dorfman.

MR. DORFMAN: I am the owner of the property on the opposite side of Hylan Boulevard.

CHAIRMAN FELT: On the west side of Hylan Boulevard, which is proposed for R3?

MR. DORFMAN: That is proposed for R3, that is correct, sir.

Felt/Dorfman

My father and I have been builders in Staten Island since 1928. There are at least 4,000 to 5,000 people living in Staten Island, homes and residences that we have built, and I feel that I have a working knowledge of Staten Island.

I agree with Mr. Hoare that as far as Hylan Boulevard is concerned in that area, that it is essentially, and will always be business. As far as the public is concerned, when I built the houses in the area, I deliberately set back 100 foot before I started any of the houses, from the Boulevard.

There are no houses that have been built, no residential, outside of one building that has been built in the area as residential since 1940. And as Mr. Hoare stated, a great number of commercial buildings have been put up.

I respectfully ask the Commission to consider the opposite side of the street as well as the side proposed by Mr. Hoare.

Mr. Hoare's Corporation is a subsidiary of the Astor Holding Company. I feel that we deserve the same moral consideration as you would give that company.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Not that we are involved with who owns what, but his corporation is an

affiliate or subsidiary.....

MR. DORFMAN: They are a subsidiary of the Astor Holding Company, and if I may add, I have done a lot of building in the area. They have only leased property. When he spoke of the A&P and the other properties that are building up, they are only on lease. They only lease the property. In other words, the man who had this property prior to them had it re-zoned for business. They in turn bought it from this man, and now have been offering it on lease to anyone who cares to build on it.

I've tried to get the other side zoned for business in order to build something, and that's what I'm asking again for, not only for myself, there are other owners in the area.

And, as I've said before, the area will always be, because of its characteristics at the present time, business. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Alright, thank you very much, Mr. Dorfman. Mrs. Robert Donaldson?

Do you want to add anything, Mr. Dorfman?

Would you speak into the microphone?

MR. DORFMAN: You mentioned that you would take up with Mr. Hoare in greater detail a consideration as to his zoning problem. I respectfully ask, if I may also be considered as to also attend at that time?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well Mr. Smith, would you step down. Mr. Smith, would you step down to see Mr. Dorfman, please? Arrange for that, so that we could see him at the same time that we will see Mr. Hoare. Mrs. Donaldson, I'm sorry.

MRS. ROBERT DONALDSON: I'm Mrs. Robert Donaldson. I live at 295 Kell Avenue in Staten Island.

I'm speaking just as an individual. I have no complaints about my present zoning.

I'd just like to make special general observations.

First, I am definitely against the provision for more apartment houses on Staten Island. There are 4 other boroughs where apartment houses can be built.

CHAIRMAN FELT: If I may say, Mrs. Donaldson, that what we have in our present zoning ordinance involves a substantial decrease of the permitted bulk in apartment houses in Staten Island and, in other words, based upon

the present ordinance, the one that now exists, many more apartment houses could be built than under the zoning ordinance that we propose.

MR. DONALDSON: Oh, I see, in other words though, apartment houses can be built even under the new zoning resolution.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In certain areas, yes. In other words, the areas that are zoned R-1, R-2, and probably R-3 will not have apartment houses, but in the areas zoned R-4, 5, and 6, apartment houses will be permitted; but they will be of a lesser density, and lesser bulk than what are now permitted.

MRS. DONALDSON: I still deplore it.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, I think it would be very unwise to prohibit any type of apartment house anywhere, that is in any of the boroughs. We have to have some. We're trying to control it.

MRS. DONALDSON: The City fathers are concerned about the flight of our middle income families from the City. If Staten Island is kept suburban, the trend from New York City might easily be reversed

Donaldson/Felt

when such families are enticed to Staten Island, especially with the completion of the Narrows Bridge, which incidentally I still don't relish.

Second, I believe the minimum lot size for homes should be 60 feet, regardless of the bulk of the building. Forty houses on 40-foot lots are now being constructed in my neighborhood and believe me, it looks ghastly.

Besides providing no real privacy, since one can look into his neighbors dining area, and see what's for dinner, the only difference between these and row houses, is a 10-foot space.

Third, each neighborhood should have its own park. In addition, the buffer zone between light manufacturing and residential districts could be parks and/or playgrounds. There doesn't seem to be enough provision for such areas under the new zoning resolution.

Fourth, I am against any heavy industry in Staten Island. In connection with zoning of business and industry on Staten Island.....

CHAIRMAN FELT: Madam, I don't think you will mind if I try to answer some of your questions.

MRS. DONALDSON: Not at all.

Donaldson, Felt

CHAIRMAN FELT: Take industries like Bethlehem Steel, take industries like White, take industries even like Nassau Smelting - to be sure, it's a large industry - there are a number of industries that are virtually anchored in Staten Island and have been there for generations. Anything that would be done to get those industries out of Staten Island would have a very disturbing affect on the entire economy of the Island. It would lose jobs for so many people on the Island; so that many of us would like to see things one way or another, but we have to look at both sides of the picture and try to do something that's equitable.

MRS.DONALDSON: Yes I understand, that is your position - you are to try to combine everybody's wishes into one goal.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Into what we think is fair.

MRS. DONALDSON: Yes, regarding the heavy industries though, isn't there some way that we can prevent more from entering?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, what we are doing under our proposed resolution is to have the areas



in which heavy industries may locate at the furthest distance from the residential areas and we are also having performance standards which would in some way, to a degree, regulate the performance of these industries.

MRS. DONALDSON: Next, of course, my last remark is just a conclusion; that I think it is the duty of the Planning Commission to promote the new resolution, if you really believe in it, and not permit it to be discussed in a local paper as if it is something hideous. I think that you should rebut the articles that are appearing in the Staten Island Advance, showing the people that what is proposed is for the general welfare.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, here I must add one thing. The various newspapers are obliged to submit to the public all sides of a picture and all opinions must be expressed. You mentioned the Staten Island Advance. One day there may be reference made to beneficial aspects of the zoning resolution; another day there may be reference to adverse aspects of it, and newspapers really have the right to present situations as they see it, from any angle. None of us would want to attempt, even if we had the power, to muffle the press.

MRS.DONALDSON: No, not that; except that I do think that all sides aren't always presented, and that it would be a service to all of us if something appeared that did not seem to be quite right and the Commission would make some corrective statement.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, when those things are brought to our attention, we usually do.

MRS. DONALDSON: All right, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

Is Mr. A. J. Kauffman here?

ABE J. KAUFFMAN: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Commission, my name is Abe J. Kauffman.

I represent myself and a few other individuals who have recently purchased some land from the City of New York. I think we purchased somewhere in the vicinity of about 200 lots.

Now I'm here to protest the change of zoning on page 33-d: Hylan Boulevard to Bayview Terrace, and Bennett Place to Harold Street.

That, plus 2 others, are being changed or proposed from "E" to R-3.

Donaldson/Kauffman/Felt

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well "E" is very similar to R3.

MR. KAUFFMAN: It is very similar, with this exception, Mr. Chairman, that under E1, two-family and multiple dwellings are permissible; under R3 just one and two. For practice purposes, multiple dwelling is nil, you might say, because it only permits about 12% coverage.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, so that you might be aware of what was said earlier - R3, as proposed would permit multiple dwellings, but we are very seriously considering, and sympathetically considering, a prohibition of multiple dwellings in R3.

MR. KAUFFMAN: I disagree with the Commission. I realize that you have a burden here, that you would like to keep the density of population low but Zone "E" does go along with you. It only permits a coverage of 35% of the land, which is a low density. We purchased these properties at a fair and marketable price at the City auctions. I believe that if you people keep on lowering these zonings, you will find that more properties will be passed by at the sale, just like we had yesterday.

We had more properties passed by yesterday and not bid on than we had in the previous eight or nine sales.

There are two others I wish to put on record: the others are on page 33c: South Railroad Avenue to Gorman, and Judson

to Kelvin; one more on 34A, Hylan Boulevard and Brook Avenue. All these are being placed into R3, prohibiting the erection of possible multiple dwellings. I don't say we will. I have started plans in one of the blocks for one-family homes.

Now, something else: we do have some properties in proposed R1 zoning which calls for 60-foot frontage.

As one of the gentlemen previously pointed out, with land running about 60 or 70 cents a square foot, \$1,200, \$1,300, a lot, the cost of improving a 60-foot lot necessitates building a house for \$18,000 \$19,000 or \$20,000.

You're keeping a lot of people out. Those particular people should be brought down to a 40-foot frontage; 40 foot frontage calls for a detached house running about \$17,000, \$18,000 and \$19,000, and it would not degrade the neighborhood and would bring in a desirable group of people.

I'm also glad that the Commissioner has pointed out to some people that we cannot build a community without multiple dwellings. It is impossible because there are some people who do not wish to live in a house.

They cannot afford the price of \$18,000 or \$19,000, but they can afford the price of an apartment. And as one other gentleman pointed out, if you eliminate multiple dwellings, you will chase people to New Jersey.

That's about all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you Mr. Kauffman.  
Mr. Weissberg. Is Mr. Weissberg present? And after we hear

from Mr. Weissberg, I'm going to call the names of those who I called earlier, on this list that we received this morning, to find out if any of you have returned. Is Mr. William A. Dreyer present? Mr. Dreyer is present. Mr. James Whitford is absent. Mr. John A. Herne? Is Mr. Herne present? Katherning Bullock. Frank B. Sterner, Jr.? Mr. A. Preston? Bruce Hostrup? Mr. Weissberg, please.

ROBERT WEISSBERG: Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert Weissberg, and I appear for Mr. Menden on behalf of Mr. Maxine B. Forman, Marjorie B. Menden and Eleanor B. Berv.

First, I would like to say that we are in accord with the proposed change, as far as zoning is concerned.

I think it may save time if I read a short letter that has been prepared, and then leave copies with the Commission, if I may.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Weissberg.

MR. WEISSBERG: The undersigned, on behalf of Maxine B. Forman, Marjorie B. Menden and Eleanor B. Berv, who own and control substantially most of the property on the east side of Hyman Boulevard between Jackson Avenue and Locust Avenue, request that the proposed zoning as commercial property be extended north to Locust Avenue on the east side of Hyman Boulevard to Miller Field.

The present zoning permits retail 100 feet in depth....

CHAIRMAN FELT: Excuse me, is that a location where within the last six months or a year there was a change in the zoning resolution?

MR. WEISSBERG: Yes, sir; 21-F, I was getting to that. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Wasn't there to have been a supermarket built there?

MR. WEISSBERG: Yes, sir.

If I may go on, I think I have the information you're seeking, sir. The present zoning permits Retail 100 feet in depth along the east side of Hylan Boulevard from New Dorp Lane to Locust Avenue.

Your Commission approved a 21-F application on the east side of Hylan Boulevard, under C.P. No. 14999, on September 17, 1959; and a further application is being presented to extend the 21-F application heretofore granted.

Pursuant to present zoning, an additional increase

Felt / Weissberg

in space for adjacent parking facilities, the owners purchased additional adjacent property to round out the proposed site, and make available store space requested with adequate adjacent parking.

The new zoning resolution indicates that the property on the east side of Mylan Blvd. from New Jersey Lane to Bache Ave. to its complete depth to Miller Field has been designated as commercial property.

This request is to extend the commercial use for 2 additional adjacent blocks to Locust Avenue.

CHAIRMAN FELT: If I may, I want to ask another question. If I recall, aren't there 4 or 5 private houses in that area?

MR. WEISSBERG: We acquired those.

CHAIRMAN FELT: All right, because I knew that there were 4 or 5 houses.

MR. WEISSBERG: We have it all now, sir. The undersigned is in favor of the concept of the new zoning plan and understands that you are aware of certain necessary minor changes as it affects Staten Island. And this Sir, is signed by Mr. Menden and , if I may, I'd like to leave copies for each member.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir. The only other person present whose name was handed in at the hearing this morning is William A. Dreyer, I believe. Mr. Dreyer? Then we'll return to the list of those whose names were handed in prior to this morning.

WILLIAM A. DREYER: Mr. Chairman, my name is William Dreyer. I'm representing Arthur Dreyer and Son, 130 Union Avenue, Mariners Harbor. On March 14th, we sent a detailed protest in the form of a letter. Within a few days we received the letter in reply from the Commission, stating that they would look into our case further. The date was March 18th, just a few days ago. In view of that letter, I would like to stand by until the Commission has further opportunity to look into our case.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Dreyer.  
Is Mr. Lagno present?

PAUL LAGNO: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Borough President, and Members of the City Planning Commission:

I've been around here since 8 o'clock this morning. My name is Paul A. Lagno.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Lagno, you know we called your name this morning?



MR. LAGNO: I must have just stepped out.. I represent the Annadale Community Association, and I live at 49 Mosely Avenue, Annadale.

We have studied your plan, especially your last review in that little booklet, and we feel that your Commission has done a pretty good job.

The only thing that we object to is that we used to have an "E1" Zone down there, then it was changed to R2, now it has been changed to R3. We would prefer an R2 zoning.

CHAIRMAN FELT: May I say this, Mr. Lagno? Are you familiar with what I referred to several times today? That is, that we are sympathetically considering the prohibition of apartment houses in R3. If that is the case, would you still be disturbed by the R3 designation?

MR. LAGNO: Well, I'd have to bring that back to our organization.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Would you, please? We want to hear all of your remarks, but I hope you will talk to your organization and find out.

MR. LAGNO: We have a meeting tonight.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Fine. Are there any two-family homes in your area?

MR. LAGNO: I don't know; maybe one or two. Most of them that have been converted temporarily to two-family went back to one-family.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I think that you ought to talk to your people and explain it to them.

We had a similar situation sometime this morning when a person representing an area had a preponderantly large number of one-family houses but also eight two-family houses. Now if we had that area R2 the one-family houses would be happy to have the change but it would disturb the owners of the two-family houses.

MR. LAGNO: We wouldn't object to two-family houses as long as it wasn't just a row of two-family houses.

CHAIRMAN FELT: You see R3 would permit one and two-family houses.

MR. LAGNO: Our homes are mostly all detached. Going back to one of the former speakers here, Mr. Winrock, I notice here that he is complaining of an R1 section - that is immediately adjoining our neck of the woods down there. He is dissatisfied with that because they are speculators, and that's what is happening. The first thing you know, we are going to be surrounded with these speculators and we're going to be hemmed in.

And we feel that we have been living down there 30, 40

years and at this late date we don't like to be hemmed in; and we would like to go along with the Commission. Our organization told me to congratulate you for the work you've done. I'm also a delegate on the Civic Congress and, as you know, the Civic Congress has gone on record as approving your resolution; and we hope that it is not extended too long because the longer it is extended, the more possibility of these developers coming in and starting before the change in the resolution.

I'd like to recommend an early approval. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mrs. Monson, would you speak to Mr. Lagno for just a minute or so because his organization is meeting this evening and I would like you to clarify the R2 and R3, and then we would be happy to hear whatever your Council recommends.

MR. LAGNO: We sent a letter to you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes; but in connection with this - whether you would still prefer the R2 or whether R3 would be agreeable....

Lagno / Felt

MR. LAGNO: That is my instructions until now. And, of course, I've got to get the consent of our group down there. We are going to meet tonight.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, that's why I would like Mrs. Monson to speak to you now. She is an old Staten Islander.

MR. LAGNO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mr. Goodwin Anderson present? I have an announcement which was given to me on a slip of paper which I shall take the opportunity of reading and it's addressed to me. Please announce that the young lady in the back of this room is Miss Patty Dougherty and her escort, Senator Langdon Parker Marvin, Jr. We are delighted to have you with us.

Is Mr. Jack Friedland present? Is Rocco C. Florio present? Mr. Denbow? I think we had someone representing Mr. Denbow earlier this afternoon. Thomas Walsh. James Reynolds. Joseph K. Grainger. N. Adler. Harold Alexander. Irwin E. Herrick. Mr. Herrick, I think we heard from you earlier.

MR. HERRICK: Yes, sir; this time I'd

Lagno/Felt/Herrick

like to speak on behalf of my own civic group.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, I think that you are entitled to do so.

MR. HERRICK: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Mr. Borough President. My name is Irvin E. Herrick. I represent the Huguenot Park Home Owners Association, Inc. I'll make it fairly brief.

There is only one point. We are on record with the Commission.

At the present time we have stretched down in our neighborhood -- the so called highly controversial R-1, which every speculator seems to be trying to mess up.

We would just like to emphasize at this time that the present R-1 district or presently known as the "G" and the area which it bounds, that under no conditions would we appreciate, if the Commission would entertain such logic as was presented by a builder as to a logical reason to change this type of a district.

The history of the so-called R-1 district in the Huguenot area is fairly well known to us. As a matter of fact, that was the beginning of our Organization because some 10,12

, 11

years ago there was an attempt to build all kinds of shacks down in that area and the association was formed for the very reason of getting that tighter zoning in there.

Now that we have it, we sincerely hope that the Commission will entertain our original written request of maintaining that R1, and if possible considering the extension which we propose. In conclusion, I'd like to read the statement from our organization that our association wishes to go on record, to state that it is heartily in favor of the new proposed zoning for our area. We are also in agreement with the City Planning Commission's principle of maintaining the Island, primarily as a residential community. As already pointed out in our letter of June 1st, 1959, our association favors extension of an R1 zone, or rather of the R1 zoning, and we will be grateful if favorable action can be taken.

At the present time, it's R1, calling for 60-foot lots. We feel that we should maintain that in our community, and that the next best step, if possible, would be the R2, as one-family houses, and we also would like to state that we take the same position

that this plan, when it is submitted for approval, should be effective immediately, with no delay to give the speculators a chance to play around. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Mr. Jacob Friedland here? Mr. Ben Goldwin? Frances P. Headley? Is there a representative of the Silver Park Association present? Of the Ward-Nixon Association? Of the Sunnyside Community Association? Mr. J. Schwartz? Mr. Lotz? Mr. Horace Stokes? Sanford Nalitt?

SANFORD NALITT: My name is Sanford Nalitt. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission: I wrote this Commission a letter just two days ago, and apparently it was not received.

CHAIRMAN FELT: When did you write?

MR. NALITT: March 23rd. Apparently it was not received, as yet.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We have been in the midst of these hearings. It may have been received, but I may not have had an opportunity of reading it yet.

MR. NALITT: I'd like to read the letter which would be the substance of what I have to say today,

Felt / Nalitt

and I think that, with a few other remarks, would satisfy me.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

MR. NALITT: Gentlemen of the Planning Commission: I wish to hereby register a vehement protest to the proposed rezoning of the above property to an R3 zone from the present "E" apartment house zone. This property was purchased and held specifically for use as an apartment house site. Rezoning would mean a severe hardship financially, and would not improve the character of the neighborhood.

This property is directly across Victory Boulevard facing a cemetery. It is bordered on the south by a gasoline station and to the west, by the Silver Lake Golf Course. The property falls away from the street to the rear of the lot in excess of 30 feet. This would make it very difficult to use the property for individual homes. I therefore strongly urge you to recommend that this property remain in the same zone as it is presently.

Now, the property that I speak of is on Victory Boulevard, approximately 250 feet north of Cheshire Place, in Map 21b.



CHAIRMAN FELT: May we have the address again, please?

MR. NALITT: Approximately 250 feet north of Cheshire Place, along Victory Boulevard on the west side of Victory Boulevard. It comprises part of Marine Cemetery. It's approximately 3 acres, with an additional acre along side owned by others.

Now, directly across the street, as I said before, is an extensive cemetery.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That's Woodland.

MR. NALITT: That is correct, Sir. Cheshire Place was built approximately 5 years ago.

The property we are discussing now was owned by the same owners at that time whom I am presently associated with. The property could not have been built as individual residences because of the falling away from the street, because of the difficult grade, and it was reserved for a propitious time to be built as an apartment house site. The property in no way would be a detriment to the area or the community.

On the east side of Victory Boulevard, all of the available land running north, that is not cemetery, is presently in the proposed zone, zoned for R-6, apartment house site, the zoning on the property I'm now

referring to was similar to the R-6 which remained on the east-side of Victory Boulevard.

The only other point I want to make is that this would be an advantageous location for middle income apartment house residences.

I've been born and brought up on Staten Island. I've lived in my own home. I now own my own home. I have a great deal of affection for 1-family residence, but not everyone wants their own home. Older people want to live in a nice area and they may not want the responsibility of home ownership. But they don't want to live in an area that 1 family residents feel should be given to apartment house or other type of zoning -because it's not good for one family houses, so let anybody use it.

This is a very desirable community. We have a golf course and a park. It's my impression that it could rightfully be used for the original purpose, "E" or re-zone it in the proposed zoning, R-6. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Nalitt.  
Mr. Nalitt, you say you sent a letter to us the other day?

MR. NALITT: It was sent to your office, sir, on March 23rd, Wednesday.

Nalitt

CHAIRMAN FELT: Do you have a copy of it?

MR. NALITT: I have another copy of it in my office.

CHAIRMAN FELT: May we have it, please, for the record? Does anyone else wish to be heard? Would you step forward, please? Were we given your name earlier?

GEORGE FERENCE: You must have missed it. My name is George Ference, Industrial Department of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, and formerly with the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company.

In the interest of conserving time, I would like to leave with your clerk a letter which was previously addressed to you by the General Manager, P. K. Partee, of the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railway Company. I think that the letter explains his views, and I will leave sufficient copies with your clerk.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much. I am very sorry but there must have been some oversight or some error. Does anyone else wish to be heard?

GENARO BEDICINI: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission: I wish to speak in reference to Map 33 -- the intersection of Hylan Boulevard and Richmond Avenue. My name is Genaro Bedicini, 200 Guyon Avenue, Oakwood, Staten Island.

Now, Richmond Avenue is 80 feet in width; Hylan Boulevard is 100 feet in width. They are both designated as arterial highways - in other words, truck routes. Richmond Avenue is a feeder for the other side of Staten Island, the only through street in that area. Shore Boulevard will run

parallel with the water, beyond there.

On the side of Hylan Boulevard between Oceanic and Richmond Avenues, the beach side, we have a tavern -- it is a non-conforming use. Across the street from there is a proposed disposal plant, or pumping station, which is to be put in. The old Empire Fishing Club is owned by the City now. I read in the newspapers that across the street from that, a bus turn-around was going to be put in by the Transit Authority. I tracked that one down, and they said they were going to put something there.

Now, we are on the opposite corner, Richmond and Hylan, between Richmond Avenue and Ridgecrest Avenue.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: What are you asking?

MR. BEDICINI: I don't think it is the intent of the Planning Commission to keep those corners in an R1 or, as now, "G-1" - continue that. They are both busy streets, arterial highways.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: What do you think it should be?

MR. BEDICINI: Either a C2 or a C1.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Is it vacant now?

MR. BEDICINI: It's vacant now. It abuts no one.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Do you own the property?

MR. BEDICINI: That's right.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Do you own the property on one corner, or on all the corners?

MR. BEDICINI: One corner.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: What do you propose for that corner?

MR. BEDICINI: Some sort of a small Retail. I don't agree with this split zoning. I don't believe in putting up a one-story building and trying to beat the tax collector, and getting a small return. I don't agree with that.

I do think it should be zoned so it can service the area. I spoke to the Eltingville Civic Group in that area; they have agreed with me. They don't like gas stations; maybe they are right; but I can't continue there as a residential zone.

Now, if we could utilize the property for either a classification 6 that you people have, or 7, that would be C1 or C2. That isn't asking too much; it would be a nice use just for the four corners. You could zone it anyway you wish, that would forever more defeat the argument there. This thing is continually coming up in the Board of Standards and Appeals for variations. I think I have a valid argument. They are both truck routes. It's not for a Shore Road, where there may prohibit commercial vehicles. I'm on a truck route. How can I put a "G" type of occupancy on those corners? It would be impossible. I abut no one. The nearest neighbor to me from the end of that property is 80 feet; across the street is 650 feet; on the other side, the Empire Fishing Club is vacant. Adjacent to that, we have a restaurant and bar. Across the way from me there is a bar, a non-conforming use.

If you people can change it to possibly a C2 -- I know about the non-conforming use. The place looks like a mess, and I would like to see it cleaned up.

I'm not asking for a gas station; I'm not asking for a flat-roof store. I want maybe a small drive-in, something nice, that fits with the area. It will be a use for the community.

I spoke to the Eltingville Civic Group. They sort of agreed. They all tell me that it's a good business zone. Fifty percent of the people in Staten Island think it's business. I continually get called up on the phone: "What do you want for the property?" They want to put in a business. It should be business. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir. Does anyone else wish to be heard? Step forward, please.

KEVEN FOGARTY: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, my name is Kevin Fogarty; I'm an attorney for Piel Brothers.

I received a call and understand that many groups appeared here today and said they thought that representatives of the industries who were concerned on Staten Island should appear. I thought that I should come and state just this small case, as I see it, for Piel Brothers, on the Island.

We are the only brewery on the Island. I know there has been some clamor against that, in particular.

There are now left in New York City five breweries.

Five years ago there were fifteen. We are the smallest brewery. We are the only brewery specifically confined to New York City. Of all other breweries here, they have outlets, they have other breweries outside the City. The brewery on Staten Island has been there for 75 years. The Company has definite plans set for a \$10,000,000 expansion of not only that brewery, but the brewery in Brooklyn on Liberty Avenue.

We realize that people do have some complaints against an industry, but when an industry has been there so long, is so vital; and it's one of the few left.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Are you familiar with the communication that we sent to Piel's?

MR. FOGARTY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Are you familiar with the discussions we've had with representatives of the brewery industry?

MR. FOGARTY: As far as it concerns Piel Brothers, yes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Because what we intend to do for the brewery industry throughout New York City will accommodate Piel's.

MR. FOGARTY: Yes, we are perfectly content and happy with the situation as it now stands. We simply thought that since the people had asked for some representative to appear--

the man who had been here and would have spoken, had to leave, so he asked that I speak.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, thank you very much. There have been many statements made, both directly and indirectly, to the effect that what we were trying to do would drive Piel's out of Staten Island, and I'm happy that you were able to say something which does not agree with that.

MR. FOGARTY: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to be heard? Will you please step forward, Mr. President. (Addressing Borough President Maniscalco of Richmond.)

BOROUGH PRESIDENT MANISCALCO: First of all, I'm glad to see Mr. Leonard Sutter, a member of our Advisory Board on Staten Island, and a civic leader, who has taken the interest to be here and listen to all the problems with which you are confronted.

I wish, personally and as Borough President, to extend my sincere thanks to the Commission for today's hearing and the manner in which the meeting was conducted.

I noticed very much your patience in listening to the speakers, to their problems, and to their recommendations, whether they were community-wide or whether they as Mr. Fornari said -



whether they had just a little forty foot-parcel.

I was very much concerned, and I was very much interested in the manner in which you handled that situation, and in how much the Commission would like to cooperate.

I think it's a very democratic way, and I'm sure that everyone who appeared here has had the opportunity to fully express himself - present his problems; and I am also confident that your Commission will study the problems and the recommendations made, and I do hope - although I realize you can't, as you stated yourself - and I've had the experience - you can't make everyone happy 100%. I am sure that you will try your best to see that you do everything possible to meet the requests and recommendations that have been presented to you, in order that we may have the type of an Island that you have always preached - a suburban community, with the things that are necessary to keep it alive.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. President.

(Applause) Mr. President, we are so happy that you were with us. When you came, you said that you would stay with us during the morning. We were delighted to see you return this afternoon and remain with us through both morning and afternoon sessions.

Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard? (no reply)  
If not, will the Secretary please call the roll on closing the hearing?

SECRETARY MALTER: This is a motion to close the public hearing on the Proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York, consisting of text and maps.

SECRETARY MALTER: (continuing)

Chairman Felt, Vice Chairman Bloustein, Commissioners Livingston, Orton, Sweeney, Acting Commissioners Sherman and Constable\* The hearing is closed.

Now, on adjournment to Wednesday, March 30, 1960, at 10 A.M. at City Hall, Manhattan: Chairman, Vice Chairman, Commissioners Livingston, Orton, Sweeney, Acting Commissioners Sherman and Constable. \*

The public hearing on the Proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution has been closed and the Commission has adjourned to meet on Wednesday, March 30, 1960, at 10 A.M., when the next regular public meeting will be held. It is now 5:00 P.M., Friday, March 25, 1960.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* (Edward Hoffman, sitting for Acting Commissioner Stuart Constable)