

J. Hoffmann

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

in the matter of

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

Borough of Queens

PUBLIC HEARING

before the

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

in the matter of a

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

of the

ZONING RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

consisting of

TEXT AND MAPS

Held at City Hall, Borough of Manhattan

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

CONTINUED HEARING - PROPOSED ZONING MAPS FOR THE
BOROUGH OF QUEENS
September 13, 1960

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

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

Pauline J. Malter, Secretary

*INDEX OF SPEAKERS - SEPTEMBER 13, 1960 - QUEENS

<u>Speakers</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Speakers</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
Bach, Peter P.	154	Nisita, Giovanni	81
Cedzich, William J.	16	Nylin, Mrs. Kathleen A.	121
Cullum, Wade (Commun.)	137	Otterstedt, Mabel (Commun.)	48
Dalrymple, Royal E.	16	Poor, Frederick H., Jr.	164
Dixon, Mary N.	156	Reichert, Henry	4
Dufour, Witham J.	92	Salminen, Carl H. (Commun.)	128
Etra, Max J. (Commun.)	52	Savacool, William L.	70
Fallon, Mrs. Ethel E.	95	Shanbron, Barry	172
Fells, William	78	Sheridan, John M.	170
Fetscher, John J.	152	Sherkel, Frank R. (Commun.)	47
Fetscher, Mae	147	Stark, Malcolm B. (Commun.)	45
Fierson, Morris (Commun.)	50	Stillman, Jack (Commun.)	44C
Firester, Jacob (Commun.)	88	Sohmer, Harry J.	124
Flick, Sol (Commun.)	46	Sovatkin, Edward J.	68
Gill, Robert J. (Commun.)	85	Sussberg, Darwin R.	57
Haback, Harry J.	66	Sylvania Electric Products Inc.	51
Hale, John P. (Commun.)	79	Tinagero, Ramon L.	83
Hirsch, Bernard I.	122	Toufexis, Steve	120
Jaffe, Herman	108	Trebor, Haynes (Commun.)	44D
Jerry, Julia E. (Commun.)	127	Venner, Julius	115
Kittross, Lucille	53	Weinstein, Frank	106
Klein, David L.	165	Zakin, Ada	137
Kruger, Irwin, J.	158	Zelman, Benjiman M.	99
LaFauci, Thomas V., Assemblyman (Commun.)	44		
Leuzzi, Joseph	113		
Levy, Edgar	135		
Linakis, John S.	132		
Lome, Max M.	58		
Lorber, Jerome Z.	74		
McConnell, Viola	151		
Master, Daniel L.	160		
Meditz, Miss Teresa	37		
Michaelis, Jules	141		
Mitchell, Lillian L.	144		
Moscowitz, Murray (Commun.)	47		
Muss, Hyman	96		

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

PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED - SEPTEMBER 13, 1960 - 2:00 P.M.

(after recess)

PROPOSED ZONING MAPS FOR THE
BOROUGH OF QUEENS

CHAIRMAN FELT: The Commission will resume after recess.
Will the Secretary please call the roll?

SECRETARY MALTELL: Chairman Felt, Vice Chairman Bloustein,
Commissioner Lindenbaum, Commissioner Livingston, Commissioner Orton,
Commissioner Sweeney, Commissioner Provenzano. 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. (CP-15820)

The hearing began yesterday morning, September 12, 1960,
at 10:00 A.M. on the text and was followed by a hearing on the proposed
zoning maps for the Boroughs of The Bronx and Manhattan.

This morning the hearing, in accordance with the public
notice that appeared in the City Record, was on the proposed zoning
maps for the Borough of Brooklyn and is being continued now on the
proposed zoning maps for the Borough of Queens, to be followed by
the proposed zoning maps for the Borough of Richmond.

(On August 17, 1960, Cal. No. 68, the Commission fixed
these days for a hearing, which has been duly advertised)

CHAIRMAN FELT: I want to say at the outset that I deeply
regret the fact that so many of you were obliged to wait here since
early this morning. But, as we advertised in the City Record, the

hearings that we are holding today will be in the following order: Brooklyn, Queens and Staten Island.

We have just concluded our Brooklyn meeting about fifteen or twenty minutes ago and I hope that those of you who have been obliged to wait will understand the reason for it.

Had you been in communication with us we might have been able to give you the approximate time.

Thank you very much.

Now, in connection with our hearing this afternoon it is our custom to call on individuals who wish to present their case and to advise them in advance, that is, two or three in advance, of the order in which they are to be heard, and the order will be as follows:

Charles E. Murphy will be the first speaker; Henry Reichert and William Reichert and Mrs. Teresa Meditz.

Is Judge Murphy present?

(No response.)

I have been told that Judge Murphy is out to lunch.

Is Mr. Reichert present? Will you come forward, Mr. Reichert and kindly give your name:

~~MR. REICHERT~~, President, Glendale Tenants' Association, Inc.

MR. REICHERT: My name is Henry Reichert, I am President of the Glendale Tenants' Association and I am representing residents of that community at the present time. As you will see, Mr. Chairman, we have quite a few of them present. They have been here since early

this morning and they have been very faithful in their attendance.

We have one very serious objection which I think we would like to take up first, and that is the fact that Glendale predominantly is composed of one and two-family homes; has been placed in an R-5 zone. We do not believe that this R-5 zone is protection enough for the homeowners who have put their life savings and many years of hard work into these one and two-family homes. Because, as to our understanding of the Code, we are told that R-5 will make it possible for apartment houses, apartment hotels and certain projects up to six stories in height to come into our community.

If this is so, we voice very strenuous objection, because we do not want to have any apartment houses of this type in the residential area.

I would like to ask the Chairman --

CHAIRMAN FELT: If you do not mind, I think it might be well during your presentation for me to ask a question or two and to bring it back to your consideration because your foremost purpose in being here representing these people is for them to know the facts and understand the situation, is that not correct?

MR. REICHERT: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That is our intention, too.

Do you know, Mr. Reichert, what the area is under the existing zoning ordinance?

MR. REICHERT: In a D zone.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Are you aware of the fact that buildings

could be developed with three or four times as much bulk in a D zone under the present zoning ordinance as will be permitted under the R-5? In other words, what we have done, what we think is appropriate for your area is to cut down the bulk considerably.

We think that under the D you are zoned with too much bulk and you could get too many big buildings, large apartment houses into the area, and we think that the existing character of the area is a sound character of the area.

I give you this after having made careful study of this for several weeks. The R-5 zone is virtually equivalent, with a degree of exactness that is hard to be precise on, with what your homes are at the present time. And if we left it the same as it is under a D zone, builders and groups would be able to erect construction, erect housing that would have three or four times as much bulk, which means as many families as you have now.

Are you aware of that, Mr. Reicher?

MR. REICHER: I am aware of that.

CHAIRMAN FIELD: I wanted to make sure that all of the people here are aware of it, too. That is what we have done in this proposed zoning, is to upgrade the district to an extent where the amount of bulk that would be permitted under the present zoning is cut down by three-quarters or four-fifths.

MR. REICHER: But isn't it true, Mr. Chairman, that under the present D zoning, when our application is made for these multiple dwellings we have the right to appear before the Board of Standards

and appeals and object to this.

CHAIRMAN FEIN: Oh, no, absolutely not. I say that unqualifiedly. This is a matter for the record, this goes into a statement that will appear before the Board of Estimate and the Mayor.

In a D zone ladies and gentlemen, and you specifically, Mr. Reichert, a builder has a right to go in now and erect apartment houses with about four times as much bulk as would be permitted under our proposal without going to the Board of Standards and Appeals, without going to anyone at all.

He has this as a right under the present zoning resolution. And what we feel is that your neighborhood should not have that heavy bulk in the area. We feel that there should be a substantial diminution of the bulk in the area, and that is why we have taken it down from D to R-5.

MR. REICHERT: Why can't we make it a one and two-family zone because of the fact that the neighborhood and community is predominantly that now?

CHAIRMAN FEIN: Let me answer that question:

You see, let us say you have so much bulk -- I am using my hands to indicate roughly that which is permitted now -- then we cut it down to so much. You see, this is about one-fifth of it, am I correct in that, Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: Correct.

CHAIRMAN FEIN: You say, "Why can't we cut it down still --" Instead of one-fifth, Mr. Smith says we cut it down by

seven-eighths. It is only one-eighth less what it can be under the existing zoning ordinance.

Then, Mr. Reichenb, you say "Why can't we cut it down still more?"

If we cut it down still more, a great many buildings in your area, and I think you have got some three-family houses, some four-family houses, some six-family houses, some eight, that would not be permitted under the R-1 or the R-2 or the R-3, and then the owners the people that have three or four or five family houses would have non-conforming buildings.

We went over that with such care. We went over it with much study. We did not want to have a proposal where half of your people would be happy and the other half might be distressed with non-conforming buildings.

And we thought that having the interest and the knowledge of your views in mind -- and we had meetings with your people, that you know -- that if we cut down from the D to the R-5 we would be giving you the maximum protection that you could have without risk.

Now, if we take it down below that, then many of the people in the neighborhood that have three, four and five family houses -- and there are some sixes and eights in your neighborhood, you know that, do you not, Mr. Reichenb?

MR. REICHENB: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: They would be non-conforming and we thought that was unfair.

The point is, how far does one go down in order to protect the situation and when is it reasonable to stop?

Now, we think that when you come a D and if you cut it down to R-5, which is nothing is done by seven-eighths, we think we have gone very far for the protection of your community.

And I am happy that you brought this up so that I have an opportunity to answer, because it is extremely important for the people that are here, the people who have their life savings in this area, to understand the true significance of this.

Proceed, please, Mr. Reinhardt.

MR. REINHART: But the fact remains, even though you have brought this down to an R-5 and say more or less uplifted the area, the fact remains that we still can get these apartment houses and projects and so forth in the Glendale area, which these people present do not want.

What can we do about it?

CHAIRMAN FELT: I do not mean to make this a debate, and I usually do not, but I think this is terribly important and these people have left their jobs and left their work, and left their homes, and they have come here. I think it is up to me as well as the other members of the Commission not to try and persuade you on anything, because the people here will make up their own minds, but to try to give you the facts, as we have been working on those facts with the City Planning Commission.

Bear in mind that under the present ordinance and with the

D, nobody has been coming to us recently to cut that down.

We ourselves did this.

We did it after checking with people and knowing what your feelings were.

At the last hearing there was some discussion on this and I think you know that we have made changes since the last hearing.

MR. REICHERT: That is right, you made changes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is that not so?

MR. REICHERT: You did.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We made that in the light of the request of some of the people here.

I want the people here to realize that we understand their position and we are trying to defend an appropriate use of that area, and we are trying to see that the manner in which the area is developed in the future is far lower in density than what could be done now.

MR. REICHERT: May I ask this question, Mr. Chairman?

It has been asked of me by many residents of the community, and they fear mostly the fact that the city could come in there on condemnation proceedings and put in housing projects, which they are not in favor of.

Is that possible under this R-5?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Reichert, let me answer you in great detail.

Zoning has absolutely nothing to do with condemnation, with

housing projects, with the city coming into an area. It has absolutely nothing to do with it.

The city has come into the outstandingly attractive areas of Queens. It has come into areas of Brooklyn. It goes into areas that it has condemned before there ever was a Zoning Resolution.

What is the condemnation procedure? What is the philosophy?

The philosophy of eminent domain, as we call it.

MR. REDGERT: That is right.

CHAIRMAN BELLI: It is this: That is, where for the common good of the community it is essential for land to be acquired for a public purpose, be that purpose a library, be it a school; because you know condemnation is used for schools.

All of the schools we have in Brooklyn were acquired through condemnation for the most part.

Be it for housing, be it for anything; the city then, as a public purpose, has the right to step in and condemn the land and give a fair payment according to the dictates of the court on what the land or what that property is worth.

Now, that has absolutely nothing to do with zoning. There isn't the slightest relationship to it.

And mind you, I must weigh each word that I say very carefully. This is all recorded and if I made any misstatement in this connection I would not remain Chairman of the Planning Commission very long, and I want to remain chairman of the Planning Commission for many years to come.

MR. REICHERT: Then you really think in your opinion that these people are wrong in the attitude that they take; that there is a possibility of their area being overrun with projects and apartment houses?

CHAIRMAN FELT: I would say this, that the manner in which we have zoned this, the R-5 instead of the D-area, 1-height, will cause likelihood of this being taken much less than it would otherwise. Because the type of housing that could be developed here would have to have such low density that it would be completely different than any other housing project that I know of in the central area of Brooklyn or Queens.

MR. REICHERT: May I call your attention to an article in the Long Island Sunday Press, May 15, 1960, in which you are quoted.

It says here: "The new Zoning Code will make it impractical for a builder to put up giant apartment houses in most Queens communities. Referring to Ridgewood, Glendale, Maspeth, Middle Village, Richmond Hill, Woodhaven and Woodside, James Felt, Chairman of the City Planning Commission, said it would be possible but most unlikely. Most builders would not consider it economic. The fact remains that the people of our community --"

The people of our community, in your own words, are not very fond of that word "possible". As long as it is possible there always is a possibility of their being --

CHAIRMAN FELT: I want to explain to you -- and you notice that I used almost those same words today -- you will never hear me

see that anything is impossible-. All things are graded.

But I would say that it would be virtually impossible and the likelihood would be extremely remote.

Let me for a moment show you two charts, one chart which indicates what could be developed under the D zone and one chart indicating what would be developed under the R-5.

In the D zone, what you have now, Mr. Reichert, and Ladies and Gentlemen -- can you see this -- this shows a highrise multiple dwelling. This is the type of building that could be erected in a D area district, one times height district.

Now, this has been developed by precise technicians. This is what could be built today in your area.

Now let me show you what could be built under R-5. This is the type of building that could be built.

These are the typical types of buildings that could be built under R-5. It shows low buildings that are attached houses -- you know, the one and two-family houses.

Also you could of course build single houses that are detached, and if you wanted to build an apartment house you would have to have an extremely low coverage, and this would show the height.

You would have a three-story apartment house with low coverage.

Now, I want to ask you Ladies and Gentlemen, when people build apartments, do they like to build three-story buildings with low coverage? Don't they seek areas where higher coverage is permitted?

Doesn't this chart speak for itself, Mr. Reichert?

Isn't that better than using the word possible or impossible?

MR. REICHERT: But the fact remains, according to the Code, that they can go to six stories in height.

CHAIRMAN FELT: If they went six stories in height, they could, absolutely; but if they went six stories in height they would have to use such a small portion of the land that it would be completely uneconomic in an area such as yours.

But always bear this in mind: Bear in mind now only what they can do or what they might do, but bear in mind -- if any of you were realists -- bear in mind what they can do -- today, and what we are trying to change, and what they can do today, in which we, after years of study, have been trying to develop for areas like yours, areas similar to yours, we are trying to make sure that they do not
(indicating exhibit)
do this./ That is what we are trying to do, and again I repeat that this is all recorded.

Will you please proceed, Mr. Reichert?

MR. REICHERT: You think that the R-5 designation is the best we can obtain in Glendale?

CHAIRMAN FELT: I think it is the most appropriate that you can obtain. I think if you obtain an R-4, and many of you think probably that R-4 is better, you would find a situation where many of your neighbors might be happy for having a little lesser density, but many of your neighbors would find that their buildings are non-conforming, and the present nature of your existing structures as you

meet them and as you see them throughout the area is tantamount, it is equivalent to the R-5.

In other words, what we have here is what you have there now.

COMMISSIONER SWEENEY: Mr. Chairman, would I please intrude for a moment to just clarify this?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Would you introduce yourself, please.

COMMISSIONER SWEENEY: Yes. My name is Sweeney. I am a member of the City Planning Commission.

I took occasion during the spring of the year at the invitation of Mrs. Cole and Mr. Reichert to come down and explain to them just what the area R-5 meant to the Glendale area. And in Mr. Reichert's home on a Sunday, I spent a very pleasant few minutes with him, and in the course of the conversation I asked him to describe the house that we were presently seated in.

And his wife very graciously offered the survey of the property that Mr. Reichert owns. I took that survey and the size of the lot on which it was erected, and I showed Mr. Reichert that the R-5 was the absolute level of the home that he was actually residing in, and that nothing of a greater bulk or population density could be erected on his own property.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Would you proceed, Mr. Reichert, please.

MR. REICHERT: Well, I would like to state here that we have a resolution that was drawn up by the members of our organization and I would like to conclude my address by presenting this.

CHAIRMAN FELT: May I ask one more question, Mr. Reichert?

MR. REICHERT: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In the light of the statement I have just read and in this I bind myself and I bind the Commission, and in view of the fact that the statement that you are about to read may not have been based upon the information which we presented to you, do you think that in fairness to the people here that it would be well for you to review the decision that you had previously reached?

You could always come back and bring to us the statement that you have now, but perhaps after this explanation you may feel differently.

MR. REICHERT: I will accept that, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. REICHERT: Thank you very much.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN FELT: The next speaker will be William J. Cedzich.

WILLIAM J. CEDZICH, representing Queens Zoning Committee.

MR. CEDZICH: Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to relinquish my spot here to a duly authorized speaker of the Queens Zoning Committee that I had been invited to speak for this morning; Mr. Dalrymple.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Pardon, sir?

MR. CEDZICH: Mr. Dalrymple.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Dalrymple, please.

ROYAL E. DALRYMPLE, representing Queens Zoning Committee.

CHAIRMAN FELD: Mr. Dairymple, you are the Chairman of the Civic Coordinating Committee of the Queens Zoning Committee, Queens County Borough Homes, New York.

Your telephone does not have the address of that Zoning Committee. May we have the address, please?

MR. DAIRYMPLE: It is part of our records in the City of New York as well as the City Planning Commission.

The address, however, is 115-04 197th Avenue, Bk. Avon 12, New York.

CHAIRMAN FELD: Thank you very much, sir.

MR. DAIRYMPLE: Thank you.

My name is Royal E. Dairymple. I have been authorized to speak for the Queens Zoning Committee.

COMMISSIONER SWERDLOFF: Mr. Dairymple, is that the Queens Zoning Committee of the Chamber of Commerce?

MR. DAIRYMPLE: No, sir. I organized the Queens Zoning Committee, I, Royal E. Dairymple, not the Queens Borough Chamber of Commerce.

CHAIRMAN FELD: Mr. Dairymple, please.

MR. DAIRYMPLE: Pardon me for interrupting.

CHAIRMAN FELD: I am sorry. I would have let you finish, but just so we get the record straight.

MR. DAIRYMPLE: Do you want me to continue, Mr. Chairman, for the record?

CHAIRMAN FELD: Yes.

MR. DAIRYMERE: I moved to Queens in September, 1929.

CHAIRMAN BELLE: I just wanted to know.

MR. DAIRYMERE: Yes, that is right, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BELLE: Very well.

MR. DAIRYMERE: St. Albans, Queens, since 1929.

I have served as President of the St. Albans Civic Improvement Association, Incorporated, founded 1906, for 27 terms.

CHAIRMAN BELLE: That is a lengthy service.

MR. DAIRYMERE: With no compensation.

And during that period I have been President of the Community Council of the City of New York, the Eastern Queens Civic Council, the St. Albans Allied Civic Council, and today it is an honor for me to be here representing the Queens Zoning Committee.

CHAIRMAN BELLE: May I ask who are the constituents; who are the members of the Queens Zoning Committee?

MR. DAIRYMERE: A substantial number of civic groups and homeowners of the Borough of Queens.

CHAIRMAN BELLE: May we have the names of some of the civic groups?

MR. DAIRYMERE: I will be glad to furnish you with a list of those names and also the names of some of our supporters among homeowners in Queens.

CHAIRMAN BELLE: When may we have that, Mr. Dairymere?

MR. DAIRYMERE: You should all like to have it.

CHAIRMAN BELLE: Within a week.

MR. DAIRYMPLER: We will be glad to discuss it at will.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

MR. DAIRYMPLER: May I also suggest any other speaker before this tribunal today be invited to do the very same thing?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well, sir.

MR. DAIRYMPLER: The very same thing. We do not claim to represent a million people nor a quarter of a million, but we do represent Queens thrifty homeowners who through sweat, blood, built a home and that investment they are interested in to protect.

Therefore, say I continue?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Certainly.

MR. DAIRYMPLER: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the City Planning Commission, a city is only as good as its officials and the people in it. Your efforts in this great zoning adventure are commendable, it is a good beginning. I wrote this about a week ago. I wrote this, not the Queensboro Chamber of Commerce.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I understand.

MR. DAIRYMPLER: However, good planning with law enforcement is imperative in this proceeding.

Yes, and sound zoning, ethical zoning will protect property and not destroy it. The homeowners of Queens, the 264,000 one and two-family homeowners recognize good zoning and comprehensive planning as well as the vested big interests of business and industry in Manhattan.

CHAIRMAN FEEL: Now, I want to say, Mr. Dalrymple, what I said to Mr. Reicher* and what I said earlier today, that we are endeavoring -- and I think we are succeeding in making certain that the interests of the homeowner and the owner of the two-family house is protected by lowering the bulk permitted in the respective areas in which those buildings are located. I think that is your position as well, is it not?

MR. DALRYMPLE: Yes, sir.

And I wish to commend not only you but the members of your Commission for untiring efforts which you have put into this program.

CHAIRMAN FEEL: In lowering the densities in these areas.

MR. DALRYMPLE: Not only in lowering but to perfect it.

CHAIRMAN FEEL: Thank you, sir.

MR. DALRYMPLE: However, the homeowners are not (Applause)

CHAIRMAN FEEL: I would like to say -- those who have not been here previously at our hearings, that the purpose of having you here today is for you or your authorized representatives to speak your views so that we might be mindful of those views in our judgment.

We do not have applause, we do not permit applause when something is said that you like to hear, nor do we permit booing or hissing when something is said that you do not like to hear.

Bear in mind that this is not a demonstration. You have been very appropriate in your conduct and we appreciate it, and we want you to continue to have the same attitude in all our hearings and procedure.

That is the case in this hall.

I am sure that you would not want to be any less than other groups have done in the past. You agree with me, Mr. Dalrymple?

MR. DALRYMPLE: Mr. Chairman, for many, many years I have been a great admirer of yours; that's for the record.

CHAIRMAN FERG: No applause, please.

MR. DALRYMPLE: May I aid to the many friends of the Queens Zoning Committee in the audience, please let me do the talking.

The homeowners of Queens are not real estate speculators.

CHAIRMAN FERG: That is right.

MR. DALRYMPLE: Nor are they blockbusters.

The World Telegram on Sunday, March 2, 1960 quoted Mr. Harry A. Yarish, Past President of the Architects Council of the New York City, as saying "The entire zoning plan has been developed around the Borough of Manhattan. Other boroughs would be made to conform to the neglect of their own individual problems."

This statement, Mr. Chairman, needs your attention and the attention of your fellow members on the Commission.

The homeowners of Queens, all taxpayers, all thrifty citizens and voters under the leadership of Borough President Clancy, will not permit our borough being treated as second class or third class borough, nor second or third class citizens, with the Manhattan crowd, the Lord high execution.

All of Queens real estate values must be protected as well as all real estate values in the City of New York.

I have been a resident of New York City for over sixty years.

I know something about the five boroughs. I have visited those five boroughs.

According to the New York Times of June 7, 1960 at a meeting in Albany on June 6th, Bob Moses -- you all know Bob -- said, "I do not challenge the sincerity and high purpose of the authors of the Zoning Resolution. Much that is proposed in New York City today is admirable, but rezoning of close to a million parcels of land on the basis of an alphabetical slogan needs a lot of explanation. We want more light, more air, more conformity of uses, and above all, less congestion.

"I would like to see these objectives and purposes spelled out," said Bob Moses,

"District by district, not left to the freak alphabetical tests of ingenuity, coupled with dubious claims of simplicity --"

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Dalrymple, you know our objectives there are very similar to the objectives of Mr. Moses. We also want to see the things that he referred to there.

I think that all people of good will and sincerity and interest in the future of the City want to see the same things done. And I do not think that there is any basic difference at all in your point of view and mine.

I just think that what we are doing is in effect accomplishing what you would like to see done.

MR. DALRYMPLE: Yes, positively. By the same token, Mr. Chairman, thousands, tens of thousands of homeowners of Queens are in

a similar position as Mr. Yarish and Bob Moses.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, sir?

MR. DALRYPLE: Let me continue.

They are in doubt of the objectives and you are clarifying it here today.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

MR. DALRYPLE: Thank you. You are clarifying it.

A great tribunal to inform the people!

Queens, as you know, is known as the Borough of Homes. It consists of 42 communities with an estimated population of 1,802,119.

In area Queens is five times larger than Manhattan, three times larger than the Bronx, and one and a half times larger than Brooklyn. In assessed valuation, the real estate for 1959-1960, Manhattan is first with the largest, \$9,851,000,000 plus; Queens is second with \$5,273,000,000 plus; Brooklyn is third with \$5,166,000,000 plus; Bronx is fourth with \$2,710,000,000 plus; Richmond is fifth with \$546,000,000.

Therefore, in area, Mr. Chairman, according to the record, Queens is five times larger than Manhattan and its assessed valuation of more than \$5,000,000,000 is next to Manhattan.

Today the Borough of Queens, the borough of homeowners, is an industrial giant big enough to be the nation's fifth largest city or the 32nd most populous state.

Queens has nearly 2,000 miles of waterfront, plus Newtown Creek, the busiest waterway of its size in the world.

Queens is the airline capital of the world with Idlewild Airport and LaGuardia Field.

Queens also has two colossal racetracks. Its 3,000 plants employ more than 150,000 workers, we are not second-class citizens.

We are not a second-class borough, we are on the level with the best and we are going forward rapidly, and in time we will be considered the A-1 Borough of the City of New York.

Hence, Queens' future must be protected through sound zoning. Yes, and to use some of your phrases, Mr. Chairman, No. 1 -- use. To insure that the right things go in the right place.

No. 2 -- that bulk and intensity of development to safeguard against overcrowding, overbuilding and blocking of light and air.

No. 3 -- to recognize the fact that the automobile is here to stay and adequate space must be provided for parking.

No. 4 -- that all one and two-family homes be fully protected against all encroachments, all hardships whatsoever.

No. 5 -- that apartment houses must provide parking facilities for its tenants.

No. 6 -- that public highways be maintained for traffic, not parking.

No. 7 -- that space on streets in front of one and two-family homes be reserved for occupants of these homes, not for outsiders.

No. 8 -- that trucks be prohibited from parking on streets

in residence and retail districts, namely, airtight provisions through sound zoning with adequate law enforcement applied as it is practiced would do what we hope and pray for.

Queens homeowners will keep New York City clean and wholesome, but the city must aid.

Finally, if the 850 changes in the proposed comprehensive amendment of the Zoning Resolution fails to provide this protection then additional changes are imperative and, Mr. Chairman, you have pointed out that revision can be made between the time the law is passed and the time it goes into effect one year later, if a further study shows changes are needed.

Our urgent appeal is that the City Planning Commission make a further study, a thorough review of its zoning proposals before its final determination.

Yes, and whatever is worth doing at all is worth doing well, and the noblest move in the public good as your zoning proposal your master plan must protect and not destroy. With each borough treated as equals for the mutual welfare and progress, we, one and all, one for all and all for one, a real democracy must proceed for success.

Thank you very, very much.

CHAIRMAN PELA: Thank you very much, Mr. Dairymple. We appreciate your statements.

MR. DAIRYMPL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PELA: I think I called Mr. Gedzich. Did you want

to call on anyone else before I call upon you?

MR. CEDZICH: No, I just thought I would ask you for permission to let Mr. Dalrymple represent the Queens Zoning Committee.

CHAIRMAN FELT: or you want to speak now, Mr. Cedzich?

MR. CEDZICH: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Cedzich, I hope you understood, and I am sure you did, some of the basic elements that I explained to the group here this afternoon.

I want to say that if you or Mr. Dalrymple or if any of the other representatives of your group -- and I extended this same privilege to you the last time if you recall -- would like to meet with me and get any further clarification, if you telephone me on Thursday I will be happy to make an appointment to see you.

MR. DALRYMPLE: Thank you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FELT: You are welcome, Mr. Dalrymple.

MR. CEDZICH: Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that Thursday you would meet the Glendale people?

CHAIRMAN FELT: No, I say this, Mr. Cedzich, that if you telephone me on Thursday -- and that would apply to you and to Mr. Reichert and to Mr. Dalrymple -- I would be glad to meet with you and extend in whatever manner I can, any clarification or answer any questions that you may have.

MR. CEDZICH: So that if they called you Thursday morning you would be willing to sit down with the Glendale taxpayers group?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Within a few days.

MR. CEDZICH: Thank you very much.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it only appropriate at this time -- I do not want to usurp the floor with two speakers from the Queens Zoning Committee -- but I would just like to clear something up. I think there is an awful lot of misunderstanding around Queens County now as to just how this Queens Zoning Committee was actually formed. It was formed right after the last protest meeting here after the last hearings in March.

Now, I don't want to be labeled as a mouthpiece or a speaker for the Queens Chamber of Commerce, I think that is very unfair.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I do not think anyone has done that.

MR. CEDZICH: They have certainly implied that in the various newspapers, and the fact that Commissioner Sweeney made an issue this morning here so as to find where Royal Dalrymple -- there must be a lot of doubt in a lot of people's minds as to just how this committee was formed.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I think I can clear that up. I think the basis of it is, Mr. Cedzich, that your telephone number was the same as the Queens Chamber of Commerce. That does not necessarily mean you have anything to do with them.

MR. CEDZICH: I happen to be a member of the Queens Chamber of Commerce and I am very proud of that, Mr. Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I want to assure you that there is no attempt on our part to in any way leave you with the Queens Chamber .

of Commerce, and I say that emphatically.

MR. GEDZICH: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to represent it, and I think that for the record I just would like to clear something up.

You asked Mr. Dalrymple a question before as to just how many groups were represented in this Queens Zoning Committee.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I asked which groups they were.

MR. GEDZICH: May I enlighten you and read them into the record.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

MR. GEDZICH: Now, the first one here I would like to read off is the Property Owners of Middle Village, Inc.

The Richmond Hill Taxpayers' Association, Inc.

The Associated Organizations of Greater Ridgewood, and these are represented by Mr. Martin Karp, who I understand represents 21 associations in the Ridgewood Area.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

MR. GEDZICH: Then we have-at the time this committee was formed, Mr. Dalrymple was President of the St. Albans Civic Association, of which he is now past president and retired.

Then we have the Morris Park Civic Association of Queens Inc.

We have the Queens Civic Committee of Woodhaven.

I am not giving you the addresses, I can give you the Chairmen's addresses but I am trying to save time.

CHAIRMAN FELT: All right.

MR. CEDZICH: I am giving you Astoria Heights Taxpayers' Association of Long Island City.

I am giving you the Block Committee of 105th Street, Corona.

CHAIRMAN FELT: What did you say, did you say Block Committee?

MR. CEDZICH: Block Committee. That is what they call themselves; of Corona.

CHAIRMAN FELT: All right, continue.

MR. CEDZICH: I am giving you the Jamaica North Civic Association, Inc. in Jamaica.

Of course, these people have civic committees and since this zoning committee came into effect the various political affairs have joined and told us that they had various civic groups that would back this, and of course I read into the record the Astoria Regular Democratic Club.

I also read into the record the Republican Association of the 13th Assembly District.

I also read into the record the Glendale Taxpayers' Association, Inc., the Woodside Republican Club -- 44th Street in Woodside.

The Allied Civics of Forest Hills of which Mr. Gabriel Deschamps is president.

The Property Owners Association of Middle Village; that is Metropolitan Avenue, Middle Village.

Liberty Park Home Owners Association, Inc., of Cypress Hills

The Belleme Gardens Taxpayers' Association of Bellaine,
Hollis.

Ridgewood Property Owners & Civic Association.

Queens Chapter A.I.A. of Jamaica Architects, -- that is
the American Institute of Architects.

and Forest Hills Civic Association, that is Forest Hills.

Peoples Civic and Welfare Association; that is Maspeth.

The Astoria Property Owners Association of Wellington County
Astoria.

Flushing Heights Civic and Improvement Association.

Elmhurst Heights Taxpayers Association.

Van Wyck Civic Association, Inc.

The KEMO 200 Block Civic Association, Freshpond Road.

Jamaica Hillcrest Property Owners Association, Jamaica.

Queensboro Property Owners Association -- that is Long
Island City.

Hollis Park Gardens Association.

Liberty Heights Civic Association, Inc.

Ozone Park.

Greenfield Gardens Community and Improvement Association,
Nashville Boulevard and Springfield Gardens.

The Auburndale Improvement Association, Inc., Flushing,
New York.

The Independent Citizens Committee of Queens County,
Jamaica, New York.

I believe I have one more here; the Rockwood Park Civic Association, Inc., Rockwood Park.

That is Howard Beach.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

MR. CEDZICH: And now, Mr. Commissioner --

MR. DADRYMPLE: and others.

MR. CEDZICH: There are many others, Mr. Commissioner, that have since been falling in line. We have not had any meeting in the past period of time or since the end of June, since the vacation weather.

But I would like to read this into the record, Mr. Commissioner, and I make this statement, I am not opposed to zoning and I never was opposed to the Zoning Code.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I know, you stated the same thing at the last hearing.

MR. CEDZICH: I was only opposed to the defects in it as it came into Queens, as it affected Queens County, and this is what I say here. And if you will just bear with me -- in 1960 and 1961 Queens Borough's assessed valuations were \$5,548,077.89.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Five billion?

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: You said million.

MR. CEDZICH: Excuse me, five billion. I am trying to hook this up so I hope you will bear with me.

CHAIRMAN FELT: You can have all the time you wish.

MR. CEDZICH: Thank you.

The employment of 30,000 workers at an annual payroll of \$204,000,000 at New York International and LaGuardia Airports; 169 banking offices plus many of their annexes out at Queens, 2,866 industrial plants employing 134,329 workers; 50 libraries; 836,911 telephones averaging 4,000,000 calls daily in this County.

16,903 acres of parks.

2,400 miles of streets.

196 miles of waterfront for marine commerce, and ten miles of beaches in the Rockaways.

There are 199,889 one-family homes.

I draw your attention to this particularly because I want to ask you a question when I am through with this, Mr. Felt.

64,216 two-family homes and 18,831 class A multiple dwellings, with 244,549 apartments, and 9,151 acres of islands in the Jamaica Bay.

Churches totaling 319 Protestant; 100 Catholic; 121 Synagogues, and 15 Orthodox, to rate Queens as one of the leading boroughs of religious edifices, and that is the way I rate it.

There are 41.5 miles of parkways; 173 acres in the world's largest railroad passenger car facility of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Sunnyside Yards in Long Island City.

209 public schools with 222,196 pupils registered.

89 Catholic schools, 7 Protestant schools, Queens College in Flushing with 10,696 students.

A Long Island Division of the St. John's University in

Jamaica with 5,234 students, and Queensboro Community College being organized in Bayside at this very moment.

Gas mains total 2,097 miles, while there are 42.74 route miles of rapid transit lines, 109 miles of city bus lines; 315 miles of privately owned bus lines.

New buildings completed in 1959 total 3,749, for an estimated total cost of \$120,364,328, including 1711 one-family homes. I say -- new ones now.

1,711 new homes. 1,228 two-family, new homes, and 72 multiple dwellings containing 5,089 apartments.

Now, Mr. Commissioner, I purposely read this into the record, as a resident of 40 years in the County of Queens.

Now I say to you, Mr. Commissioner, that this is the last patches of green grass, Queens County.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I would like to say this to you, because you would want me to -- that it is the steadfast aim of the City Planning Commission to maintain that green grass and to maintain the sanctity of the private house owner, and the two-family house owner in Queens. And any objective, studious analysis would indicate that by the Zoning Resolution we proposed we are going a long way in that direction.

Now, some people might like to say, "Go even further." We may not have gone as far as the most zealous would want us to go. But going into the specific areas in which these people live, Mr. Cedzich, we are reducing the bulk, which means increasing the open

space and light and air from eight-eighths to one-eighth, and that you understand, do you not, Mr. Cedzich?

MR. CEDZICH: Mr. Commissioner, I understand that perfectly well. But I cannot for the love of me see how this here proposed Zoning Resolution, as it affects Queens County, this is in the estimation of the Queens Zoning Committee and the very people that I have been speaking to for the past seven months -- and I have toured around Queens County and spoken to many, many people; this zoning Resolution -- I can appreciate that Brooklyn needs zoning, I can appreciate that Manhattan needs zoning, and I can appreciate that the Bronx needs it, but I will be darned, Mr. Commissioner, if I can see how you can bring the same diet that you prescribe for the other boroughs and bring it into a borough of homes predominantly one and two-family.

Now, you know that the entire Rego - Forest Park and the Forest Park Avenue and the Queens Boulevard Section, according to us, has been destroyed with these vertical cheeseboxes.

Zoning has taken all the one-family homes and taken --

CHAIRMAN FELT: You mean the existing zoning.

MR. CEDZICH: That is right.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In other words, many of these things that have disturbed you and distressed us, Mr. Cedzich -- and here too just as I am of the same mind as Mr. Dalrymple in many of the things he says, I am of the same mind with you -- we are endeavoring to correct those conditions and to see that they are not resumed.

We are striving most, I think, with the Borough of Staten Island and Queens because those are the boroughs that we can do much more with than some of the most intensively developed areas.

I say this, and I will repeat it once more, I think that after you and Mr. Dalrymple and Mr. Reichert meet with me and our staff, I think all of us will have a better idea of what each other is endeavoring to accomplish, and it will have a great clarifying effect. Most of all, I can assure you now that we will be of one mind insofar as objectives are concerned.

I think that we will be able to persuade each other insofar as our general views are concerned, all in the interest of protecting these people and attaining those objectives.

MR. CEDZICH: Mr. Felt, I want to thank you and I want to leave this last thought with you: That you know that I came down here in March and had put on a demonstration for the homeowners in Richmond Hill and Woodhaven, and we must say that we are very appreciative of the new district that came out of this little controversy, this demonstration, this R3-1 District.

We had been zoned as an E-1 district, but you must understand, Mr. Felt, that Glendale is in the backyard of Richmond Hill -- I say the back yard.

These people here -- and this is a matter of public record -- these one and two-family homeowners, this community is one of the cleanest communities of one and two-family residences on record throughout the entire United States.

I don't just make this as a claim. These people wash their sidewalks on Saturdays and their front doors.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Gedzich, so far of all of the people that have been heard yesterday and today -- there were eighty-five people that spoke yesterday and probably some thirty or forty today -- and the reporters heard my statement and I would not misstate -- you three are the only ones that I personally invited to come and sit down with me and discuss the matter for the purpose of clarification.

Because I realize what this area is. I have had report after report from Commissioner Sweeney about the good people that live in this area and we want to try and protect them.

MR. CEDZICH: I was very much impressed by what you just said, because that will give these people a great deal of courage in the Glendale area and the Ridgewood areas. And we certainly intend to do just that, sit down with you, and we would like to have this discussed a little further.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Then you telephone me on Thursday morning, please.

MR. CEDZICH: I certainly will. I will call you the first thing.

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

Has Judge Murphy returned?

(No response.)

Is Miss Melitz present? Miss Melitz, do you want to be heard?

MISS MEDITZ: I do.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Will you step forward, please?

Will you wait a minute or so, Miss Meditz, because I think many people want to leave the room--so you will not be disturbed as they go out.

MISS MEDITZ: Are you ready, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes.

MISS TERESA MEDITZ, representing Glendale taxpayers.

MISS MEDITZ: I am Miss Teresa Meditz, residing in Glendale and representing myself, friends and relatives. I would like to ask you one or two questions, Mr. Chairman.

You made a statement that the government can condemn a section for public use; is that correct?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, any section in the city wherever it is located.

MISS MEDITZ: Right. Can the government condemn a section and turn it over to private investors for cooperative apartment houses?

CHAIRMAN FELT: The government may do this: Under recent legislation, if middle income housing is to be provided, the right of eminent domain may be used for acquiring properties. That law has been in effect a few years, but I do not know of a single instance where there has been action taken under that law.

MISS MEDITZ: Well, the people in Glendale --

CHAIRMAN FELT: I might also say, that that can never be

done without first having a public hearing before the Board of Estimate to be followed by a public hearing - first at the City Planning Commission and then followed by a public hearing at the Board of Estimate.

MISS MEDITZ: But it can be done in R-5?

CHAIRMAN FELT: It can be done in R1 to R10. It can be done under any zone. It can be done in C1 to C8. It can be done in M1 to M3.

It can be done any place. In other words, the city has the right of eminent domain for the taking of land for public purpose if there is zoning or no zoning, and however the land may be zoned.

That is a matter of law and that is a matter that has been constitutionally upheld.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Only the Board of Estimate can authorize the condemnation.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Zoning has nothing to do with it.

MISS MEDITZ: But you have a right to appeal before the Board of Estimate?

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: That is correct.

MISS MEDITZ: If you feel that the private investor is putting up an apartment house that is not solely for middle income.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: The matter must be heard before the Board of Estimate.

CHAIRMAN FELT: May I explain this to you for a moment? This will take a minute or so.

In the first place, if there is any middle income housing there first must be approval by various city agencies. And this approval would be approval on the basis of an informal approval. It would involve the office of the Comptroller, because tax exemption is required.

It would require the approving of the Housing and Redevelopment Board. It would require the approval of the City Planning Commission.

Now, if all of these three agencies did approve it, then it finally would be heard by the City Planning Commission. But then it would again have to be heard by the Board of Estimate.

The Board of Estimate is the governing board of our city. It is composed, as you know, of the Mayor, the Comptroller, the President of the Council, and the five Borough Presidents, and not an inch of land can be acquired in condemnation without the approval of the Board of Estimate.

That has been the case before the 1916 Zoning Resolution, the old Zoning Resolution. It has absolutely nothing to do with zoning.

You can have condemnation in cities where there is no zoning. It is the right of the municipality to take land and pay compensation for the land if the land is used for public purposes.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLONSTEIN: Whether you have a new zoning resolution or not, what same means that the Chairman speaks of prevail, so that what we are hearing today has nothing, no effect on

the question you raise, Madam.

MISS MEDITZ: Well, the people in Glendale do not fight the fact that you are taking public building like libraries or things like that; schools. But they do resent the fact that you take away one, two-family homes that are in perfect condition, while you have slums all over the city that can be used.

VICE CHAIRMAN FLOESHEIM: Don't say "you". We do not do it. It is the Board of Estimate that does it.

MISS MEDITZ: I was talking to the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN FELT: May I say this: If there ever were to be a taking of land in your area -- and let me say that there is little likelihood of any taking of that type because of the manner in which your area is improved -- but if there were any contemplated taking of the land there would be a hearing before these various groups and finally before the Board of Estimate.

MISS MEDITZ: As Mr. Reichert pointed out, why can't we be put in one and two-family zoning instead of an R-5?

A lot of six-families that are there stay as they are, but refuse to allow any more to come in.

In Richmond Hill they have done that and in Woodhaven.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Madam, if you did that your buildings would be buildings of non-conforming use. In other words, they would be illegal structures.

While that might be very good for the families that have one and two-family houses, it might be very much of a burden to those

We have the three, four, five and six and eight-story houses.

But what we have done over here is to develop a zone which, in effect, equates with your existing improvements, and I think this bears repetition -- it would provide for folk of the building that could be developed on our lot to be only one-sixth of what it is under the present zoning laws.

So you see, Medina we have reduced it considerably. We have squeezed a big object into a very small zone in reducing this from to Rb, that is why I have always felt that what your neighbors and people living in your area would have a full realization of this -- and I think they probably will after we have our meeting and after Mr. Reichert and Mr. Selwyn and Mr. Gedrich report to you in a group or individually -- I think that what you will be doing will be coming to the Board of Estimate applauding our Zoning Resolution rather than being opposed to it.

MISS MEDLEY: I do not think that day will ever come.

COMMISSIONER BEDE: That will be all.

MISS MEDLEY: I am only a telephone operator, I have never been before a group of people. But I am hungry and I am tired. I was supposed to be in the office at ten this morning and I was refused permission to come in here this morning to the taxpayers' meeting.

Now, if I came from Ohio or Wisconsin or Pennsylvania or I be permitted to come into the taxpayers' meeting?

CHAIRMAN BEDE: No.

MISS MEDLEY: It was a public hearing, was it not?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Let me explain this to you: The advertisement that we have in the City Record was as follows: That the hearings would take place for Brooklyn, Queens and Staten Island, in that order.

MISS MEDITZ: Did they say only Brooklynites were permitted to attend a Brooklyn meeting or vice versa, or did it just say it was a public hearing for Brooklyn taxpayers?

CHAIRMAN FELT: It was a public hearing.

MISS MEDITZ: If it was a public hearing, no matter who I was in the street you had no -- no one has any business to stop me, ask me who I was, where I came from. I could have come from anywhere.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Madam, I do not mean to be ungracious by interrupting, but you see we never suggested that you come here at 9:30 or ten o'clock.

MISS MEDITZ: But I wanted to listen to the Brooklyn taxpayers at nine o'clock. Didn't I have the right to listen to them?

CHAIRMAN FELT: There were ladies sitting here, if I recall. You ladies in the rear, were you sitting here this morning?

(A chorus of yes.)

CHAIRMAN FELT: While the Brooklyn hearing was taking place. Look for yourself, Madam.

MISS MEDITZ: How many ladies tried to get in and were refused permission?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Madam, we have operating problems, and we try to be reasonable. We made special arrangements so that the Council chamber would be made available.

last year at the last hearing, -- and this will be confirmed by Mr. Cedzich himself -- there were also a large number of people here from your area. It was a windy, cold day even though it was late in the spring. I was told that there were a great many people waiting outside in the cold and at great discomfort.

We were not able to handle the people inside of the structure, and under the circumstances I arranged to have Vice Chairman Bloustein go out of this chamber and meet Mr. Cedzich.

Mr. Cedzich, is that correct? Where is Mr. Cedzich?

(No response.)

I could tell you that it is so.

I asked him, Madam, to call the group of people in here because of the inclement weather under the circumstances. Now, this time we have not as full a chamber as this, as you have here right now, but we had a well-filled chamber from Brooklyn.

And under the circumstances it would be completely inappropriate for any of the Brooklyn people to be left standing outside while the Queens people were seated and the matter was a Brooklyn matter. I think we did whatever could be done on an appropriate basis, at least I hope we did. We certainly tried to

MISS MEDITZ: Mr. Chairman, are you referring to the meeting this morning? Or is it that I was packed in here this morning?

It was empty when I came in.

CHAIRMAN FELT: It may have been empty at the end of the day but it was crowded in the morning. But I think I will discontinue any

further discussion or procedure.

We have been acting under these procedures for years and I think we have been eminently fair. I think your leaders will tell you that. Will you please proceed with what you wish to say?

MISS MEDITZ: I have nothing more to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Senator Seymour R. Thaler here?

(no response) Is Max Block here? (no response) Lucille Kitross? Will you step forward, please? Miss Kitross, while some of the people are leaving, I have a number of communications which I want to include in the record.

I have a statement here from Thomas V. LaFauci, member of The Assembly. I haven't seen this before but I will read the last paragraph.

(The Chairman then read the last paragraph of the following communication)

THOMAS V. LA FAUCI, ASSEMBLYMAN, 1st ASSEMBLY DISTRICT, QUEENS
(statement of)

September 13, 1960

"Re: Proposed change in zoning.

"Honorable Sirs: I appear here as Assemblyman of the 1st Assembly District representing a population of more than 100,000 people, which comprises the areas commonly known as Astoria, Long Island City, Woodside, Hunterspoint and Ravenswood. It is an area in the northwesterly part of Queens which runs from the East River to approximately 60th Street and from the Triboro Bridge to Northern Boulevard and Newtown Creek. This area is used for many purposes - residential, business, industrial and other areas consisting of a combination of these uses. In fact, the industrial area of Long Island City is one of the heaviest in our City and has caused our City and Queens County to flourish for the industry which has developed.

"I agree with the necessity for a change in our zoning laws. Our present laws do need modification and should be amended to keep up with the times. Proper planning is necessary to meet the needs of the people and the changes which inevitably must come about. I find no fault with the purposes and the end result of the proposed zoning changes. However, such changes in our law must come about in a reasonable manner.

"The proposed change which has been designated to simplify the zoning law will not simplify, but will create more problems detrimental to the people. The present law with its definitions contains approximately 25,000 words whereas the new proposed law has more than ten times the number of words. The new language in the law will encourage litigation to determine the interpretation of its language. It will not simplify, but will create greater problems since the interpretation of the new law will be subject to attack.

"I feel that it is not possible with the stroke of the pen to change the entire zoning law which has been on our books for more than 50 years. Good judgment and sound reasoning require that a matter of this type be given years of consideration before a drastic change shall be put into effect. There is no reason for the adoption of the proposed new zoning law at this time. It will be more advantageous to postpone the adoption of the law until further studies may be made and until the public has had sufficient opportunity to consider its effect upon our population or our city.

... becomes suspicious when a law as wide in scope and one which affects the very lives, homes and communities of all the people of our City, is imposed upon the public in such an arbitrary manner without an opportunity on the part of the people to have adequate time to peruse every aspect and ramification of said law. This type of procedure is undemocratic and will cause great hardship. It will not accomplish what it was intended to do, but on the contrary, will bring about unrest and discontent.

"In my own area, I have been plagued by a number of people who question the wisdom and motive of the new zoning law. They live in fear that the new zoning law will change the complexion of the community and thereby cause their very homes to be taken from them. A good portion of the population in my community have had this experience in 1954, when on the pretext of slum clearance, their homes were threatened to be condemned. It was only after conclusive proof had been offered by department investigations showing that the area was 95% in perfect condition, that the scheme to condemn the entire area was abandoned.

"They still feel that with the new zoning law they would be subject to condemnation proceedings at the will and whim of the City Planning Commission and other bodies whenever they deem an area necessary to be taken for some ulterior purpose. They fully realize that in such an event, their property could be condemned and taken from them at a very low cost.

"The security they want in zoning laws will be threatened and they may find themselves homeless in a country which guarantees the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This proposition is noble dream, but is a practical and absolute fact. Many homeowners will be subsidizing government as well as private building. This is an unhealthy situation and certainly should not be imposed upon the public.

"In conclusion, I urge this honorable body to postpone the adoption of the new zoning laws in order to give to the public sufficient time to consider the new law and its application. There are many imperfections and many causes for hardship in the new law. The best service to the public will result only from prolonged deliberations and intensive study. The public will best be served by this approach and not by forcing upon them a law which is premature, inadequate and will result in detriment to the people, as well as to our City. Respectfully submitted, THOMAS V. LA FOLLET."

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will put into the record a telegram from the Hollis-St. Albans Civic Association, Jack Stillman, President.

JACK STILLMAN, representing HOLLIS-ST. ALBANS CIVIC ASS'N

September 13, 1960

"CITY PLANNING COMMISSION CITY HALL NYC

AFTER FAIREST MOST COMPLETE STUDY AND HEARINGS RECOMMEND ADOPTION OF NEW ZONING RESOLUTION AT ONCE.

HOLLIS ST ALBANS CIVIC ASSOCIATION JACK STILLMAN PRESIDENT."

CHAIRMAN FELT: Now I have a telegram which I have been asked to read from the Flushing Chamber of Commerce.

HAYNES TREBOR, Executive Secretary, FLUSHING CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. JAMES FELT, CHAIRMAN

Dated: September 8, 1960

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION 2 LAFAYETTE STREET NEW YORK CITY

"FLUSHING CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS SPEAKING TIME FOR ITS REPRESENTATIVE, CARL H. SALMINEN, CHAIRMAN OF CIVIC PLANNING COMMITTEE AT PUBLIC HEARING SEPTEMBER 13. RECOGNIZING IMPERATIVE NEED FOR GOOD PLANNING FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW YORK CITY AND ITS OWN COMMUNITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FULLY ENDORSES PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE AMENDMENT OF ZONING RESOLUTION. FOLLOWING EXTENSIVE STUDY AND DISCUSSION FLUSHING CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BELIEVES THAT RESOLUTION NOW PROPOSED, WHICH HAS AMPLE PROVISION FOR MODIFICATION WHERE NEED IS SHOWN, IS WORKABLE AND GENERAL EQUITABLE BLUEPRINT TO MEET COMPLEX ZONING PROBLEM, FLUSHING CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

"APPRECIATE ATTENTION GIVEN RECOMMENDATION FOR MAP CHANGES IN ITS AREA, WHICH HAVE PROVIDED MORE URGENTLY NEEDED INDUSTRIAL SPACE. ESPECIALLY APPROVED ITS ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT THAT EXISTING INDUSTRIAL USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS MEET PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND BE TERMINATED IN PRESCRIBED PERIOD OF YEARS. PRESENTLY PROPOSED RESOLUTION WILL ACCOMPLISH SAME OBJECTIVES AND IN CHAMBER'S OPINION COMMISSION HAS ACTED WISELY AND FAIRLY IN THUS AVOIDING HARDSHIP TO ESTABLISHED INDUSTRIAL FIRMS DURING TRANSITION PERIOD.

(signed) HAYNES TREBOR, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY."

CHAIRMAN PELT (continuing): I also have a letter which we would like to include in the record which relates to some of the elements in the law, in the proposed zoning law, from Coffee Instants, Inc., signed by Malcolm B. Stark.

MALCOLM B. STARK, representing COFFEE INSTANTS, INC.

(communication dated September 13, 1960)

"With reference to the Proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York (published September 6th, 1960, in the City Record) and the objections to the earlier Proposal submitted on behalf of Insco Realty Corp. and Coffee Instants, Inc.:

"1. In effect, it will be years - perhaps decades - before New York will be substantially changed by the proposed Code. To attain the balance in controls of acceptable standard for open space, density, light, air, etc., is a monumental project.

"The framework on which to achieve this balance is set forth in the present Proposed Amendment.

"The changes made, and now incorporated in the General Provisions - particularly in Article VII, chapters 2 and 3 - have clarified the confusion which we thought existed in the earlier context. Our objections have also been obviated by the basic easing of restrictions on future expansion.

"2. The change made in the proposed zoning of our property, located

in Long Island City, is considered by us to be a fair, sound and equitable determination.

"3. This is the first giant step in presenting a truly modern zoning concept for the greater City of New York. We wish to thank the City Planning Commission for its earnest and extensive efforts and trust that it will continue to exercise the splendid judgment it has thus far in pursuing to its ultimate conclusion a contemporary Zoning Resolution."

Dated: Sept. 13, 1960, Malcolm B. Stark, COFFEE INSTANTS, INC.,
2-15 - 26th Ave.
Long Island City 2, N.Y."

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will put into the record a telegram from Sol Flick, Bulova Watch Company.

SOL FLICK, representing BULOVA WATCH COMPANY (communication)

SY PGAC43 LONG PD WUX FLOSHING NY 6 1033A EDT

"HON JAMES FELT, CHAIRMAN, CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

2 LAFAYETTE ST NYK

BEING ABROAD AND THEREFORE UNABLE TO APPEAR AT YOUR HEARINGS PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT THE PROPOSED REZONING OF OUR PROPERTY ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF WOODSIDE AVE BETWEEN 61 ST AND 63 RD STREETS IN QUEENS IS CONTRARY TO GOOD CITY PLANNING AND CERTAINLY NOT IN OUR BEST INTERESTS. AN EQUITABLE DECISION AND WHICH WOULD MUCH BETTER SERVE THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY WOULD BE TO REZONE THE SUBJECT PROPERTY AT

UP TO A DEPTH OF 100 FEET INTO AN M-1 DISTRICT. SOL FLICK, BULOVA WATCH CO."

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will put into the record a telegram from Murray Moskowitz, President of the Oakland Civic Terrace Ass'n.

MURRAY MOSKOWITZ, representing OAKLAND CIVIC TERRACE
ASSOCIATION. (communication)

SY FGA393 ED 20 FIDSHINA NY 8

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION 2 LAFAYETTE ST NYK

AS PRESIDENT OF THE OAKLAND TERRACE CIVIC ASSOCIATION I AM OPPOSED
TO THE PROPOSED ZONING CHANGE FROM R3 TO R4 IN THE VICINITY OF THE
OAKLAND GOLF COURSE AS SHOWN ON THE NEWLY REVISED MASTER ZONING PLAN.

MURRAY MOSKOWITZ PRESIDENT OAKLAND CIVIC TERRACE ASSN 64-30 232 ST
BAYSIDE NY."

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will put into the record a letter from
Frank R. Sherkel relating to the Ozone Park Area.

FRANK R. SHERKEL (communication)
"Hon. James Felt, Chairman, City Planning Commission, 2 Lafayette
Street, New York 7, New York.

Dear Mr. Felt:

"In view of your frequently-announced policy and desire,
under provisions of your proposed Zoning Resolution for New York
City, to preserve and protect the "residential character" of a
community, I fail to understand your R-4 zoning of the Ozone Park
area of Queens bounded generally by Liberty Avenue, 123rd Street,
Linden Boulevard, Rockaway Boulevard, 108th Street, Linden Boulevard,
and the Long Island Railroad.

"May I respectfully call your attention to Paragraph #5 of
the July-August 1960 issue of the Department of City Planning
"Newsletter" which says, in part, ...'During the ensuing two-year
study, every block in the City was inspected, evaluated and mapped.'...

"If this policy had been applied to this 90-square-block area of Ozone Park, I...as a one-family homeowner in that section... would not be obliged at this time to point out to you that your R-4 zoning would down-grade this community.

"This area is predominantly one-family homes, with a scattering of two families, two blocks of row houses, and small apartments of a very limited number. Basically, therefore, it is a community of one and two-family homes.

"Your proposed R-4 zone permits construction of row houses and apartments. Would this, therefore, preserve the 'residential character' of this area?

"Because of this proposed R-4 zoning which would down-grade my 'home' community, I wish to register my opposition to your Proposed Zoning Resolution and request that same be recorded at the Sept. 13th public hearing on the 'Maps'. Sincerely, Frank R. Sherkel."

CHAIRMAN WEIZ: We will put into the record a letter from the United Property Owners & Taxpayers Association which is signed by Mabel Otterstedt, President.

MABEL OTTERSTEDT, UNITED PROPERTY OWNERS & TAXPAYERS ASS'N
"City Planning Commission, City Hall, New York 7, N.Y. (commun.)"

"Honorable Sirs: Re: Hearing on New Zoning Code as Revised

"Although we are happy to note that some of the changes have made the Code more palatable to private home owners, yet they are not extensive enough to safeguard their homes and interests, and maintain the suburban residential character of Queens.

"Except for the R-1, R-2 and R-3.1 classifications, the categories are too 'all inclusive' rather than providing protection by being definitive.

"Although Richmond Hill and Woodhaven have been redesignated R-3.1, the areas to the north, Glendale, and to the east, Jamaica, are R-4 and R-5. This will only make this area an island in a sea of trouble since once any large project is allowed into an area, the areas far miles around are devaluated. This was the effect of South Jamaica Houses on Jamaica and Hollis. Yet there are many of our members with homes in Jamaica, both north and south of the shopping area who have been trying to maintain decent homes there since they realize that the only alternative is to leave the City and State as so many have already done.

"Since the area adjacent to Idlewild is designated low height, we had requested that the whole area south of Jamaica Avenue from Brooklyn to the Nassau line be made R-3.1 to stem the influx of large apartments already menacing on the north, as the last refuge for a small home owner. However, the Planning Commission has already ignored the Code in approving 16 story buildings for the Jamaica Race Track Site. The land use formula is no protection against overcrowding and slums. While speculators find it more economical to build up rather than sprawling buildings, the problem of land use per capita is not changed because families cannot live in the sky all the time.

"If you will compare the new prime map of the City with the new project map, you will note that they follow the same pattern. To

prevent Queens, like Manhattan, of becoming a ghost town inhabited by locusts, an immediate halt must be made to stop the destruction of the private residential areas. Respectfully yours, United Property Owners & Taxpayers, Mabel Otterstedt, pres."

"Mr. James Felt, Commissioner, City Planning Commission, City Hall
New York, N. Y.

"Dear Mr. Felt,

"Enclosed are twelve copies of our objections to the new Zoning Code as Revised.

"As none of our officers are able to attend on September 13th to present our views, we should appreciate your cooperation in having our views made part of the record.

"Thank you for your cooperation. Very truly yours,
United Property Owners & Taxpayers, Mabel Otterstedt, pres." (see
above)

"FURNISHMAN FAIR: We will put into the record a letter from the Little Neck Community Association, Inc.

MORRIS PIERSON, PRESIDENT LITTLE NECK COMMUNITY
ASSOCIATION, INC.

"Gentlemen:

"This letter is to re-affirm the position taken by our association with reference to the zoning resolution presently being considered for the City of New York. Our association has heartily approved passage of this resolution and hopes that it will take effect as soon as possible.

"There is, however, one slight change which we would suggest

and which we feel is necessary for the preservation of our area and that is to change the zoning to R3-1 for the area contained between Northern Boulevard and the Long Island Railroad, from Little Neck Parkway up to and including 84th Street.

"In all other respects the resolution has been approved. Respectfully submitted, Morris Fierston, President, 253-03 Thornhill Avenue, Little Neck, New York."

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will put into the record a letter from Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.

SYLVANIA ELECTRIC PRODUCTS, INC.
"Hon. James Felt, Chairman, City Planning Commission, New York 7,
New York

"Dear Mr. Felt:

"Under the proposed new Zoning Resolution, Sylvania's property in Bayside, Queens County has been zoned in an M-1 district. Naturally we are pleased with the M-1 zoning in that it is consistent with and in recognition of both the existing and projected use of the property for general research and developmental laboratories, with an administrative center.

"In conjunction with our special counsel, Michael A. Castaldi of 500 Fifth Avenue, New York we have followed rather closely the efforts of your commission to bring about modern zoning for the city. Although we do not profess to be zoning experts, we do believe that the proposed resolution is an effective step towards making New York City a better place in which to work and live. Surely, no one can properly quarrel with those objectives. Therefore, we support the

Etra
(statement of)

Q 52

resolution and voice the hope that it will be adopted. Sincerely
yours, Sylvania Electric Products, Inc. By Secretary.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will put into the record a communication
from Max J. Etra.

MAX J. ETRA (communication)
Etra & Etra
Attorneys at Law
745 Fifth Avenue
New York 22, N.Y.

Enclosure 5-1077

September 14, 1960

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

Dear Sir:

I received your letter of August 17, 1960 and did not
reply thereto, although I was deeply appreciative of the decision
rendered by you and the other members of the City Planning
Commission, because I had wanted to publicly state for the record
the wholehearted endorsement of my clients and myself for the work
that you and the Commission have done and are doing in connection
with the proposed amendment to the City's Zoning Resolution.

I attended the hearing held on September 13th, but
unfortunately could not remain past 3:15, and you know that up to
then the delegation from Glendale was being heard.

Nevertheless, I feel that I must state for the record that
all of my clients, to wit, Star Corrugated Box Co., Inc., 56-00 Grand
Avenue Corporation, Hamabe Realty Corporation, Grandgar Corporation,

Hersey Lumber Distributors, Inc., Crane & Clark Co., and Wm. Koburger & Co. and myself received from your Commission and from the Administrative staff members such courtesy and consideration as is seldom found in a similar body. We were afforded all the time and cooperation by both yourself and by the members of your staff, most particularly Mr. Smith and Mr. Friedman, in going over our particular problem and in the endeavor to arrive at an equitable result. We were granted every opportunity to present our case and every facility of your office was open to us so that our problems became the Commission's problem. I believe, and it is, of course, my clients' firm conviction, that the decision of your Commission was sound and equitable and completely justified.

"Above and beyond the decision, however, my clients and myself were so impressed by the treatment we received and by the reasonable approach of yourself and all of the members of the Commission and its Administrative Staff that regardless of whether the decision was favorable or unfavorable, my clients specifically requested me to state for the record that they wholeheartedly endorse the work of the Commission and unqualifiedly recommend that the proposal to amend the City's Zoning Resolution be approved and adopted. Sincerely, ETRA & ETRA, By Max J. Etra."

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is Lucille Kittross here?

MISS KITTROSS: I am.

LUCILLE KITTIROSS, representing JACKSON HEIGHTS COMMUNITY FEDERATION

MISS KITTIROSS: I am Lucille Kittross, representing the Jackson Heights Community Federation. Before presenting the formal statement of the Federation, I would like to preface this statement by telling you that I am the Republican candidate for Assembly in the district, and I have walked around since July at least 300 of the approximately⁴⁰⁰/square blocks in the area. I have found very few blocks in need of rehabilitation. It is almost impossible to believe that right across the East River from Manhattan there are grass and there are trees and flowers, and some of my neighbors even raise Concord grapes and tomatoes in their yards. There are houses -- there are houses, homes, they are not merely shelters, and their children are loved and they are cared for and we want to keep it that way.

Since the proposed plan for rezoning New York City was first published in February, 1959, the Jackson Heights Community Federation has studied the effect which the plan would have on the Jackson Heights Area and on the City as a whole. The Federation once again announces its general support of the proposed new Resolution.

During the past few months we have heard much from the opponents of the plan about how it will allegedly destroy property values, bring construction to a halt (or conversely, lead to an invasion of apartment houses), and other claimed evil effects. But on contrary, our examination leads us to think it will have important good effects.

We are told by some observers that in 1916 the same crisis

of disaster were heard before the present Zoning Resolution was adopted.

We have, on the outskirts of the Jackson Heights area, several sections that were built in the pre-1916 period, which would not have been permitted under the 1916 ordinance. We also have in the heart of Jackson Heights several blocks of apartment houses that were built before the 1916 rules were made effective, but built in conformity with them.

It is the non-conforming buildings that have deteriorated and lost their rental value. The buildings which were built in conformity with the first zoning rules have retained top rental value to this day.

Jackson Heights is a pleasant middle class community. We have unfortunately already seen the harmful effects of overcrowding and over-building in our area.

This proposed Resolution would for the first time put reasonable limits on ground coverage and population. At present in the apartment house district of Jackson Heights, an average of 70 per cent of the ground area is covered by buildings.

Under the new proposal, such coverage would be reduced to about 50 per cent. Our current population is 96,000. The proposed plan would limit total population in our area to approximately 125,000 if all property were built to the maximums permitted in the new rules. This appears to be a reasonable limit.

My block by block examination of the Fourth Assembly District

showed up two areas of very recent change, one a racial change showed no deterioration in the neighborhood at all, but the other a nationality change has begun to depress a former good neighborhood.

We believe that only through effective zoning limitations can controls be exerted over the neighborhood environment, so that good and bad buildings alike will not be ruined by overcrowding of the neighborhood.

I would now like to say just a few words about LaGuardia Airport which forms the northern boundary of Jackson Heights.

Airport noise is a source of man-made blight, just as manufacturing nuisances are. Noise and glare restrictions have been proposed for control of manufacturing areas.

We believe that ultimately similar objective performance standards must be developed to control airport operations. We have been assured that such standards are technically feasible. What agency is going to install them?

The City Planning Commission can do a great service in exerting some leadership on the problem of airplane noise blight, a zoning problem of constantly growing magnitude. If zoning restrictions can be imposed on the residential areas around airports for the benefit of the airports, then surely the tables can be reversed so that effective controls are imposed on airplane nuisances too.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Miss Kittross.

Mr. Darwin E. Sussberg?

DARWIN R. SUSSBERG, representing Pearl-Wick Corporation.

MR. SUSSBERG: I want to speak in behalf of one of the many manufacturing companies that have their plants here in Queens.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Will you announce your name, please?

MR. SUSSBERG: My name is Darwin R. Sussberg, I am with the Pearl-Wick Corporation, manufacturer of bathroom equipment, accessories.

We have been manufacturing in the Borough of Queens for over 30 years. For the first 10 or 12 years we were in Glendale and we are now presently in Long Island City, the Astoria Section of it.

I noticed one gentleman here prior to me mentioned the amount of factories and the amount of employees that are employed in manufacturing companies in Queens. And the total that he quoted was something like 132,000, and then he went on to mention how many one-family homes and two-family homes exist in the Borough of Queens, which was even greater than the amount of workers employed.

I happen to be greatly in favor of the whole Planning Commission's plan and the way it is adopted, because I believe that to further your city you must make some rules at some point, realizing that errors existed in the past.

But to try to correct any errors that would go any further in the future is what you should do. But I do think that very little has been stated. So far it has been mostly people who have one or two-family homes.

But I always believe that a man who lives in a one or two-family home must also go to work and earn a living to be able to

support this one or two-family home. That every city and every community should have a fair proportion of manufacturing or offices or some form of employment.

I believe that the average person does not like to commute hours upon hours each day getting to and from work and taking much needed time away from their children and their families, which certainly need them, when you read of all the trouble in the papers.

Men spending this time commuting cannot be spending it with their families where they are greatly needed.

My main point in coming today is to try to tell people that I have listened to some of these complaints, that you cannot please everybody with any forward progress. And I think that I have looked over the complete proposal, and I think it is an excellent one. I think that the Commission should certainly be commended for the work they have done so far today.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Max M. Lome?

Will you give your name, please?

MAX M. LOME, representing Queens Federation of Civic Councils.

MR. LOME: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Planning Commission, my name is Max M. Lome, I reside in Laurelton, a community in the County of Queens.

I am here today not as a self-appointed ambassador of the homeowners of the Borough of Queens, but as the duly constituted representative of the Queens Federation of Civic Councils. This

that they had the power to poll the civic organizations of Queens to determine once and for all whether or not the Federation speaks for the civic associations of Queens and whether I, as their chosen delegate here, whether I represent these people.

Several days later I was called up by Mr. Becker of the Long Island Press who told me that in the poll of civic associations, 201 civic associations were ahead with everything that I had said before this committee and indicated that I could be the speaker representing them before the hearings on the present Zoning Resolution.

Now, I do not know whether this is an issue or not because here today I heard the reading of a list or lists of civic associations that make up what is known as the Queens Coordinating Civic Association or Committee.

Originally I had thought and I had good grates to think that this coordinating committee was the child of the Queensboro Chamber of Commerce. In fact, I have here various clippings and various items that were signed several months ago, which indicated this, and I read to you from the Long Island Star Journal of July 19th.

The Queens Zoning Committee was organized by the Queens Chamber of Commerce to campaign against the new Code, and, a blast at the Federation came last week from Royal E. Dalrymple, the committee's Civic Coordinating Chairman.

I read again from September 8th issue of the Long Island Press in which he said: "The Zoning Committee is a group which speaks for the Queens Chamber of Commerce." They are referring to the

Queens Zoning Committee and Royal E. Dalrymple, Civic Chairman of the Committee and a former president of the St. Albans Civic Association.

Now, these are items that I have here, and of course the Planning Commission is welcome to have it.

But the last item that came from this Coordinating Committee came to me by mail under date of September 7th, and called for this great mass meeting of which I shall dwell on for a brief period, and as you look at the papers you will find that this is distributed as a public service by the Queens Chamber of Commerce.

I only bring this up because I cannot understand why they should now deny their affiliation with the Queensboro Chamber of Commerce.

I have known the Queensboro Chamber of Commerce for many, many years, and although I have opposed them I have always had the greatest respect for the Queensboro Chamber of Commerce and for their members. And now they are hiding from that Chamber and trying to inform this Committee -- this Planning Commission, -- that there is no connection between them.

That I say is not true, it cannot be true, and these are the papers that speak for themselves.

Of course, I have never been a prophet of doom nor have I ever in all the years that I have been connected with civics-- and I have spent a few years in that connection -- ever attempted to misrepresent or to, by innuendo, misrepresent or misstate the true facts

as they exist.

You all heard here how many people came under the elusion that if this Zoning Resolution were adopted their homes would be condemned and they would be thrown out of houses that they have owned for many years, and which represents their life's earnings.

These are the tactics that have been adopted by certain people in the opposition, and even worse.

I have here a statement that was issued not too long ago, and it comes from the Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens in which they try by innuendo to show that of all the square blockage to the extent of some 5,000 square blocks in Queens, only 337 blocks have been restricted to one-family use only.

But they are very careful, one-family R-1, but do the average men on the street, what do they know R-1, R2 or R3? The inference here is that in the entire Borough of Queens only 337 blocks have been restricted to one-family detached homes. Of course, there is another column in this paper which is labeled "R2". But they do not say that R2 is also restricted to one-family homes, and in the R-2 area we have 1,819 blocks. So here we have a total of almost 2,200 blocks out of a possible 5,000 blocks, almost 40 per cent of the Borough of Queens that has been set aside to the people of the Borough and said -- here, here is half the Borough almost for one-family homes. Not one and two-family homes, for one-family homes only.

And if we break it down even further and go into the R-3 zones --

A VOICE: We have been waiting.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I will call on you if you wish to be heard.

A VOICE: You are very handy with that gavel.

I say we have been waiting five hours to talk about zoning and he has been talking about everything else except zoning.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Will you please be seated or you will be escorted out of the room by an officer.

MR. LOME: I am sorry, but I thought that this was zoning and pertaining to zoning, because when the Chamber of Commerce listed it as zoning -- and I have it here -- the Chamber of Commerce then says it is zoning. When I speak of it it is no longer zoning.

Mr. Chairman, I will offer this in evidence also, it is not my doing, it comes from the Queensboro Chamber of Commerce and it has to do with the new Zoning Resolution which is currently before this body.

And I am here to correct these mistakes if I possibly can, so the people who have been misled will know the truth of the situation rather than to rely upon statements that cannot be backed up by any truth, and this is the truth. I am sorry for the outburst.

We have gone on record, over 160 civic associations, all duly constituted and in existence for many years, to support with all our vigor and with all our might the present Zoning Resolution that is currently before this Body.

We say that all haste is needed in its adoption; that the delays that have been afforded at present or up to the present time

have only worked havoc in the various areas of our Borough.

Remember that Queens is one of the largest, it is the second largest Borough in the City of New York. I think it is only exceeded in area by the Borough of Richmond.

Queens has great and vast amounts of undeveloped area that is still subject to physical improvement. If we do not have this Zoning Resolution adopted immediately, if we do not have immediate action to thwart the efforts of those who are greedy in trying to exploit these areas by building gas stations within our residential areas, warehouses within our residential areas, factories within our residential areas and all sorts of junk yards within our residential areas, the entire purpose of zoning will be defeated.

Zoning is the plan by which civilized nations may and can only possibly exist. Without zoning there can be no great cities in which you and I have a pride as being a citizen of that city.

Without zoning we have what has been happening in our Borough of Queens, and I ask you gentlemen, all you need to do is to take a walk with me along Merrick Road or through some of the areas,

Northern Boulevard, of our Borough of Queens, and I will show you what the lack of zoning has done, and the 1916 resolution that is currently in effect is not a zoning resolution at all but is a sham and a fraud upon the people of the city.

Because it takes very little to come in before the Board of Standards and Appeals and ask for a variance in any area without a single reason, and these variances, unfortunately, have been granted

to a great extent.

So that we have these non-conforming uses throughout the entire Borough of Queens, and that has been the greatest setback of our Borough.

Areas that might have been today the most beautiful areas of our city are now the beginning of slums, and I can show them to you.

Areas that are now the most beautiful areas of our city are being threatened by encroachments of large apartment house developments in G and G-1 areas, where many, many variances have been requested of the Board of Standards and Appeals to permit that type of non-conforming use.

Gentlemen, I am not going to speak very much longer on this. I only urge upon you the need of speed.

Not only do I urge upon you the need of speed, but I want to leave one thought in your minds, and that thought is this: Should the Planning Commission adopt this zoning resolution, and should the Planning Commission then forward it to the Board of Estimate and the Board of Estimate sees fit to approve it, I ask you in all decency to please get together with them, because I fear that the one-year grace period for effective dates in which it takes effect; that during that period there will be such a run on applications for variances that the new Zoning Resolution may well be thrown aside and its effectiveness completely defeated.

So we must have something done there to prevent this great

amount of applications for variances. We saw it within the last few months.

The number of variances that were filed in all haste in order to get in, as they said -- as many of them said -- beneath the deadline of this Zoning Resolution.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to say this to you and to everyone in this room, that the Queens Federation of Civic Councils has only one axe to grind and that is the axe of civic welfare for the people of our borough and our city; that Federation which has no interest in property and seeks to make no profit out of land, but whose wholehearted support is given here for one primary reason, to protect the people of the Borough of Queens and is unalterably supporting this new Resolution and urges its adoption with all necessary speed.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FEE: Thank you, Mr. Lome.

MR. LOME: If you want these papers, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to give them to you as they contain the statements that I made.

CHAIRMAN FEE: Is Mr. Harry J. Haback here?

HARRY J. HABACK, representing Oava Equities, Inc., Block 6698, Lot 12-W/3 Kissena Boulevard, between 71st Avenue and 72nd Road.

MR. HABACK: My name is Harry J. Haback, I am an officer of Carol Management Corporation and first I would like to commend the Chairman and the members of the Commission for the manner in which

they are trying to clarify the density situation that we do have in New York. It was a pleasure of Carol Management Corporation to be cited in several of your articles where you show some of our developments with the openness and light and air and so forth, and the greenness.

I am here this afternoon to object to the recommendation that this Commission has, and it is block 6698, lot 12, cited in your page 14C, of your present recommended zoning.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Will you wait a moment, please, so that the Commissioners can turn to that page.

MR. HABACK: It is on the west side of Kissena Boulevard between 71st Avenue and 72nd Road.

This Commission probably is well aware of the past history of this particular piece and all of the presentations made to it regarding what we considered spot zoning when directly to the north of this piece and for blocks on either side of it it is all retail, and our piece is left as residential.

We were greatly heartened by the fact that up until several months ago in the recommendation of the Commission you had it earmarked as C1-2 and all of a sudden out of the dark -- and it is certain light was not produced from the dark -- but then further darkness continued from the dark -- it suddenly becomes an R-4 district.

I would greatly request this Commission, if I may have the opportunity, to come down and present our arguments with photographs. I know this is not the time and the place. This hall is

is crowded.

CHAIRMAN FEEL: Mr. Haback, do you have a memorandum prepared at this time?

MR. HABACK: I don't have them with me at this time but I will be happy to have it prepared.

CHAIRMAN FEEL: Will you have it submitted within one week?

MR. HABACK: I certainly will.

CHAIRMAN FEEL: Thank you.

MR. HABACK: All I ask is equity.

CHAIRMAN FEEL: Very well.

MR. HABACK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FEEL: Thank you, Mr. Haback.

Mr. Edward J. Sovatkin.

EDWARD J. SOVATKIN, representing J. Sklar Manufacturing Company.

MR. SOVATKIN: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my name is Edward J. Sovatkin, I am president of the J. Sklar Manufacturing Company, operating a manufacturing plant, making surgical instruments in the Woodside area of Queens.

We have been there since 1940. I did not come here to protest to what the Commission is doing and I have heard so much about protests being filed that I thought it might be no more than right as a citizen and taxpayer and a resident of Queens to say for the record something about the experience that our company has had after being alerted by the Queens Chamber of Commerce as to what would

happen to our property if the Resolution then proposed originally was to become effective.

When I studied it I found that our property was to be rezoned as R-4. We happen to have a building there that is perhaps one of the showplaces of greater New York. It looks like a gentleman's country home in Surrey, England, and it is a place that the neighbors are very proud of because we have a plot with flowers and garden in front of it.

I decided to, on advice of the Chamber, that I address a letter to the Commission, which I did. I received a very courteous response from the Chairman who made an appointment for me to meet a member of his staff at the Commission office.

I presented photographs and statements of what we do there, and he said they would give it consideration.

I am glad to tell you that it was not only received with courtesy and my appeal was promptly acted on, I received a letter very recently signed by Mr. Felt saying that they had changed the map, realizing the value of the property to the neighborhood and the fact that we are just practically across the street from the Long Island Railroad yards; that our property is very well adapted for its present use, and they have rezoned it to M1 and we are very well satisfied.

I thought that this kind of a commendation for the very nice treatment we received and the fact that they did listen to our appeal, and granted what I think is fair, should be noted for the

record.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. William Savascoul.

WILLIAM L. SAVASCOUL, Chamber of Commerce of Borough of Queens.

MR. SAVASCOUL: Chairman Felt, Members of the City Planning Commission, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am William L. Savascoul, speaking for the Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens. I am indeed fortunate in having Mr. Boratkin precede me here as he reported to you that one of our investigations was successfully carried through. I now have to report to you gentlemen some other investigations we made of similar character in the Borough of Queens, with the hope that they will receive your greatest attention.

The proposed Zoning as issued August 18, 1960 lays out in Corona on Map 108, a Manufacturing One District. This M1 District has been enlarged by the City Planning Commission since the previous publication in The City Record of December 21, 1959. This District is centered along 98th Street from 50th Avenue to 55th Avenue.

Excluded, however, from M1 and zoned Residential are the two buildings of "Vibration Mountings" on the northerly side of 50th Avenue east of 98th Street, and part of the plant of ELIANEFF Machine Tool Co., whose address is 97-11 50th Avenue; also the property mainly occupied by Philip Lugana, landscape contractor, of 59-61 97th Street. This property is located on both sides of

97th Street and extends from Christie Avenue to within 100 feet southerly of 50th Avenue. Excluded also, from M1 is the block bounded on the north by 50th Avenue, east by 98th Place, south by Christie Avenue and west by 98th Street. The Oakhill Contracting Company of 41-10 102nd Street, Corona, uses part of this block for storage of earth moving machines. Part of this block is used for storage of used materials of construction. The proposed zoning Residential is questioned.

In Woodside, the Proposed Zoning shows a Residential 5 District on Map 9D as published August 18, 1960, which includes an area bounded by 58th Street, 34th Avenue, Connecting Highway, 37th Avenue, 61st Street, 39th Avenue, and 58th Street. A count on the ground shows that there are twenty industrial type plants within this area zoned residential. Included in the area bounded are the following firms: Avion Aircraft Co., Thor Power Tool Co., Sicobo Mills, Inc., ARO Equipment Corp., Long Island Motors, Marlum Manufacturing Co., Inc., W. Sheinker & Sons, International Seal Co., Staats-Herald Newspaper, Palmer-Oliver Printing Co., Continental Stainless Corp., Saphor, Inc., Aid Stores, Inc., Stevenson Trucking.

The Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens requests the City Planning Commission to restudy this area with a view of making these industries conforming users of their land.

The Proposed Zoning as published August 18, 1960 proposes for inclusion in a Manufacturing One District, which permits only about 80 per cent of land coverage, or a one story building, the area

in Long Island City on Zoning Map 9B, bounded by 41st Avenue, Northern Boulevard, 19th Street and Sunnyside Woods to 41st Avenue.

The Chamber of Commerce has an aerial photograph taken of this strip and the environs and it shows the following substantial buildings averaging six stories high or over, are on this strip of property, in the following order, beginning at 41st Avenue and going along Northern Boulevard to 30th Street: American Office Building, Westinghouse Electric, National Gasket, Sherry Ice Cream, Scott's Coffee, Ford Building, Foto Ecol, Maytag Washing Machines, Sagesman Slocum, Sperry Rand, Lighthouse for the Blind, Standard Motor Products.

The Chamber of Commerce requests that these buildings be zoned as part of the ML-5 District as on the opposite side of Northern Boulevard.

Another locality, Long Island City, was investigated.

In Long Island City-Astoria, the Proposed Zoning shows a Residential 5 District on Maps 9A and 9B of the Proposed Zoning as published August 18, 1960, bounded by the East River, 36th Avenue, 38th Street and Broadway, comprising fifty three City Blocks excluding the Ravenswood Houses and Queens View Cooperative Houses. A count on the ground shows 120 factories in this proposed Residential 5 area.

ASTORIA

Adjoining the Residential 5 District before mentioned, there is a large area in the Proposed Zoning designated R2 which

is bounded as follows: Along the East River from Broadway to the Astoria Houses, a public housing group, thence along First Street to 26th Avenue, to Shore Road, to Hoyt Avenue, Hoyt Avenue to 21st Street, to 26th Avenue, to 12th Street to 30th Avenue to Crescent Street to Broadway and following Broadway to the East River.

In this area by count on the ground there are forty industrial plants.

In these two districts previously described are the following prominent companies.

Metropolitan Plumbing Supply Corporation, Trailmobile Corporation and General Motors Corporation occupying each a whole block.

Then we have a list of companies occupying a block front as follows:

Pioneer Mounting & Finishing Corporation, Structural Display Company, Inc., Ledkote Aircraft, Plymouth Manufacturing Co., Blue Crest Wine Company, Paramount Pictures Laboratory, NYSCO Laboratory, Inc., Zarkin Machine Company, Sohmer Piano Company, Contractors Supply Corporation, General Builders Supply Corporation, Cincerete Corporation.

Gar Wood Industries occupying one square block. Nelson Galvanizing Company occupying a block.

Drier Structural Steel occupying at least two blocks.

The situation in these two districts zoned Residential is critical in relation to the future. Many cities in the United States

are offering inducements to industry to open factories and provide employment. These cities are reaching out for the industries we now have in Long Island City and Astoria.

The City Planning Commission by proposing to zone these districts Residential is not promoting the welfare and prosperity of our people in Queens.

In place of tax paying industries, we may expect more tax exempt public housing like Ravenswood Houses and Astoria Houses with a resulting increased tax burden on owners of small homes in the Borough of Queens.

The Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens is opposed to the Proposed Zoning and favors keeping the present zoning with any beneficial amendments which will not injure the Borough of Queens and its prosperity.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Savacool.

Is Mr. Jerome Z. Lorber present?

JEROME Z. LORBER, representing AD-HOC Queens Citizens Zoning Committee.

MR. LORBER: Chairman Felt, Members of the Commission: My name is Jerome Z. Lorber. I am the President of the Woodside Savings and Loan Association, which is a banking institution, which has been serving savers and homeowners in Queens since 1919. However, I appear here today as Chairman of the AD-HOC Queens Citizens Zoning Committee, an AD-HOC Committee composed of property owners, builders, architects, real estate men, bankers, lawyers, public works experts and

even a college president.

All of us, by the way, are homeowners in the County.

All of us have lived most of our lives in Queens and all of this committee are infinitely connected with the County, its people, its business, its growth and its problems.

We have studied the amended resolution at great length. We have studied with a view to deciding what we think is its overall effect on the future of our County.

We have read and we have heard many, many glowing predictions of the glorious New York that's going to spring up full grown when this amended Zoning Resolution is enacted. We have heard that New York's famous congestion will cease. We don't believe it.

Some think that the disturbing exodus of our middle class to the suburbs will come to an abrupt halt. We don't believe that either.

Some of us think that all of our traffic problems with all its evils are going to come to a halt. We don't believe that either.

In fact, we don't believe any of the glowing reports we have heard about the effect of the new Zoning Resolution.

On the other hand, we have heard many dire and gloomy and baleful predictions and reports of what is going to happen to this vibrant city of ours when the new Zoning Amendment is passed.

Some of us think that new construction will cease and is going to stop. We do not think that is so either.

Some think that the flow of the people to the suburbs is going to be hastened and not halted. We don't believe that either.

We have heard that traffic congestion is going to get worse because of the increased parking facilities are going to be available. We don't believe that either. In fact, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we don't believe any of the available predictions that we have heard.

What we do believe, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee is that the amended Zoning Resolution is only one of the many, many tools that our city and its planners require to make it a better place to live.

The Zoning Resolution by itself isn't going to work any miracles nor is it going to create an entire new city. The Zoning Resolution by itself won't produce new schools, improved rapid transit facilities nor better housing. Nor will it eliminate traffic congestion, clear slums, do away with all the nuisances, undesirable neighborhoods, nor is it going to create a new Utopia. What it will do, and this we are firmly convinced of, is that it will channel the development of New York City and of Queens County in particular into ways which will be more in tune with the future than with the past.

Our Committee has had, Mr. Chairman, and still has many important and deep seated reservations about sections of this Resolution. We feel that much of Queens was developed into patterns which took shape in the years from 1910 to 1920.

Mr. Chairman, since 1945 we have had almost fifteen years

of massive construction programs in our County, all under a Zoning Map which was established some 44 years ago. We feel that in many, many cases, the further development of our County now requires that consideration be given to trends which call for uses different than the present use.

In many, many maps we feel your Commission has tended to preserve the present use and current use rather than to look to the future. We believe that other changes in Queens will appear necessary and desirable after this Resolution has been tested by time.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, you will remember that you have made several changes and improvements which you considered and adopted as the result of our suggestions. We feel that we, the rest of the organizations in the county, will be able to bring further changes to your attention for your consideration in the future as we all have in the past.

Our Committee is further convinced that some hardship is bound to result to the smaller developer from the application of the new amendment. No progress is ever made without hurting someone.

It appears to us that aids to smaller projects may prove feasible and prove desirable. We are sure that you will be just as eager as we are to consider some of these aids in the future.

We are convinced from the many meetings that we have had with you and that you have had with people throughout the County, that you and your associates will do everything in your power to ease these hardships when they are brought to your attention in the future.

In the main, we feel that the overall plan for the County is a good one. To delay its enactment while a perfect plan evolves, we think is foolish and wrong. We know that the kinks and hardships in this plan will be corrected by a sympathetic Commission in good time.

Response to the needs of the County, to the needs of the citizens and to the needs of the city for the future will be taken care of in good time.

Mr. Chairman, the AD-HOC Queens Citizens Committee wishes to go on record as urging you to do everything in your power to have this modern zoning amendment enacted without delay.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Lorber.

Mr. Fells; is Mr. William Fells present? And after Mr. Fells, Mr. Nisiba and after Mr. Nisiba, Mr. Kallman.

WILLIAM FELLS, representing Civic Council of Southern Queens.

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

My name is William Fells and I represent the Civic Council of Southern Queens as its president.

CHAIRMAN FELT: May I interrupt you for a moment?

I would like those who intend to speak on Queens to please raise their hands?

(Showing of hands.)

Please be seated. I'm saying this for the benefit of those who wish to speak on Staten Island. Will those who wish to speak

on Staten Island raise their hands?

(Showing of hands).

Well, we will do this: we will remain here as long as you wish, but we also want you to know that we have notified the Staten Island Advance and the Borough President's office yesterday, not realizing that we would have fair weather today, that the Staten Island hearings will be continued tomorrow morning at ten o'clock. I mention that so that if you wish to remain until the Queens hearing is completed -- we will remain and hear you.

On the other hand, it seems to me that Queens will probably take another one and half hours to two hours. That would take us to about 5:30 or 6:00 o'clock.

If that goes beyond your scheduled time, you might wish to come tomorrow morning. We have no preference whatsoever because we will stay through the evening as late as it is and hear everyone who wishes to be heard.

MR. JOHN F. HALE, representing Breezy Point Home Owners.

MR. HALE: Mr. Chairman, may I just submit a letter and waive the right to speak? I'm sure you'd have no objection.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Alright. (read following letter)

"Hon. James Felt, Chairman, New York City Planning Commission,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Felt:

Re: Breezy Point

This Committee represents the three thousand families

who reside on the western end of the Rockaway Point Peninsula in the areas known as Roxbury, Rockaway and Breezy.

Although at the present time we are leasing the land on which our homes rest, we are negotiating to buy the land and such sale should be consummated within the near future.

This Committee approves the proposed R-4 Zoning for the western tip of the Rockaway Peninsula as being consistent with the present development of the area. We believe that the R-4 zoning provides sufficient latitude for future orderly growth calculated to develop the area as a better class residential community.

Very truly yours, ROCKAWAY POINT JOINT ACTION COMMITTEE, By:

John P. Hale."

CHAIRMAN FELT: I'm sorry; would you proceed, Mr. Fells?

MR. FELLIS: I'll only take a couple of minutes of your time.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Take whatever time you wish.

MR. FELLIS: It's no secret to this Commission that my Council is tremendously interested in zoning and its effect on our communities in South Queens.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yours is the Civic Council of South Queens; is that right?

MR. FELLIS: That's right, Mr. Chairman.

Appearances by our representatives before this Body and the Board of Standards and Appeals prove this interest. You must understand that when I stand before you I am speaking for autonomous

organizations will have decided for themselves the positions they have taken on this Resolution under discussion. The majority of our affiliates are in favor of the Resolution. Any opposition they may have had was corrected following the last round of hearings.

All our affiliate clubs mail the proposed stoppage of the continuing invasion of gasoline service stations into resident communities. However, we do have dissenters in our council and they will speak for themselves and present their objections individually, and which you have heard prior to me speaking.

We are all in agreement in principle and in the definite need for a Zoning Resolution which will give our South Queens community guarantees of maintaining and keeping their residential character.

Respectfully submitted by William Fells.

CHAIRMAN FELL: Thank you, Mr. Fells.

GIOVANNI NISITA, representing Eastern Queens Civic Council.

MR. NISITA: Chairman Fells, Members of the Commission:

My name is Giovanni Nisita, President of the Rockyhill Civic Association and President of the Eastern Queens Civic Council and Co-Chairman of the Federation of Civic Councils of the Borough of Queens.

Ever since I was mastered out of service in 1946, I became very much interested in civics and since that time I have devoted a great time and effort in order to correct many inequities in our section as well as in the Borough of Queens and the City of New York.

Most of our troubles have come from the Board of Standards

and Appeals in zoning. I have tried with the help of the Council and my organization to correct many of these evils and we have always been blocked through some means or other, especially if we had to contend with some very clever attorney representing the opposition at matters before the Board of Standards and Appeals.

Now, since the first of the year alone I have appeared nearly a half a dozen times trying to fight and keep our Eastern Queens, which is so vulnerable to the promotion of gas stations and apartment houses.

Now, we have the old resolution and we have no relief whatsoever because we are against a blank wall. My experience has proven that to fight these things under the old Resolution is almost futile because of the fact that there are too many loopholes and too many things to squeeze through by going to the Board of Standards and Appeals.

We took Mr. Lome with all the arguments he has given you in supporting the new Resolution; we feel that there isn't anything in the last 40 years which has come before the people of the City of New York that has been so advantageous to the taxpayers and especially to the homeowners as this new Resolution.

I was amazed in listening to many of the so-called civic leaders who come here and give you their arguments. It only proved to me that either they had not studied the Resolution, did not know the Resolution, or they know where they were going to or from.

We of the Council of Eastern Queens support Mr. Lome in the

Resolution which we have backed to the hilt and we will also fight for this before the Board of Standards and Appeals. Our only concern is this:

We are most anxious to have some stop-gap between the time that this Resolution is approved and the time it becomes effective, and we depend upon you, gentlemen, to give us that assistance because we feel that this is the only step forward which will help the people of the City of New York and especially the people of the Borough of Queens.

Thank you, gentlemen.

COMMISSIONER ORTON: Mr. Kraushaar:

Mr. Kraushaar is not here.

SECRETARY MALTER: Mr. Kraushaar will write a letter to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Ramon L. Tinagero, President of the Westmoreland Association of Little Neck, Queens.

RAMON L. TINAGERO, President of Westmoreland Association of Little Neck, Queens.

MR. TINAGERO: I am here, Gentlemen, of the Commission, to move or ask you to move to adopt the proposed Resolution.

Also, to thank the members of this Commission who recently upgraded our property to what it had been three years ago and to thank them and specifically our representative on the Board, Commissioner James Sweeney. Also, the Borough President of the County of Queens, John T. Clancy for his work in having final approval before the Board

of Estimate. There was an exception when the property was upgraded.

For years, we felt we were protected by the covenants and the deeds of the property. Because the covenants were written in the 1901-1902 period and reiterated in 1920, they did not cover conditions as they exist today and which we did not know exist. Originally, we were covered against the building of a stable or blacksmith shop -- things which are now obsolete.

One exception that was made during the two-year hiatus when we did not have the protection of the Planning Commission was when there had been a downgrading of the property, permitting two-family attached homes, which have slipped in there during April of this year through the Building Department, legally.

They got permission, and a house has been built there which is supposed to be a two-family attached house. It's not quite completed and I wish you gentlemen could see it. I passed by it today, and it is a monstrosity, three stories high. The alleged basement is on the street level. Today it is filled with three feet of water due to the storm. There's supposed to be a garage there and an apartment downstairs.

This builder advertises that house and houses in another area as basement apartments, suitable for a professional man. They are getting around the multiple dwelling law.

We, as the residents, are going to see that they don't. We are going to keep our eyes open. It is the function of this

Committee must be up to it, make sure as you did and we thank you, gentlemen. It will not happen again in our community.

I hope it doesn't come about in other communities, because the two-family attached houses that are being built and approved are not what are generally accepted as two-family houses, and I invite you gentlemen to sometime look at that house; Jim Sweeney knows where it is, because it will open your eyes to what's going on and it's to be expected in trying to get around the laws.

Thank you for your action in the past and for your continued cooperation.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

Mr. Dufour?

Madam Secretary, I have been asked to place two statements on the record. One -- and it involves four letters from Ziegler, Gill & Glabky, attorneys, offices at 39-15 Main Street, Flushing 54, New York, and the other is from Jacob Finester, attorney in the matter of the application of John C. L. Vielmann, All-Craft Studios, Inc., and 55th Woodside Corporation.

I'll hand these to you.

ROBERT J. GILL, representing FRANKLYN FOLDING BOX CO., INC.
"City Planning Commission, 2 Lafayette Street, New York 7, N.Y. (commun).

Gentlemen:

Re: Proposed Zoning of Property on the East Side of
Prince Street from 35th Avenue to Roosevelt Avenue,
Flushing - Map 10

On behalf of our client Franklyn Folding Box Co., Inc.,
we have previously requested that the above area be zoned M-1. We

have previously written to you on September 2, 1960, with regard to an apparent error in the map as published in the City Record on August 18, 1960. The map as published fails to show this area from 35th Avenue to Northern Boulevard on the east side of Prince Street as an M-1 area. We believe this is an oversight in view of our conference with your staff and in view of your letter of August 17, 1960.

"This letter is intended to be submitted at the public hearings held on September 13, 1960. Your very truly, Robert J. Gill."
ROBERT J. GILL, representing GEORGE DE COMBO (communication)
"Re: Proposed Rezoning of Premises at Alley Pond, bounded on the east by Alley Creek, on the north by Little Bay, on the west by the Belt Parkway and on the south by Northern Boulevard

"On behalf of our client George DeCombo, who is the owner of substantial property in the area, we request that the above premises be rezoned to an M-1 area. The present proposal of R-1 amounts to a confiscation of property. We have previously advised you that this land cannot be developed for one and two family homes because of the extensive piling in depth which would be required. We have had estimates from reliable contractors to show that it would cost approximately \$15,000.00 to put a foundation in for a one or two family home in that area. I am sure you will agree that this alone is sufficient reason for not zoning the area for restricted residential purposes.

"Again we repeat the request that the zoning originally set forth by the zoning experts in the first published proposal for

this area, i.e., M-1, be adopted. We believe that this conclusion was arrived at on the basis of sound planning principles.

"It is intended that this letter be submitted at the public hearings on September 13, 1960. Yours very truly, Robert J. Gill."

ROBERT J. GILL, representing L. EDWARD DUPUY (communication)
"Gentlemen: Re: Proposed rezoning of Property from 15th Avenue to 25th Avenue, between Parsons Boulevard on the east and Belt Parkway on the west."

"ON behalf of our client L. Edward Dupuy, the owner of considerable property in the above area, we request that it be zoned as R-5. We believe the contour of the land alone is sufficient reason for zoning this area as an apartment site similar to Mitchell Gardens and Linden Hill which are in the vicinity. Of course, there are other valid reasons for this position. Some of them we have previously submitted to you in our correspondence."

"It is intended that this letter be submitted at the public hearings on September 13, 1960. Yours very truly, Robert J. Gill."

ROBERT J. GILL, representing FORSTER BROS., INC.
"Gentlemen: Re: Proposed Zoning of Property on the East Side of Prince Street from 35th Avenue to Roosevelt Avenue, Flushing - Map 10"

"On behalf of our client Forster Bros. Inc., located on the east side of Prince Street at Roosevelt Avenue, Flushing, we wish to record our thanks for your consideration in discussing the zoning of this area. We are to note that you now plan this as an M-1 area. We also believe that the entire length of Prince Street, along the east side from 35th Avenue to Roosevelt Avenue should be zoned as M-1."

"This letter is intended to be submitted at the public hearings held September 13, 1960. Yours very truly, Robert J. Gill."

JACOB FIRESTER, ESQ., representing J. G. L. VIEHMANN
and 55th Woodside Corp. (communication)

"In the Matter of the Application of John G. L. Viehmann,
All-Craft Studios, Inc., and 55th Woodside Corp.

"To extend an adjacent M-1 Designation in the Proposed
Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning Resolution, so as to include
a portion of 55th and 54th Street, in Woodside Queens.

"The applicants are the owners and occupants of several
commercial buildings situated within the following described area
in Woodside, County of Queens, and described as follows:

"That area lying between 55th Street and a line 125 feet
west of and parallel with 54th Street; and south of 38th Avenue
to a line 100 feet north of and parallel with 38th Avenue, in the
Borough of Queens, City of New York.

"The above described area is a part of the map on Page 151,
Map Number 9b of the Proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning
Resolution relating to the Borough of Queens in the City of New York,
and is hereinafter described as the 'subject area'.

"The subject area above described is now within an Unre-
stricted Use District, and the buildings that have been erected were
erected in conformity with the Zoning Resolution as the same was in
force at the time of the construction thereof, and constitute a com-
pact commercial and manufacturing community.

"Under the proposed Comprehensive Amendment of the Zoning
Resolution, the Commission has designated and placed a large portion
of this present unrestricted use district within an 'M-1' district.

The application is to extend the adjacent 'M-1' designation so as to include the subject area within such 'M-1' designation. The same is more particularly depicted on a map of the area showing such requested extension, such map being marked 'Exhibit A', attached hereto and made a part hereof.

"The applicants, JOHN C. L. VIEHMANN and the ALL-CRAFT STUDIOS, INC., are the owners and tenants, respectively, of premises 38-32 54th Street, Woodside, Queens, a one story fire-proof structure, sprinklered, steel frame construction, having a frontage of 100 feet and 125 feet in depth. The ALL-CRAFT STUDIOS, INC. are in the business of manufacturing advertising novelties, art displays and silk screen specialties. The tenant gives employment to an average working staff of about 30 employees. Photographs of these premises are attached hereto, marked Exhibits B1 and C1.

"The applicant, 55TH WOODSIDE CORP., owns premises known as 38-25 54th Street, Woodside. These premises consist of a Class 1, fire-proof building built in the form of a 'U' with the bottom part of the 'U' on 55th Street and the two legs of the 'U' being extended towards and fronting on 54th Street. The building covers an area of 10,000 square feet, and is presently occupied by GLASSY PRODUCTS CORP., a tenant. This tenant has been in possession of the premises for many years, and provides employment for an average of 60 employees. Photographs of these premises are attached to this report, marked and designated as Exhibits B2, D1, D2, E1 and E2.

"Both of these buildings are within close proximity of a

railroad which is visible in the various photographic exhibits attached hereto. Both buildings meet modern construction standards, and all operations are carried on within the building structures. The operations carried on at the premises can be classed as light manufacturing.

"The subject area as well as the contiguous 'M-1' is devoted almost entirely to light manufacturing. It is respectfully submitted that the subject area would not be suitable for residential purposes, because of its close proximity to the railroad. This fact is amply demonstrated that the few originally residential dwellings were converted to and are being used for commercial purposes. See Exhibits B2 and C2 attached hereto.

"The buildings within the subject area and the adjacent designated 'M-1' district, have constituted a compact, commercial and manufacturing community, which has developed over a period of many years, and has provided employment for a great number of residents, and has contributed to the economic life and industry of this City.

"The operations presently conducted in the subject area as well as in the proposed contiguous 'M-1' district, cannot be charged with causing or creating noise, vibration, smoke, fire or explosion hazards, or the emission of dust or any other types of toxic noxious or particulate matter.

"During the period of development of this compact commercial community, the nature of the operations has been such as not to deter the creation of the nearby residential communities, and which in turn

have not found this commercial community to create or do anything that would be regarded as a nuisance.

"It is submitted that the Commission, in establishing the contiguous proposed 'M-1' district and extending the lines of such district to include the subject area which is the subject of this application, would not in any way retrograde the proposed 'R-4' district, because the existing commercial uses were and are not objectionable, and they presently come within the high performance standards required in 'M-1' districts as defined under the proposed comprehensive amendment of the zoning resolution.

"Further, it would be unfair to take a portion of this compact, commercial manufacturing community, where property owners have made large investments in conformity with the requirements of existing regulations, and to conform these investments to the uncertainties of 'non-conforming uses', particularly when they have not been a deterrent to the residential development of the nearby areas and the desirability thereof.

"It is further submitted that the extension of the lines of the contiguous 'M-1' district to include the subject area, which is the subject of this application, would not be violative of the master plan. This Commission has defined an 'M-1' district to be

'an industrial front window nearest to adjacent residential and commercial areas and therefore has the most rigid performance standards and uses.'

"A visual inspection of the area amply demonstrates that

this area, in its present performance standards and uses, comes squarely within the above definition.

"The applicants therefore request that this Commission extend the adjacent 'M-1' designation to the area lying between 55th Street and a line 125 feet west of and parallel with 34th Street and south of 38th Avenue to a line 100 feet north of and parallel with 39th Avenue, all within the Borough of Queens, City of New York. Respectfully submitted, Jacob Eldesten, Attorney for the Applicants, Office & P.O. Address, 26 Court Street, Borough of Brooklyn, City of New York."

CHAIRMAN FRLE: I'm sorry.

WILLIAM J. DUFOUR, representing Old Country Club Civic Association of Flushing and North Shore Council of Homeowners Association.

MR. DUFOUR: My name is William Dufour. I'm President of the Old Country Club Civic Association of Flushing and Zoning Chairman of the North Shore Council of Civic Associations which is affiliated with the Queens Federation of Civic Councils of which Mr. Max Lome has already spoken.

We, both the North Shore Council and the Old Country Club Civic Association, urge the immediate adoption of this new Zoning Resolution without any further delay. We have certain reservations of which you're aware and have reserved the right to confer with you about the few mapping changes in which we are specifically interested.

This, to me, has been a revelation to hear some of these

people come here and take the time of our officials in a way in which some of them have done it. I think there's been enough time for anybody who is vitally interested in this subject to know what he is talking about when he gets before this microphone. I myself am not a zoning expert; I'm not a lawyer. I'm just an ordinary person and a homeowner.

I became interested in zoning about a year ago when we had the threat of a variance in our one-family neighborhood. Since then, I have found out that there was a new Zoning Resolution being prepared. I got busy and started studying it, and I have kept up to date.

I have not been railroaded into my thinking on this resolution, and I think that everybody who is vitally interested in this thing had plenty of time to study it and know exactly what was in it and what was implied and what it intended to do.

Specifically, I would say that since the hearings in March, the reprinting of the resolution is fully covered in the resume pages which you sent to anybody who is interested, and did not take 16 working days to see what changes were made since last March, but at the most 15 hours, and I don't think I knocked myself out in those 15 hours.

I feel that if there is any indication on the Commission believing that it should further delay adopting this proposed amendment to the Zoning Resolution, that I think the Commission will be remiss in its duty in allowing the spokesmen who have been before you to influence you in that direction. We have to have this new Zoning

Resolution to protect us in Queens. I would say the whole city needs it, also.

Until we get this new Zoning Resolution, we are not going to be able to have any idea of what can happen in our neighborhoods or in our Borough. With the new Zoning Resolution, the master planning of our City will go ahead on an orderly basis; we will not have the situation where suddenly a large apartment house springs up and the needs for schools, police, sewer, fire departments, sewage are necessary to be financed by the taxpayers, not by the developers of these large developments.

I think one of the speakers earlier this afternoon took credit for a lot of civic organizations in his so-called Queens Zoning Committee. We know for a fact, without having his list which is quite a well-guarded list, and I think he was reading that -- I think -- out of his head -- that the following are not associated with the Queens Zoning Committee:

The Forest Hills Civic Association, the Jamaica-Hillcrest Civic Association, the Bellerose Garden Civic Association, the Flushing Heights Civic Association.

Those people are connected with the Councils of the Federation of Civic Councils and they are very much in favor of it. The Federation of Civic Councils request that you pass this new law as promptly as possible without any further delay.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thanks very much, Mr. Dufour.

Is Mrs. Fallon present?

MRS. ETHEL E. FALLON, representing Bellerose Commonwealth Civic Association.

MRS. FALLON: I am Ethel E. Fallon, President of the Bellerose Commonwealth Civic Association.

We are affiliated with the Eastern Queens Civic Council which is in turn, as you have been told, affiliated with the Queens Federation of Civic Councils.

Our organization consists of over 600 paid-up members. We have not been stampeded by the literature sent to us at great length by the Queens Chamber of Commerce. The Queens Chamber of Commerce, Gentlemen, that doesn't even know where Queens County ends.

I have here a map put out in early -- last fall, I believe -- in the early days of their campaign, that purports to be Queens County, which they represent. According to them, Queens County ends at Little Neck Parkway. Now, it does not, gentlemen.

At Hillside Avenue it runs out to about 270th Street, at Union Turnpike it runs out to Lakeville Road. This is the Queens Chamber of Commerce that presumes to speak for Queens homeowners.

Our organization, at its meeting in April went strongly on record, unanimously, as being in favor of the adoption of this new proposed zoning resolution. I urge that this resolution be adopted without delay.

Our Queens homeowners need the protection that this zoning resolution provides us.

In passing, I would just like to laud those who drew it up for their concept of zoning - the idea that certain areas be reserved exclusively for certain uses. This makes sense, Gentlemen, and I strongly urge that this be adopted without any further delay; there is no reason for delaying it.

Our Queens Chamber of Commerce is trying to kill it; when the President does this, we call it a pocket veto -- pigeonholing. But I would also like to remind them that that veto can be overridden.

They are hoping that this resolution will die by delaying tactics. Let us see that it does not.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELD: Thank you, Mrs. Fallon.

Mr. Muss.

HYMAN MUSS, representing Charles Muss and himself.

MR. MUSS: Mr. Chairman and Members of this Commission:

My name is Hyman Muss and I represent my brother Charles Muss and myself.

We are now in respect to property, which is listed on your map 14A. It is bounded by Horace Harding Expressway, 108th Street, Colonial Avenue and 62nd Drive, and you gentlemen are familiar with this location.

I read your recent opinion with a great deal of interest denying our application for 21C. You did in your opinion acknowledge the fact that this matter was before you many times, that at one time

we had about 80,000 feet of business that was taken away for Horace Harding Expressway, and that we were in an area that was surrounded on all sides by apartments and high rise apartments.

It, therefore, is incomprehensible to us that we should be rezoned from what was D, principally D with some C for a hundred feet on Colonial Avenue, to R-4. The Chairman in the opening of this hearing indicated that this Commission was very well aware of the consequences of changing D-1 to R-5. We were changed from D-1 to R-4 and we actually, I would say, this is a change in zone principally for our property because except for a vacant spot to the south -- on the south -- to the south of us -- the southeast corner of 110th Street and 62nd Drive which is also vacant, we are the only vacant pieces of property, and the owner of that property has also requested me to represent him, Mr. Kroll and it would appear that this is a spot-discriminating zoning which amounts to, as far as we're concerned, real confiscation at the present time.

We are able to put up 4800 apartments and under the proposed zoning it will be about 370 apartments. We don't see the purpose for it. There's nobody to protect.

The Horace Harding Expressway is to the north of us, and certainly, you're not concerned with the cars that use Horace Harding Expressway, and there is almost 200 feet of roadway between us there and the other side. To the west we have a school, true, but partly to the west we have the six-storey apartments which would not be permitted under the present zoning and to the south, we also have six-

storey apartments.

We are completely surrounded by the six-storey apartments which would be probably R-7 under this present construction.

To the east we do have those two-family houses, those two-storey apartment houses which were constructed ten years ago, but which would be prohibited today. And I might also mention the fact that at our location we require piling of almost 100 feet. So that under the present zoning-- under the proposed zoning, we would be limited to what amounts to one-family houses, practically, because we could not even put up two-family attached houses with --

CHAIRMAN FELL: Mr. Muss, would you be able -- I don't mean to interrupt you -- but I want to make certain that in any memorandum that you sent us you made reference to the piling required in connection with --

MR. MUSS: We did not.

CHAIRMAN FELL: Will you please?

MR. MUSS: All right.

In addition to the prohibitive expense of piling that is required, it is, I believe, incomprehensible that anyone would purchase a one or two-family house in this area that is surrounded by the Horace Harding Expressway and that contains all of the traffic that was pointed out at that 210 hearing where the emphasis was upon the tremendous amount of traffic that exists there. It therefore would seem to me that it would be in effect condemning this land to permanent barrenness. In addition, if you will examine all of the

other surrounding properties which are presently vacant, you will note that to the north there is R-6. That was at the -- prior to the original proposal, and that was R-5, and that was upgraded to R-6.

If you will examine your maps on page 10A, rather on 10D, that also is in the vicinity of one or two-family houses, and they are already constructed. You rezoned that to R-6.

It is therefore also further incomprehensible to us that this property that's just across the street from us, there, where they do have one and two families constructed, you have R-6, we, where we have no one and two-family constructed, surrounded completely by apartments and high rise apartments, we should be R-4. Only two blocks to the south, you'll see on that map on 14A. It is R-7-1.

We believe it must have been an oversight, and we respectfully request that you give it this consideration and you have other memorandum from us and we have mentioned the piling and we will therefore supplement our previous letter with this piling and we trust that we will have your favorable consideration.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes. Will you have that for us within one week, please?

MR. MOSS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Now, let me see. Is Mr. Zelman present, Benjamin Zelman?

BENJAMIN M. ZELMAN, representing Queensview Cooperative Homes and Ravenswood Homes, Astoria.

MR. ZELMAN: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission:

My name is Benjamin M. Zelman. I happen to be Vice President and a member of the Board of Directors of the Queensview Cooperative Homes in Astoria, Long Island.

This cooperative, as you know, consists of approximately 3,000 residences. I have also been delegated to speak in behalf of the Ravenswood Homes which are not cooperatives, but which are homes owned and controlled by the City of New York.

Now, in the first place, I've spoken before this Body several times as well as before the Board of Estimate, and I will not repeat myself as I think my views are generally known.

First, I briefly want to point out that insofar as the Astoria area is concerned, if there's any area in the City of New York that should and must be residential this is it. It has to be residential because of the very character of the neighborhood.

You gentlemen know very well that this whole area was a marginal area, reclaimed land, and for many years has been neglected. As a result, from time to time, some factories were built on the land, leaving big open spaces. However, the City of New York in the last ten or twelve years, realizing that more attention must be given to this area, because it is situated near parks and along the river, has begun to sink money into it in many ways. It has built as you very well know, the Ravenswood Homes, 10,000 people, the Queensview Cooperative Homes, over 3,000, as well as Queens, U. S., which has approximately 1500 people and the Astoria Homes, also. City homes, are further up.

Now, anyone who looks at that area, obviously, must conclude that it can and must be nothing else but residential. However, as I've stated, within the past few years certain people, in order to beat the deadline have suddenly begun building in this particular area. They can build now because it is not zoned properly as everyone practically concedes.

This particular area -- and I know you gentlemen realize that I'm speaking truthfully -- is a hodge-podge if any area can be selected, because of 34th Avenue and 21st Street. Presently, this is a residence area, right alongside, and next to it it was a manufacturing area until you rezoned it a few years ago to a commercial area; right alongside the commercial area is a retail area, and right alongside of that is an unrestricted area, and in between is another residential area.

So that right now in this particular area, in Astoria, it is perfectly permissible for factories to come into these open lots where you have nothing else but slag piles and junk -- there have been junk yards some of which have moved, some of which are moving back. For example, a little while ago, a gentleman speaking for the Queens Chamber of Commerce tried to indicate to you that this area should be not residential but manufacturing. And he began to name some organizations which are there and I wrote the names down. He mentioned Trailmobile. All right. Trailmobile. What's so wonderful about that? Trailmobile came into existence only a few years ago while you gentlemen were working on a proposal and couldn't get the City to approve

What's so wonderful about a Trailmobile occupying an entire block right between Queensview and Ravenswood where there's a public playground right alongside of it where children go back and forth all day long and here you have hundreds of big trucks going in and out and all day. What's so wonderful about this Trailmobile?

Then he mentioned next to it a wonderful Pioneer Mounting and Finishing Company. I don't know too much about the character of their business. It's an honorable firm. What's so wonderful about a mounting and finishing firm right alongside of two housing projects?

Then he mentioned Terry Construction Company. What's so wonderful about that? Right alongside of Terry Construction Company -- Terry Construction Company has an open yard with a lot of junk and steel and iron. What's so wonderful about that? They didn't call this to your attention. They led you to believe that these are just honorable gentlemen who come in and who are helping build up industry and increasing and bring about tax revenue.

As a matter of fact, they do not bring in tax revenue, they decrease tax revenue, because these houses are situated in an area where builders who would like to build residentially cannot build because this is here and because there is a delay.

Now, I know personally that applications have been made for a variance in that area and several have been granted, unfortunately, through the Board of Standards and Appeals.

This is not the only danger, the granting of variances. But the greater danger lies in the fact that after this Commission

approves -- the Planning Commission -- approves your report, and I'm sure you're going to approve it with some variations, of course, it's first going to go to the Board of Estimate and then a time will be set a year or so later. Within that year, I assure you, and I've said this before, gentlemen, I've said it on several occasions and I indicated what lots were vacant on 35th Avenue and on 36th Avenue, and I don't want to take up the time now, but I pointed the lots out to you at that time, two years ago and three years ago. They are now in the process of being built, not for residence but for one-storey construction and cement concerns, right in the midst of the Jewish Center which is on 36th Street, right in the midst of a Catholic Church and school, right alongside of it. Right alongside of it.

Now, this is precisely what is bound to happen in the future if there's further delay.

Now, this Planning Commission has modified the proposals insofar as our area is concerned, and has allowed a certain public utility to come in with certain rights. We think it's unfortunate, but we are not for that reason going to say, gentlemen, because we don't like your proposal in that regard, let's have further delay. Delay is to kill, delay is to stifle and that's precisely what some people will accomplish, unintentionally in many instances -- I do warrant you -- many honorable organizations have spoken here and they honestly believe that delay will help -- delay will kill and delay will stifle, and I want to leave that point with you very, very

strongly.

Now, I'd also like to indicate to you that many people in the area realize that this is going to be a residential area because on Crescent Street, within the last few months, builders have come in and built large apartment houses. In fact, one large apartment house owner on Crescent Street advertised in the Times "Fine 7-story apartment house , beautiful rooms," quoted rentals, playground nearby. You know the playground he referred to? He referred to the playground in the cooperative homes across the street.

In other words, they recognize that this is a residential area, and I don't have to mention the fact that many builders have built one and two-family homes all along the Astoria area and they're going up very quickly. They're afraid to build apartment houses because they don't know what the effect of the Resolution is going to be and whether or not it's going to be passed. But I assure you, gentlemen, that as soon as this Resolution is adopted here and by the Board of Estimate, I have no doubt however that real estate builders are going to come into that area, clean up the swamp area right opposite the East River and the City is going to have great revenue and good revenue from an area where it gets very little now.

In closing, I'd like to say that the Zoning proposal, with minor modifications, is very humane, I think it's broad in scope and forward-looking. Those who presently oppose, in time -- and I know there's honest opposition, and some which is not so honest opposition -- but I think those people who oppose it now will in time come the

other way, especially when they begin to get better results on their investments.

I think this substitutes planning for planlessness. That's what our present Resolution is - the 1916 Resolution.

It substitutes initiative for the status-quo; sensible controls for overcrowding; a proper balance in building for haphazard building; orderliness for confusion; it substitutes architectural design for non-symmetry, and certainly changing needs of a district for static development.

We believe that the proposal overhauls a horse and buggy 1916 outmoded resolution which has outlived its usefulness, but from a monetary point of view is very costly to the City of New York and no longer can serve the good and welfare of the Metropolitan Area and the people of the City of New York.

We in Queensview and in Bayswood and in the surrounding area highly commend the Commission for its fine work and we will do everything we can to support the present proposal even though in some respects we don't see eye to eye.

We feel that all citizens have a wonderful opportunity later on to bring about the changes here and there. But don't destroy something that is good under the guise of delay and seeking further opportunity to be heard. We support you and thank you very much for your fine work.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Zelman.

Mr. Frank Weinstein; Mr. Weinstein.

I'm sorry some of you have had to wait so long, but in-

variably there is always the last person to speak, and we have no alternative.

FRANK WEINSTEIN, representing Greater New York Terminal, Inc.

MR. WEINSTEIN: My name is Frank Weinstein. I represent the Greater New York Terminal.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Planning Commission:

I had the pleasure of appearing before you on March 23, 1960, when I objected to certain portions of the plans pertaining to the zoning of certain industrial property in Astoria. I represented the Greater New York Terminal, the owner of over 30 acres of land in Astoria, which land has a frontage on the East River and Steinway Creek of over 2,200 feet.

Upon this property there has been erected the most efficient, modern, fire-proof, fuel oil storage plant in the world, having a storage capacity of 63,000,000 gallons of fuel oil. This property was originally zoned as an M-1 district. Your Commission, after considering my objections, corrected this zoning so as to indicate that the property in question is in an M-3 district.

This change will enable the storage capacity of this plant to be increased from time to time to meet the future demands for more fuel oil as may be required by the continuous growth of the City. This oil storage terminal is now used principally by Burns Brothers and Preferred Oil Company. No longer need the City fear a shortage of fuel oil for homes, apartment houses and factory within

its boundaries such as occurred in 1947 because of a Rizzardi and some years ago when the oil could not be delivered in sufficient quantities to the city because of a tugboat strike.

Oil is delivered to this terminal not by barge but by super ocean going tankers.

The Greater New York Terminal is prepared at all times to use its vast storage facilities to protect the public against possible fuel oil shortages. The present proposed zoning resolution assures continued growth of our city. It assures industry and millions of the City's dwellers who depend on employment in industrial plants for their livelihood that they need not fear the loss of such industry. It provides for suitable space in good locations for future industrial development.

There is no longer any danger that the Zoning Ordinance would drive industry away from the city. The modernization of the city by the Zoning Resolution will serve as a model for all other large cities, not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

In conclusion, I desire to state that a great majority of the public extend their thanks to the members of the Planning Commission for their unselfish efforts, time and energy in carefully examining and considering all criticism and suggestions and, thereafter, incorporating constructive suggestions in the present amended resolutions.

However, the monumental task that has been performed by this Commission will be fully realized in future years when the growth

of our City will be greatly enhanced. At that time, the public will fully realize that the work of this Commission has been largely responsible for improving the living conditions of millions of the dwellers of the great City of New York which, it is anticipated, will have in the future the greatest population of any city in the world.

May I, therefore, be so bold as to express not only my personal thanks but also the thanks of the public, generally, to this Honorable Commission for a job well done in helping to create a new and better New York.

I thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much, sir.

Is Ethel Blackwell present? Miss Blackwell?

Harry McArdle? Mr. McArdle?

Herman Jaffe?

HERMAN JAFFE, representing Community Council of Queens.

MR. JAFFE: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Commission:

There's some -- there's some compensation in sitting as I have since two o'clock. I made some statistics and some 22 people have addressed your Honorable Body. The average has been four and a half minutes.

I won't be as long as the fifteen-minute man, and I can't be as short as the two-minute person, but I'll keep within the limits of say ten minutes.

But before I address myself to the prepared remarks that I made, I want to, for the record, admit an error and mistake that I

made in a newspaper release which I sent on August 22nd from Bar Harbor, Maine, where I was vacationing with Mrs. Jaffe on a 40th Anniversary trip.

I then learned that the Commission was going to spend \$78,000 for a survey, and I at my home had a copy of the survey that had cost the real estate firm in 1954 some \$30,000 to prepare. Well, I felt that here's where I'm going to save the City \$78,000.

When I got back from my vacation, I learned that I had made an error after visiting Mr. Jeroff, who explained to me that that \$30,000 operation was going to be included in the other \$78,000, and that you were really saving the city some \$20,000 or \$30,000.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We've been so advised of your feelings, Mr. Jaffe.

MR. JAFFE: When I make a mistake I like to admit it publicly.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We appreciate the statement and we're very hopeful that the project that the city contemplates will materialize.

MR. JAFFE: Yes, sir.

Now, at that time I learned, of course, that the Mayor had publicly announced that he was -- his approval of using the Flushing Airport as an industrial area, M-1.

Now, my remarks, gentlemen:

Since my appearance before the City Planning Commission in March of this year, and at the previous hearing, I have been greatly encouraged by many favorable statements from garment manufacturers,

union officials, Chamber of Commerce officials, civic-minded citizens, architects, real estate and other business men about my proposal -- about our proposal -- that the garment and textile industry be re-located in the College Point Area, the Flushing Airport and Queens County. This --

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Jaffe, for the record, when I referred to the fact that we trust that the project we have in mind will materialize, I referred to --

MR. JAFFE: I didn't hear that, Commissioner.

CHAIRMAN FELT: When I said earlier that we trust that this project will materialize, I wanted -- I want you to know that we weren't referring to any specific type of development.

MR. JAFFE: I realize that.

CHAIRMAN FELT: (Continuing) Garment center or otherwise, but merely an industrial area.

MR. JAFFE: I very carefully stated that I read the Mayor's statement that he approved of that as an industrial area.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That's right.

MR. JAFFE: Which gives it an opportunity for any industry.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Yes, but we didn't want anyone to misconstrue our great interest in that as being directed to the garment industry or anyone in particular.

MR. JAFFE: I understood that, Mr. Chairman, and that's why I was careful to say "industrial area" for the Mayor, but feeling as I do about the value of doing what I have in mind, I'm making this

statement.

As I said, that I've talked to many business people about this area-- this will have a two-point value for New York City, the first is that it will -- we will be able to build a modern industrial park to house the production facilities of the most important and the largest industry segment of New York where workers will have ideal conditions for production and manufacturers will have factory facilities that will be more economical than in Manhattan.

The second very important point is that much has been said about the traffic-paralyzed midtown Manhattan area near Times Square. This move will eliminate the problem that is slowly and steadily moving the garment industry out of New York City.

The Community Council of the City of New York is in full agreement with the leading real estate and architectural societies and other organizations in heartily endorsing the recommendations of the City Planning Commission, and we are specially pleased to learn about the Mayor's statement that that should be an industrial area.

CHAIRMAN FELT: When you refer to the recommendations --

MR. JAFFE: I beg your pardon?

CHAIRMAN FELT: (Continuing) -- has this anything to do with our zoning recommendations?

MR. JAFFE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In other words --

MR. JAFFE: It's been zoned to M-1.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That's correct.

MR. JAFFE: Yes; and I'm placing on the record the statement that we approve of the zoning of that area as M1 and we also make the further statement for the record - so that it will be known publicly - that we feel that as things progress, that we should then go on to making it an area for the garment industry.

And we, of course, approve of the editorial in the Times and in the World-Telegram, and in the Long Island Press and other newspapers; and I have prepared more detailed copies of our activity as a community council - I do not intend to read the full statement.

I have given copies to the Commission and to the press.

We are heartily in accord with everything you are doing, gentlemen, and we are all very proud of the fact that you give the time that you do.

These are the copies. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Jaffe.

Is Mr. Leuzzi present?

JOSEPH LEUZZI, Real Estate Broker in Queens.

MR. LEUZZI: My name is Joseph Leuzzi. I'm the President of the Overall Realty Company; it's my own firm.

I'm here on my own behalf, and what I think is a purpose to serve my community and the city of which I've been a resident for 50 years.

Several months ago I took the liberty of writing to you, Commissioner, with regard to a plan on Jamaica urban renewal and a small part of it covered an area that I would like to elaborate on further since it's a small bit of real estate, but could mean a great deal to our Borough and City.

You, Commissioner, were very courteous and acknowledged my letter promptly. I was appreciate of this. The area involved is that from the center line east of 195th Place, 100 feet, and south of Jamaica Avenue to the Long Island Railroad, and east to Carpenter Avenue.

About eight acres in the east portion and five acres in the west portion of this line comprise a little triangle of Hollis which is a geometric key to the future of Jamaica and Queens as a whole, residential and businesswise. There are a total of 79 one and two-family homes on this easterly portion, having a vintage of about 30 years or more. And about one-half back up to the railroad are business property.

The entire east and west has had 21 houses built since the second world war, one-half being two-family and one-half being one-family. The west portion has 61 homes of one and two-family; also 30

years or more.

This makes an overall total of 140 houses in all.

This small triangle has had apartments in its midst for 30 years or more. At the end of the triangle, factories and commercial industrial properties exist for about a mile west.

I'm publicizing Overall here, you can see.

Of the overall of the 120 total prewar homes, either for some unfortunate reason or for the lack of confidence in the area, only two houses have had the owner make a radical or extensive extension or modernization. This is not consistent with the post-war progress of houses.

The area has only a few lots, none of which are feasible for new one and two-family houses. Not because of zoning; because the buyers would not buy in such a retarded neighborhood.

The bulk of these 120 homes are frame and shingle and built in trying times and they look it, and whereas most neighborhoods have profited from inflation, these few people did not have that good fortune, from a house value or from present land value. This because of the railroad through its rear and factories and commercial to the west and because it's a small boxed-in triangle.

The fact is the -- this fact is also a handicap for all of Jamaica and Hollis, Jamaica, Hollis, Hollis Park Gardens and Jamaica Estates and for Hollis, for what happens in the next few years in this geometric triangle will determine neighborhood character and real estate evaluation for miles around and will tremendously affect

business for Jamaica and the Borough of Queens.

Holding to E-1 or R-5, which you have now presently in this "itsy-bitsy" railroad backup triangle, a remaining total of non-apartment land amounting to less than 500,000 gross square foot, will deteriorate further and make slums of the adjacent areas. There are no big interests presently involved in these few blocks of real estate. So any benefit from any monetary standpoint from changing the zone to R-6-7 or 8 would go directly to these poor homeowners, some of whom are here 35 years and more. They justly deserve every dollar.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, my plaudits go to you for a mighty and bold task being progressively done.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER BRAUSTEIN: Julius Venner.

JULIUS VENNER, ESQ., representing Napan Construction Corp.

MR. VENNER: Gentlemen of the Committee:

My name is Julius Venner. I represent Napan Construction Corporation.

Napan Construction Corporation owns about 16 areas of land in the College Point Area which Mr. Jaffe just discussed.

The area which I'm speaking about can be found on map pages Nos. 141 and 152, and the land area is bordered on the north by 15th Avenue, on the south by 20th Avenue, on the east by 141st St. and on the west by 138th Street.

To the north of 15th Avenue lies a first class residential

area, and 15th Avenue represents a natural boundary line that this Commission itself recognizes.

On August 22nd, in the New York Times report of the proposal to make the College Point area into an industrial park, the Commission, Mr. Felt, I believe it is, stated that the proposed site is to the west of the Whitestone Parkway, it is bounded on the north by 15th Avenue, and on the west by 127th Street.

Now, in the March proposal, the entire area south of 15th Avenue was zoned M-1. This I believe represents a true picture or a true evaluation of the area.

However, in the present proposal, the area has been shifted so that R-2 now extends down into 18th Avenue, which covers this sub-standard land which Mr. Felt in his statement of August 22nd described as having poor soil conditions and lack of adequate roads and sewer and special foundation problems. And there are, gentlemen, special foundation problems. It requires extensive piling, and because of this new proposal of R-2 requiring a land area, it would be prohibitive for a builder to construct one-family houses on that area, taking into consideration the amount of piling which is necessary and the amount of land.

I believe, on behalf of my client, that this was -- this line was shifted because of, perhaps an inadvertence. It certainly doesn't reflect the true character of that particular area.

As I stated before, the natural boundary line lies on 15th Avenue, and the zoning as it is constituted north of that pretty

accurately reflects what exists at the present time in that area.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Where is your client's property located?

MR. VENNER: As I said, it's south of 15th Avenue, runs to 20th Avenue, and on the east it's bounded on 141st Street and on the west by 138th Street.

We submit, Gentlemen, that to zone the northern half of my client's property R-2 would cause a real hardship and would effectively remove this land from the building market, if you will.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: What do you propose?

MR. VENNER: Well, we would suggest that the prior proposal of M-1 be kept, or if what the Commission indicated was a buffer zone of some kind, that a lower quality or lower quality of private home development be permitted, or if that not is suitable, some commercial zone which would, I think, be a more natural buffer zone between this manufacturing area and the high-quality homes which are required to be built.

Now, I submit, Gentlemen, that no proposed builder or buyer of these homes would purchase an expensive home which borders immediately upon a manufacturing area, and if what we're seeking is a sort of gentle transition from a high-quality home to a manufacturing area, I submit that some kind of buffer zone would be more equitable and suitable.

CHAIRMAN FELT: You know, it really depends, if I may say so, on the manner in which the area is developed.

For example, in Fairland, New Jersey, there is an industrial park which has 21 of the most attractive industrial buildings that I've ever seen, and within 400 feet of the industrial structures are private houses selling for \$35,000 and \$40,000.

In other words, an industrial park or industrial usage -- the same as the Bulova Watch Company and other groups -- can be made extremely attractive and it is the purpose of the City in areas that have private residences and apartment houses not too far away to make sure that the industrial usage will be exemplary and helpful rather than harmful.

I might say, so as to clear up any doubts that you may have, that the exact boundaries of the industrial park will depend upon the studies made and the recommendations given by the consultants and the ultimate review of that and acceptance of it by the City Planning Commission and the Board of Estimate.

MR. VENNER: Well, I think, Mr. Felt, in your absence I mentioned that in your news release of August 22nd, you mentioned that the northernmost boundary was 15th Avenue.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, that is merely a study boundary, but the contract provides that the areas immediately adjoining the bounded sections will also be included as part of the settlement.

MR. VENNER: I would like to make one further observation -- this is not meant on behalf of my client as a quibble, but if we look at the general map of the area, there is immediately surrounding the R area, on the south an M-1, of which the R area is a part.

To the west we have an R-4 area; to the northwest an R-4 area, and then sandwiched between the R11 area in the northeastern sector is the R-2 section of which we now become a part.

It is our contention that the best interest of all, including the possible development of this area would be served by keeping an area such as R-4 or at least a strip of R-4 so that we can -- we can have a saleable product when we develop the area.

We are developers; we're not in there for speculation. However, as it stands now, it would be very -- I doubt if it would be feasible to put up --

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, we'll be glad to keep you advised as these studies progress. We'll be mindful of your problems and your views.

MR. VENNER: I have been normally extremely busy waiting to you. I would like the opportunity to do so.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I think to go on to say, that you ought to write a letter to the Commission setting forth just what your problem is and ask to be advised from time to time in connection with it so at least we will have a record -- even beyond the statement that you made at this zoning hearing.

In other words, it should be in our files, both on the proposed industrial park and the zoning hearing.

MR. VENNER: I'll be happy to do so. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

Is Mr. Steve Koufexis here?

STEVE TOUFEXIS, representing Elmhurst Civic Progressive Organization and Homeowners of Broadway-Queens Boulevard and 51st Avenue.

MR. TOUFEXIS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Will you step forward, please?

MR. TOUFEXIS: Mr. Chairman and Members of the City Planning Commission:

My name is Steve Toufexis, and I represent the Elmhurst Progressive Homeowners Association, and also most of the homeowners bounded by Queens Boulevard, Broadway and 51st Avenue.

This area forms a triangle at the intersection of Queens Boulevard and 51st Avenue, pointing to the well-known building of the Elks on Queens Boulevard.

This area has been many times attacked by commercial interests to the point that these interests have been successful in changing this valuable part of Queens Boulevard into an eyesore and a slum.

The Board of Standards and Appeals has helped this shameful situation by granting variance upon variance; and some businesses also operating under existing zoning regulations in this area have complained to the Building Department, having no effect.

On May 24, 1960, we mailed a request to you for an examination of the proposed zoning of this area which was designated as C8. On August 17, 1960, in your communication to me, it is stated that it has been resolved as C-1, C-2, R-6, and it is shown as such on

the City Record of August 18, 1960.

This decision, gentlemen, of yours shows justice and impartiality. It is based on its own merits, and I am sure it will serve and protect the interests of the surrounding community.

In closing, we wish to place on record that the designation of this area C-1, C-2 and R-6 is sound and equitable and we strongly oppose any attempts of any business group which may in the meantime petition you to change such designation.

Please, also, accept our sincere appreciation for the enormous dedication and the kind of serious consideration you have given to our complaints and the great difficulties which you have encountered in your sincere efforts to make this city of ours a better place to live in and work. We ask that the Zoning Resolution be adopted without further delay.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, sir.

Kathleen A. Nylin. Is Mrs. Nylin present?

KATHLEEN A. NYLIN, representing Laurel Hill Civic Association.

MRS. NYLIN: Commissioners, I'm Kathleen Nylin, 52-02 44th Street, Maspeth, Queens.

I represent my neighbors in the area bounded on the west by the Kosciusko Bridge -- I hope I pronounced it correctly in honor of that famous gentleman -- on the east and north by the Queens Midtown Expressway, and on the south by 54th Avenue.

This area appears on Map 13 of the City Record of August 18,

1960. I have attended all the public hearings on Queens Zoning. We, six of us, have come to say thank you for maintaining the residential status of our neighborhood which was the request of our petition. We wish to be counted among the representatives of the organizations, large or small, who have come here today to register their approval of the new proposed zoning resolution. We hope that the Board of Estimate will recognize its value and that it will be our new Zoning Ordinance before the end of this year.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

Is Mr. Hirsch present, I, Bernard Hirsch? Will you step forward please?

I. BERNARD HIRSCH, Executive Secretary, Chamber of Commerce of the Rockaways.

MR. HIRSCH: My name is Bernard Hirsch, and I represent the Chamber of Commerce of the Rockaways.

Chairman Felt, Members of the Commission:

It is the unqualified view of the Rockaway Chamber of Commerce that the Resolution as presented by the Commission most closely approaches the ideal zoning plan.

I must make it clear, however, that I speak only in reference to the Resolution as it applies to the Rockaway Peninsula. You will note that I said "most closely approaches the ideal zoning plan". We feel that there is one factor which has been omitted, and which, if added to the current resolution, would greatly enhance the plan.

This factor applies to the proposed zoning of the Rockaway Beach Front and Boardwalk.

It is well known that the Rockaways are unique. We have an area that is a year-round residential area, as well as a summer resort area. In fact, the Rockaway Peninsula is one of New York's busiest resort areas. In the summer, the population nearly doubles and on weekends, millions of transients flock to the beaches. To encourage seasonal use of our beach front, it is necessary to provide these people with areas of recreation, amusement and refreshment.

However, the Zoning Resolution in its present form does not provide adequate commercial zones on the boardwalk to permit these establishments. In fact, in time, the resolution would virtually eliminate the many concessions and food stands that provide important services to our summer visitors and which are vital to recreational areas such as the Rockaways.

Under the new proposal, only two areas of the 11-mile beach front are zoned for commercial use. One of these is in the Rockaway Park section and the other is at Beach 98th Street, adjacent to Rockaway Playland. A former C-7 zone along the boardwalk which had extended from Beach 97th to Beach 101st Street has now been reduced to extend from Beach 97th Street to Beach 99th Street.

We do not ask that the whole of the boardwalk be zoned for commercial use. What we request is an increase in boardwalk commercial areas in the Far Rockaway-Edgemere, Arverne and Rockaway Beach sections. We also request that the aforementioned C-7 zone be extended to its

former boundaries.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that these establishments on the boardwalk are an integral part of the Boardwalks both economically and through the services they render during the summer season. They must be maintained and permitted to expand and modernize.

We urge the Commission to take these measures under consideration and establish some commercial use areas adjacent to our beach and boardwalk facilities.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

Is Mr. Sohmer present? Mr. Sohmer.

HARRY J. SOHMER, representing Sohmer & Co., Re: Section 4, Block 50, Block 5 - 31st Avenue and Vernon Boulevard, Astoria.

MR. SOHMER: Mr. Chairman and Members:

It's a little late. I'll try to make it brief, and I'll start by saying that my name is Sohmer, Harry Sohmer, as a matter of fact, and I've been connected for many years with the Sohmer Piano Company in Astoria.

In an attempt to be brief, I think maybe I'd better read this -- it's not very long and it's probably a whole lot more concentrated than I would tell you if I were speaking freely.

This is a letter, incidentally:

"We have written you on a previous occasion so we hope we will require no further introduction at this time than to say we are speaking in behalf of the Sohmer Piano Company, a business that has

occupied the five-story factory building located at 31st Avenue and Vernon Boulevard for the last 74 years."

I don't know whether you gentlemen recognize where that is. That's on the Astoria side, directly opposite the Lighthouse, and it is one of those places -- I've been connected with the company fifty years, but, frankly, with the exception of the low cost housing on the Point, I don't think it has changed in 25 years, and I'm inclined to think or doubt that some of you gentlemen have ever been there -- I don't know -- I won't question that, but if you didn't get there, you didn't miss very much anyway.

So during all these -- during all these years, this has been an unrestricted zone, but it is now being placed, as you know, in an R-6 residential zone.

"When we received Mr. Felt's letter of August 17th, we rather thought that most of our troubles were over. However, a more careful reading of the revised resolution, Article V -- I don't remember the chapter -- discloses the fact that we are circumscribed by all kinds of restrictions as non-conforming user in an R-6 residential zone."

And may I add, I think that's one of the most unfortunate positions to be in, which we are. We're in a non-complying use -- a non-conforming building and a non-complying use, I guess that would be it. It certainly wasn't our fault that we got in there in 1886, thirty years or forty years before they ever contemplated zoning. And it just seems unfortunate that we should have all these restrictions

placed on our building and that will make it exceedingly difficult to sell.

I know it's hard to sell or rent anything over there anyway, but to attach a certain number of conditions to it, and you are licked before you start. I can tell you that.

The piano business is somewhat of an uncertain business; I mean, depending on times. I know in the 30's, well, people wouldn't even look at the place. So just to continue and make it short --

"As we interpret these provisions, getting back to Article V, our possibilities of expansion and growth are practically nil. As we understand it, certain non-conforming uses must be discontinued after three years, and some after ten years. Certain advertising signs must be discontinued after eight years.

"There are also stringent restrictions as to the rebuilding of premises. This is paragraph 52, page 99. Also, stringent restrictions as to the rebuilding of premises destroyed or partially damaged by fire or otherwise, all of which would tend to make the building difficult, if not impossible to rent or sell.

- "We note that areas, such as the Brooklyn waterfront, Long Island City, Astoria, have been permitted greater industrial bulk."

I think we took that from the new map. Those are your words, Mr. Chairman -- "have been permitted greater industrial bulk." This is true of the waterfront directly north and south of us, but the small five-block section between 30th and 35th Avenues where we are located has been assigned an R-6 zone.

You have recently changed the northerly and westerly parts of Astoria Point -- that is where the low-cost housing is -- directly north of it; you have recently changed northerly and westerly parts of Astoria Point from R-5 to M-1.

We are thoroughly in sympathy with the idea -- they're entitled to it, and we would like the same treatment. As property owners who have paid taxes for more than 74 years, we feel we are entitled to equal consideration. We therefore respectfully request that the zoning ordinance with respect to this property be changed in one of the following ways:

Change zone designation from R-6 to M-1 or M-2, make an individual exception or variance similar to what you have done in other instances. Respectfully submitted, Harry J. Sohmer.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Sohmer.

Is Mr. Linakis here? Mr. Linakis, if you will please wait a few minutes -- I just want to enter a few letters for the record.

I have a letter signed by Julia E. Jerry, President of the United Civic Council of Queens County:

"UNITED CIVIC COUNCIL OF QUEENS COUNTY

Julia E. Jerry, President

38-34 192nd Street
Flushing 65, New York

FL 7-9344

September 10, 1960

Commissioner Felt, City Planning, New York, N.Y.

"Dear Sir:

"As President of the United Civic Council which represents some thirty local civic groups, we urge that New York City approve the New Zoning Resolution. On the local level, we represent the Harding Heights Civic Association, as president of same.

"We are affiliated with the Federation of Civic Councils of Queens.

"There has been untold delay and procrastination. We believe now is the time to accept and approve the new Zoning Resolution for the benefit of the people of the City of New York. It is imperative that you give this matter your immediate consideration, and have this Zoning Resolution accepted.

"We sincerely trust you will comply with our request."
(Signed: Julia E. Jerry)

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing)

Then I have a letter which I shall not read because it is quite lengthy but it, in effect, is an endorsement of our zoning proposal from the Flushing Chamber of Commerce. The letter is signed by Carl H. Salminen, Chairman, Civic Planning Committee.

CARL H. SALMINEN, CHAIRMAN, CIVIC PLANNING COMMITTEE,
FLUSHING CHAMBER OF COMMERCE (communications)

"FLUSHING CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
Chamber of Commerce Building Flushing 54, N.Y.
Flushing 9-6262"

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the City Planning Commission:

"My name is Carl H. Salminen, Chairman of the Civic Planning Committee of the Flushing Chamber of Commerce.

"Following extensive study and discussion of the revised proposal, our Committee wholeheartedly endorses this resolution recognizing the urgent need for good planning for the future development of New York City and our own community.

We believe that the proposal as now written after constructive criticism by various community, educational, real estate, building, architectural and civic groups, embody the basic objectives of sound planning. We believe it is a workable and generally equitable

"blueprint to meet the present and future zoning problems.

" We are especially grateful for changes in the final draft of the resolution concerning Non-conforming Uses omitting the conformity requirement of 15 years of Performance Standards in Section 52-51 and eliminating Sections 52-85 thru 87 requiring amortization periods of residential districts.

" The presently proposed resolution will accomplish the same objectives and in the Chairman's opinion the Planning Commission has acted wisely and fairly in thus avoiding hardship to establish industrial firms during the transition period.

" We also appreciate the attention given to recommendations for map changes in our area which will provide more urgently needed industrial space. However, we note that certain requested map changes of extreme importance to our community and markets were considered as not worthy of revision.

"The above, the Planning Chairman would again appreciate the opportunity of resubmitting the attached list of map changes, of only three items, for reconsideration, before this resolution is adopted by the Board of Estimate.

" In closing, the Planning Member of Commerce wishes to congratulate the City Planning Commission for preparing an excellent Resolution which, when adopted, should be a boon to the City and its inhabitants. Respectfully submitted, Carl E. Salmela, Chairman, Civic Planning Commission, Flushing Chamber of Commerce"

CARL H. SALMINEN, Architect
135-39 Northern Boulevard, Flushing 54, N.Y.

Flushing 9-6522

Member of Queens Chapter of A.I.A.
Reg. State of N.Y., N.J., Conn.
& Vt.

September 13, 1960.

"Honorable James Felt, Chairman, City Planning Commission

Dear Sir:

"I have your letter of August 17th concerning our request of April 26th for rezoning property on the north side of 26th Ave., between 126th and 129th Streets, College Point, L.I.

"We are now diminishing the area of our original request which is midway between 126th and 127th Streets to 129th Street on the North side of 26th Avenue to be included in the M1-1 Zone, for the reason that this particular area is unsuited for residential construction due to the nature of the sub-strata and the nearness to a manufacturing district. We are firmly convinced in the Flushing Chamber that this area should be included in your M1-1 Zoning which will fit in splendidly with the proposed Industrial Park.

"I would appreciate the opportunity of discussing this area more fully with one of your engineers and a geologist who knows the sub-strata conditions. See our Map 1-A attached in reference to this parcel.

Very truly yours,

Carl H. Salminen"

CARL H. SALMINEN, Architect
135-39 Northern Boulevard, Flushing 54, N.Y.

September 13, 1960.

"Honorable James Felt, Chairman, City Planning Commission

Dear Sir:

"I have your letter dated August 17th concerning our request of April 25, 1960, for rezoning the property at 111th

Street between Roosevelt and 44th Avenue, Corona, New York.

"We are now diminishing the area of our original request to encompass the property on the east side of 111th Street between Roosevelt Ave. and midway between 41st and 42nd Aves. into the C2-2 zoning.

"As your engineers will note, 111th Street is predominantly commercial and the particular reason for this request is that the large restaurant on the northeast corner of Roosevelt Ave. and 111th St. is seriously in need of additional parking space and is losing hundreds of customers weekly due to lack of parking facilities. This ^{is} one of the leading restaurants in Corona.

"We therefore ask the City Planning Commission before this resolution is adopted to kindly reconsider this area into a C2-2 zoning. The Borough President of Queens has been consulted in this matter and he stated that he would see what he could do in helping the situation. See Map 14-A attached.

Very truly yours,

Carl H. Salminen"

CARL H. SALMINEN, Architect
135-39 Northern Boulevard, Flushing 54, N.Y.

September 13, 1960.

"Honorable James Felt, Chairman, City Planning Commission

Dear Sir:

"We wish to call to your attention one extremely important parcel of land which the Flushing Chamber feels very strongly should be included in the M1-L zoning for the reason that this area

previously has been Unrestricted and at present is in a Manufacturing District.

"The owners of the land on that block have gone through a great deal of expense to recently purchase the property in this area because it was in a manufacturing district. The concern was located in Maspeth prior to coming to Flushing and when they came to Flushing they expended over \$150,000. in alterations and equipment. The growth of manufacturing and heavy industry in the Flushing area, as noticed by the Flushing Chamber, has been centered in this area of activity.

"We, therefore, strongly urge that the small parcel on the east side of Prince Street between 35th Avenue and Northern Blvd. as indicated on Map 11-A attached herewith be rezoned for M1-1.

Very truly yours,

Carl H. Salminen"

CHAIRMAN FELT: (continuing) You may recall that previously I had read into the record a telegram of endorsement from the same organization - from Haynes Prebor. Now, Mr. Linakis?

JOHN S. LINAKIS, representing Jamaica Chamber of Commerce, Jamaica Real Estate Board and Hillside Ave. Businessmen's Civic and Property Owners Association.

MR. LINAKIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the City Planning Commission:

My name is John S. Linakis, Chairman, City Planning and Zoning Committee, Jamaica Chamber of Commerce; also representing Jamaica Real Estate Board and Hillside Avenue Businessmen Civic and Property Owners Association, Incorporated.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the proposed new zoning resolutions, there is one area in particular which vitally concerns the various organizations which I represent. This area is the heart of Jamaica.

It extends from Sutphin Boulevard on the west (where the Queens General Court House is located), east on Parsons Boulevard (where the Central Queens Public Library is), further east to 164th Street (where the Post Office and Macy's and the Bus Terminal and many department and specialty stores are), all the way up to 169th Street (where May's and the Municipal Parking Lots are), and bounded by Hillside Avenue on the north (with the Independent subway - Sutphin Boulevard, Parsons Blvd., and 169th Street stations), and Jamaica Avenue on the south (with the B.M.T. subway lines).

The residential part of this area consists mostly of 6-story elevated apartments and one and two-family homes, many of which have been converted into undesirable rooming houses.

The existing zoning for this area is B or C which allows 60% to 65% land coverage and 6 to 9 story elevation.

The new proposed zoning resolution places this area in an R-6 category which decreases the land coverage to 30% - or one-half of the existing regulations.

The Jamaica Chamber of Commerce and the other organizations which I represent strenuously object to this R-6 zoning designation and recommend that the subject area be placed in at least R-7 classification, so as to permit 49% coverage, which is still below the present zoning of 60% to 65%.

We believe that anything less than R-7 designation will have drastic effects on this area. From the standpoint of the property owners, the change will be disastrous, real estate values will drop. The businessmen will suffer because the economic growth of Jamaica will be curtailed. Even the City will feel the loss of revenue from additional real estate taxes that it could realize from new construction.

We cannot conceive of any builder trying to assemble sufficient land by acquiring dilapidated one and two family homes and rooming houses to build an apartment house with only 30% land coverage. With such building limitations, the number of apartments in each building would be fewer and in order for the builder to realize a fair return from his investment, the rentals would necessarily be extremely

high. Such construction is not feasible and in our opinion will not be undertaken.

Eventually without construction of new buildings, the decline of Jamaica, which we are desperately trying to prevent, will become evident, and the existing conditions of deterioration and slums will be worsened.

For these reasons, we strongly urge and recommend that at least R-7 zoning be designated for this important and vital area.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

Mr. Linakis, you really confined your statement, and understandably so, to the section from Hillside Avenue to Jamaica Avenue and from Sutphin Boulevard up to 159th Street.

MR. LINAKIS: Up to 170th Street.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Have you any comment on the resolution aside from that?

MR. LINAKIS: The only comment I can make is my own comment because I was not authorized. I'm in favor of the entire resolution because you're doing an excellent job.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, that is your personal judgment rather than an authorized statement.

But what you directed your remarks to, was the policy of those three organizations, relating to that specific area, which is designated now R-6 and which they think should be R-7.

MR. LINAKIS: I believe that the organization will go in favor with the entire resolution without any doubt, but I cannot place it

in the record at this point -- the only area that they told me to place in the record --

CHAIRMAN FELT: As you know, we have worked a great deal with some of the people in the areas there.

Thank you very much, Mr. Linakis.

Edgar Levy? Is Mr. Levy present?

EDGAR LEVY, representing INVESTORS COLLATERAL CORPORATION

MR. LEVY: My name is Edgar Levy. I represent Investors Collateral Corporation.

This company is presently the owner of approximately 450 scattered parcels of real property in the County of Queens.

A great many of these parcels were acquired from The City of New York at its public auction sales.

We feel that the resolution as it stands, generally, is one which we heartily endorse. However, with respect to any all-encompassing or general progressive plan, there are bound to result a number of inequities; and while we own over 450 parcels, as I said, we have found 26 instances in which we think there have been inadvertencies.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That is 26 out of the 450?

MR. LEVY: That's right.

VICE CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Pretty good, isn't it?

MR. LEVY: We think it is pretty good.

CHAIRMAN FELT: As I have stated earlier, there will be

many cases submitted to us that are equitable cases and cases that are justifiable cases and require change, and after passage and during the grace period, we will be happy to consider any situation which any owner in any borough thinks warrants change.

MR. LEVY: Yes. Those particular measures of relief which I think would remove the hardship in those cases, I have embodied in the 26 particular instances, and I have the photographs and memoranda that go to make up that.

I would like, if I may, to leave that with the Commission --

CHAIRMAN FELT: We would be delighted to have it.

MR. LEVY: And, if possible, arrange within the near future a conference with some designee of the Commission to go over these things.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well.

I would suggest that you communicate with the Commission. You might call Mr. Smith, Jack Smith.

MR. LEVY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I hope you wouldn't do it before next Monday.

MR. LEVY: All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: You're welcome.

Wade Cullum, from the Liberty Civic Association.

Is Mr. Cullum present?

I am told that a statement was left by Mr. Wade Cullum which I shall read; it is just four lines.

WADE CULLUM, representing LIBERTY CIVIC ASSOCIATION (commun.)

"Dear Mr. Felt: This is to inform you that our organization is in favor of the proposed zoning code. We feel that it is adequate protection for home owners. Sincerely yours,
William C. Hughley, President and Director, represented by (signed)
Wade Cullum"

CHAIRMAN FELT (continuing) I am going to read the names of those persons from Queens for whom I have cards; and so that we have an opportunity to properly check them, will you please answer "Here" if your name is called.

Mrs. Robert W. Edgar; Edgar Greenblatt; Mrs. Zakin, Jules Michaelis, Peter Bach, Daniel L. Master, F. D. McKenzie; Herman Glicker; F. C. Whitman; Gruber, Widder & Connelly; David L. Klein; J. S. Sheridan; Mary Dixon; Irwin J. Kruger; Edward F. Horgan; John J. Fetscher; Viola McConnell; Albert M. Sanders. Thank you. Mrs. Zakin?

ADA ZAKIN, President, FAR ROCKAWAY TAXPAYER AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION

MRS. ZAKIN: This time it is an hour and a half earlier that it was the last time, Mr. Felt.

Chairman Felt and members of the Commission: My name is Ada Zakin; I am the President of the Far Rockaway Taxpayer and Civic Association. Sometimes I wonder if we are penalized because we come from the tail end of the City.

The Far Rockaway Taxpayer and Civic Association, representing property owners in that section of Queens County bounded on the

South by the Atlantic Ocean, on the East by the city line, on the north by Reades Lane, Empire Avenue and the city line, and on the West by Beach 20th Street...have studied your proposed zoning resolution with great interest and admiration.

We are in agreement with the purpose of this resolution, and your efforts to make New York City a better place in which to work, live and play.

We have had the pleasure of submitting suggestions at previous meetings and acknowledge, with thanks, acceptance of your commission of some of our proposals.

Our community is now enjoying rapid growth. No longer is Far Rockaway the Summer haven for sweltering city dwellers. Far Rockaway is fast becoming an all-year residential area comprising one and two family homes and luxury apartment houses. Older residents are not against this change...they welcome the growth in population with the many benefits it brings. However, they have originally settled here because of the suburban environment, and wish to maintain the character of the area. More recent residents have decided to live in Far Rockaway because of the suburban atmosphere found here, yet within the limits of New York City. It is one of the aims of this Association to maintain this desirable, residential suburban atmosphere. And, we are pleased to note that your proposed resolution does, in part, attempt to retain the suburban character of our community while allowing for sensible growth.

At this time, we, the permanent residents of Far Rockaway,

wish to establish this law as we have no desire to restrict the resort and recreational facilities of our area to our personal use. This would be very unfair to other citizens of our city. This would be impossible to implement.

However, we should like to remind the City Planners, and others who have a voice in city government, that the general population of the City use our local resort and recreational facilities only two months of the year.

To attempt to convert our community for the benefit of those citizens who use our natural facilities during the summer months only, would be just as unfair as our attempt to restrict the use of these facilities for our own use.

The idea that Far Rockaway is a place to go to keep cool during summer is as old fashioned as the trolley car. Far Rockaway is a permanent, suburban residential area. With this in mind, we respectfully offer the following suggestions for your consideration:

1 - DAY CAMPS: Although your proposed resolution lists stringent restrictions, we wish to point out that a Day Camp is a commercial enterprise. A business operated for a profit. Day Camps are synonymous with noise, garish signs and banners, litter, bus and auto traffic. They operate only two months of the year, true, but their presence is an all-year annoyance. They do not rightly belong in a residential area. We respectfully request that the new zoning resolution prohibit Day Camps from operating in residential areas.

2 - PARKING: We respectfully suggest that the regulation requiring

100% off-street parking be enlarged to include the "R-5" zone. Our streets are narrow and congested. In many instances, 2-side parking constitutes a safety hazard to drivers and pedestrians, and a fire hazard to all. During the summer months, visitors to the beaches occupy every possible foot of curb space. Every automobile we are able to keep off the streets will be appreciated.

3. HOME OCCUPATIONS: We respectfully suggest that the provision limiting the use of signs in only the "R-1" and "R-2" zones be revised to include all residential zones.

4 - VARIANCES AND SPECIAL PERMITS: We have been unable to locate, in your proposed resolution, any requirement regarding notification of owners of adjacent property when a variance or special permit is requested. We feel that property owners in the area neighboring the site for which a variance or special permit is requested, should be allowed to express their views regarding such a request. Therefore, we respectfully request that you include a provision whereby property owners in the area surrounding the site for which a variance or special permit is requested, for a distance of four (4) city blocks in each direction from the site in question, be notified by mail of the specific request before the Board and be permitted to express their views concerning each specific request prior to the granting of any variance or special permit.

5 - BEACH FRONT AREAS: This Association is adamantly opposed to any extension of commercial enterprises, such as amusements, kiddie parks, refreshment stands, along the beach front and boardwalk

areas of Far Rockaway. These establishments result in noise and litter, become meeting places for undesirables, and in no way enhance the adjacent residential community. The beach area is, in effect, a city park, and these establishments destroy the beauty of this natural resource.

Our sincere thanks for your cooperation and consideration of our suggestions. We will welcome any comments, and we are wholly in favor of your resolution, as you know.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Jules Michaelis.

JULES MICHAELIS, representing Rockaway Council of Civic Associations.

MR. MICHAELIS: Mr. Felt, may I bring one of our attorneys up at the same time with me to expedite the whole series?

I have one attorney and Mrs. Fether. If we all go together, it would be with your permission --

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, you can proceed in any way you suggest, any way that you think best.

MR. MICHAELIS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the New York City Planning Commission:

The Rockaway Council of Civic Associations, composed of

14 --

CHAIRMAN FELT: Your name?

MR. MICHAELIS: My name is Jules Michaelis, Chairman of the

Rockaway Council of Civic Associations, President of the Wavecrest Civic Association and Chairman of the Borough President's Slum Committee of Rockaway.

CHAIRMAN FELL: Now, we have to have that for the record so there will be no confusion.

MR. MICHAELIS: The Rockaway Council of Civic Associations is in complete accord with your proposed changes in zoning with two exceptions, which Mrs. Mitchell and Mrs. Fletcher will explain to you.

We also state that no changes be permitted in the business area along the boardwalk; as Chairman of the Borough President's Committee to prevent slums in the Rockaways, the Committee and the Council agrees that any change may tend to create more slums and deteriorate residential property.

Now, I would like to take up -- the height of buildings that we discussed with Mr. Ginsberg over at the Federal Building with Mr. Elliot, Mr. Wiley, Commander McCormer -- I think you're acquainted with that, Mr. Fell.

CHAIRMAN FELL: Yes. Well, you and I discussed that.

MR. MICHAELIS: That's right.

Now, the idea is that we want to go along -- we contend that ten and 20 story buildings would not help the terrific noise problem we have to contend with, but would greatly increase same.

At the top three stories in a ten-story building, it would have to be soundproofed and air conditioned as opening windows would

be out of the question. So that 20-story buildings would help make the noise and safety problems impossible.

I don't know if Mr. Ginsberg made his report to you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, I've had a complete report on this, sir.

MR. MICHAELIS: I see; thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That is, following your meeting at Idlewild.

MR. MICHAELIS: As far as Mr. Hale who submitted this letter over here before, he would like to have the R4; that would be Roxbury Point and Breezy Point and Rockaway section -- not Rockaway Park -- that's Breezy Point, Roxbury and the Rockaway Point, that's right, that's the three.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We have the record.

MR. MICHAELIS: They have an R4, but they would like to have the other end extended into that R4, which we'll be perfectly satisfied with.

CHAIRMAN FELT: As I recall, unless I'm mistaken, at the last hearing they were rather distressed with the R4. They wanted R1 or R2.

MR. MICHAELIS: No, they've changed that.

CHAIRMAN FELT: They now, in their communication, agree that R4 is compatible with the conditions existing in their area.

MR. MICHAELIS: That's right.

I would like to state further that we're fully in accord and

cognizant that the Planning Board state its report as quickly as possible because we have to contend with one-family, or I'll say one-family bungalows which have been there from the year one, and they're mostly summer bungalows, and your plan - the quicker it's put through will alleviate the main conditions.

As I said before, the commercial end of it is the main portion, and Mrs. Mitchell will cover that.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

LILLIAN L. MITCHELL, representing Wavecrest Civic Association.

MRS. MITCHELL: My name is Lillian L. Mitchell. I'm one of the legal counsel for the Rockaway Council and the Wavecrest Civic Association which represents the Wavecrest area and Far Rockaway area in Far Rockaway.

We have 100 families in the section besides the Wavecrest area -- we have 100 families from Beach 25th Street down to Beach 12th Street in our organization. And we have -- we are very much upset by the fact that our requests for R-6 in the area from Seagirt Avenue to Mott Avenue, Beach 13th to Beach 19th Street was not changed to R-6.

I explained the last time the fact that this area consists of, in the main, old multiple dwelling summer properties and summer bungalows which are in very great disrepair and are being milked only because these people are waiting until such time as a builder will come and acquire it. Also, their properties are on deep plots but

short frontage, which also requires a 6 zoning in order to get improvements in here.

We have already found repercussions in the area. Many of our members have found builders were negotiating with them who withdrew any propositions of any kind.

Now, around this section are beautiful homes. The section which is R-2, R-3, R-4, that's the Wavecrest, the section on 9th Street which is the Reade Lane section, we have one and two-family homes in there that are really gorgeous, and this section is hurting the other areas around it, and in view of the fact that you've made 17th -- 19th Street on the beach side R-6, I can't see any harm if it would hurt us by leaving ^{it} R-5 to making that small area R-6, too.

First of all, we have what Mrs. Zakim said was a community which is all year round except for that little section in there. The rest of the area is all improved.

Now, what happens if this section stays in the condition in which it is and we are injured by it?

CHAIRMAN FELT: What is our proposed designation?

MRS. MITCHELL: R-5, and we request it to be R-6.

On the others we wanted to down-zone. This is the only one that would hurt us because in the sections adjacent thereto, you have homes up to \$50,000 and \$60,000, from 15 up, all kept beautifully, and the next block over you have these horrible buildings which are boarded up all year round which are not kept in repair and only used for the summer and which nobody is taking care of.

Now, the lots are so narrow in the frontage that one and two-family homes could not come in this area feasibly because of the value of the property itself. The only thing that would be justified in that section would be an R-6 zoning, and actually, right across the street from it you do have the R-6. It's only one short block -- approximately 200 feet from the beach and it wouldn't hurt any part of your zoning resolution in any way, but we feel that it would help us by improving that section with the R-6.

Would you like me to give you the street designations that we're talking about?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Do you have a statement, a written statement?

MRS. MITCHELL: I do have it from the past -- from the other meeting we had, the former one where we approved everything else but we requested certain upzoning --

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, I think that in order to make certain that this doesn't escape our attention, you had better give us the street designations.

MRS. MITCHELL: You want me to do it in the record now or in writing?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Well, we would prefer you send it in, in writing.

MRS. MITCHELL: Well, we'll do that.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I think if you send it in writing and if you make a statement here, that you are going to send that in to us, it would be preferable.

MRS. MITCHELL: Fine.

I will send in in writing the section which we would prefer to have R-6 instead of R-5 in order to prevent a continuation of a blight and in order not to injure the surrounding territory in our section.

Thank you, Mr. Felt.

CHAIRMAN FELT: You are welcome.

MAE FLETCHER, Rockaway Civic Club; Rockaway Park, Belle Harbor Property Owners Association.

MRS. FLETCHER: I'm Mrs. Mae Fletcher, and I represent the Rockaway Civic Club and the Rockaway Park, Belle Harbor Property Owners, of which I am the President. And in a conjunctive effort representing the residents of the Rockaway Park area take exception to the designation of R4 Zoning for the area bounded as follows, from Beach 130th to Beach 117th Streets. This designation by the Zoning Commission is capricious in that it shows evidence of an arbitrary discrimination.

Under the present zoning regulations this area enjoys an E-1 Zone from the Jamaica Bay to the Atlantic Ocean. This Board has seen fit however, under the proposed regulations to divide it in half by designating the north side of Newport Ave. as an R3-1 Zone. In our opinion, such a designation of a zone is contrary to the principles of the Planning Commission as we have been led to believe by the Commissioner, Mr. James Felt. It has been our understanding that the purpose of the Planning Commission is to upgrade an area rather than

to downgrade it. If the proposed zoning is permitted to remain as is, the Planning Commission will have successfully divided a neighborhood against itself, and will have extended a formal invitation to speculative realty operators to create new slums by milking the present properties for their own ends.

This condition has happened before in the Rockaways and it is the purpose of the aforementioned civic clubs to prevent the recurrence of said conditions by insisting on more rigid zoning rather than the proposed R-4.

The neighborhoods or areas known as Neponsit and Belle Harbor extending from Beach 149th to 130th Streets, bounded by the Jamaica Bay to the north and the Atlantic Ocean to the south are designated in the present regulations as G 1 Zones. In the proposed regulations these areas have been designated R1 and R2 respectively, thus maintaining the status quo. The consideration shown by the Planning Commission to these areas is to retain the present character whereas the same consideration has not been forthcoming to the area immediately adjacent known as Rockaway Park. This discrimination is even more apparent in the fact that a division has been made within the Rockaway Park area itself.

The Belle Harbor Property Owners Association are in conjunction with this idea of making the entire Rockaway Park area an R-3-1.

Mr. Felt, if you will look in your files, you will find that on April 26th -- 22nd, rather, 1960, Mr. Shandler, Mr. David Shandler, President of the Belle Harbor Property Owners wrote you and

asked that the Rockaway Park area receive a designation of an R-3-1, so that it will become compatible with his area which has an R-2 designation.

The inference per your map for that portion of the Rockaway Park area marked R4 is an assumption on your part that this location is dedicated to rooming houses. However, this is a misleading conception. Since 1946 every available lot has been utilized by the erection of 2 family houses ranging in price from \$35,000 to \$50,000. Contrary to your belief, the trend is now to purchase antiquated properties, demolish the buildings there and erect 2 family houses. I will note several specific incidents, although I will not take up your time by giving you all the incidents that have been occurring in the last few years.

The northwest corner of Beach 123rd Street and Rockaway Beach Boulevard, house demolished and the erection of three two-family houses, \$43,000 per house; the southeast corner of Beach 125th Street and Newport Avenue, house demolished, 3 houses erected in the same price range; Beach 118th Street and 119th Street, semi-detached houses, ranging in price from \$25,000 to \$30,000.

It is clearly understood that there is a boom of the one and two-family house development and, therefore, it is injustice to change the zone which will permit multistory erections. An investigation of the tax rolls will show that the north side of the area pays even higher taxes than the south -- rather, the south side pays more than the north side which has been designated as an R3-1 Zone. People

have been buying houses, builders have been building with an understanding that they were living in a very highly restricted E-1 Zone. They have bought the houses under those considerations and that is a lot of money to invest in a one-family or a two-family house, \$50,000. Suddenly, these people find themselves designated in an R-4 zone. Frankly, many of them are very disappointed and certainly, with this proposed R-4 zone, it has stopped the building that has been going on. There is a great deal of money invested. There are a great many people who are very much worried about their large investments. I think this Belle Harbor-Rockaway Park area -- we have been here before on the zoning -- is an asset to the City of New York. It is an A-1 area paying very high assessments. We would be very satisfied with an R-3-1, but we are very dissatisfied with the area being divided into an R-4 and R-3-1.

The permissive uses allowable under R-4 regulations are contrary to the principles established by the Planning Commission in prior decisions rendered by Mr. Field himself.

In 1958, as many of you gentlemen will remember, there was a movement to alter the G zone which ran along the boardwalk from 116th Street to 126th Street, 100 feet in width. At that time we were here to fight the extension of that G zone, which was to extend it to 270 feet north of the boardwalk. We petitioned the area and we had approximately over 63 per cent of the people of the area in opposition, but area-wise. In other words, we didn't have 63 per cent of the people, but we took the entire area per square foot and came up with 63 per cent in opposition. At that time our Commissioner was very

gracious to hand down a decision that he would not extend that commercial zone. So that the whole feeling of the area is that this should be a one and two-family area; that this should not be divided into an R3-1 for the north side of Newport Avenue and R-4 for the south side, but that the entire area be an R3-1 area and since it is adjacent to an R-2 area and then you go from the R-2 to R-1, it seems that it is compatible to keep that area such as it has been all these years, a one, a two and a three area.

We have another problem. Although we are very thankful for your regulations we feel that it will do the entire City justice and that you have done a very wonderful job. We still have one more problem. I would like to introduce Mrs. McConnell who will talk on the area from 110th Street to 116th Street.

Thank you, Gentlemen.

VIOLA McCONNELL, representing Rockaway Park - Belle Harbor Association. Re: 110th Street to 116th Street, Rockaway Park.

MRS. McCONNELL: I am Mrs. V.O. McConnell, and I live at 149 Beach 112th Street. I am Vice-President of the Rockaway Park - Belle Harbor Association. I have petitions here for 99 per cent of the area. We would not come up and bother you at all only that we were advised that the Chamber of Commerce doesn't want us to have an R-5 zone.

You people were very kind to give it to us and we would like to see that we retain it. We are from 116th Street to 110th Street on the east side of Rockaway Beach Boulevard. That area is starting to upgrade at the present time. We have a new commercial

high school for girls on 112th Street. On 111th Street we have St. John's Home and on 110th Street we should have a new Public School 225. On the boardwalk there is only one vacant ocean front and that is a business zoning anyhow in the R5 category. We have a new nursing home and, all in all, it is much nicer than it has been for the last 20 years. I am there over 40.

The people would like it very much if you would consider not changing this to a C7 zone because, in the first place --

CHAIRMAN FELT: What do we have it at the present time?

MRS. McCONNELL: You have it in R5. That's what we would like. They just tore down bathhouses and put up a nursing home. People just don't use bathhouses out in that section any more. We don't need any more people at the beaches. We are going to have the new projects and we haven't got room for them now. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you.

JOHN J. FETSCHER, representing North Hammels Holland Civic Association, Re: B79th to B98th Street, Rockaway.

MR. FETSCHER: My name is John Fetscher. Before I came to the meeting today I stopped in the Rockaways to see if it was still there. I thought perhaps I would have to come in and ask for a new zone, a bird sanctuary. I am the President of the North Hammels Holland Civic Association, Inc.

The North Hammels Holland Civic Assn., Inc., covering an area in the Rockaways from Beach 79th Street to Beach 98th Street exclusive of project areas hereby submits its objections and suggestions

to the Proposed Zoning Regulations insofar as the area heretofore prescribed.

Our first objection is to the classification of the area south of the Rockaway Freeway from Beach 85 Street to Beach 97 Street as an R6 Zone. In the original of the resolution promulgated last March, this area was classified as an R5 Zone. Why was it reclassified downward instead of upward? We know we have in the Rockaways powerful organizations who ask for the opening up of the areas lest they starve to death. These organizations have had a long term in the Rockaways and a survey by you gentlemen would show the achievements of said organizations; slums, junk shops and honky tonks.

We, of the Civic Association, ask therefore that the area south of the Freeway from Beach 85 to Beach 97 Street be placed in an R4 Zone or at the very least an R5 Zone. Any higher classification would, we believe, greatly dissipate hopes in the future of the Rockaways and would contribute to the start of another slum in the Rockaways. We are cognizant of the fact that many non-conforming buildings are located in every zone, but we believe you, as well as we, want to upgrade an area.

Our second objection is the placing of the east side of the 300-Block of Beach 98 Street in a C8 Zone. This block contains four very well-kept and attractive homes, which would be a credit to any neighborhood. We, therefore, request that the R4 Zone on the west side of Beach 98 Street be extended eastward to include the west side of the block.

We are definitely in favor of the zone classification running directly to the beachfront with no super classification along the beachfront. Some will say that bathhouses are required, but may we point out that the biggest and finest bathhouse in the Rockaways found that bathing lockers were not so lucrative and this past summer became a nursing home.

On the matter of nursing homes we would suggest that these be granted in all districts only by special permit by the City Planning Commission. We say this not because we want to see old folks neglected, but because we do not want to see them put up in any old neglected building. We believe a special medical board should act in an advisory capacity to the Planning Commission before nursing homes are permitted.

In Appendix C we note that Crossbay Boulevard is missing in the list of principal routes. This route is just as important and well-traveled as many of the routes listed.

In conclusion, may we express our appreciation for the many beneficial changes incorporated in this revision, and our admiration for a job well done. We humbly await your decision on our requests.

PETER P. BACH, representing Bellaire Gardens Taxpayers Association, Re: Hillside and Jamaica Avenues from 209th Street to Hollis Court Boulevard.

MR. BACH: I am Peter P. Bach, representing the Bellaire Gardens Taxpayers Association. I represent the people from 209th

Street to Hollis Court Boulevard between Hillside Avenue and Jamaica Avenue.

Before I go any further I wish to correct the statement made here by the Queens County Coordinating Committee on Zoning. They mentioned our name as being affiliated with them. We are not affiliated with anyone. We are an independent organization and we did not authorize anyone to represent us. We speak for ourselves.

Our Association has gone on record as approving the new zoning code and we wish to thank you for the revision in the new zoning code that upgraded our community. We also wish to thank you for all the efforts you have made to give us a proper zoning which has been lacking so long in this community. We also would like to ask you a question: Could we be assured that the Board of Standards and Appeals -- that any time in the future that they won't come in there and grant a variance contrary to this new zoning code?

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: All we can assure you of is that the new zoning code will be the law when adopted and they must comply with it from a legal standpoint. What they will do within their discretion we can't guarantee. These are new standards and they will have to comply with them.

MR. BACH: We have had that trouble before. In fact, we had ten gas stations within a half mile. They still granted a variance for another gas station.

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN:

That is particularly within the jurisdiction of the Board of Standards and Appeals. Except for the fact that we have

set up new standards under which the Board may or may not grant variances, we don't control their actions.

In the residential districts, they have no right to do it.

MR. BACH: There was Residence on three sides and they did put a gas station in there. In another location in Cambria Heights they only had Residence in the back and Business on both sides and they denied that application.

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: We can't govern those things except by the limitations that have been imposed upon them.

MR. BACH: We hope that the Commission will continue its efforts to give us a good, stringent zoning code, as we have needed it for a long time. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: Mary Dixon.

MARY N. DIXON, representing six homeowners from Bowne Street to Parsons Boulevard, Blocks 5182 and 5184 Ash Avenue to Franklin Avenue, Sanford Avenue.

MRS. DIXON: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the City Planning Commission:

My name is Mary Dixon of Flushing. My appeal is made on my own behalf and that of several of my neighbors, one who came with me and the others could not, concerning two blocks in the center of Flushing, Queens.

It is on your Map 10D, along Sanford Avenue and Franklin Avenue; and these streets run parallel to each other, and the blocks in question are between Bowne Street on the west

Parsons Boulevard on the east.

If we take it by blocks, #5182 includes the south side of Sanford to the north side of Franklin, and #5184 is the south side of Franklin to the north side of Ash Avenue.

At the west Bowne Street has 150' deep for business. The east ends were previously zoned for apartments.

I am appealing to have these two blocks changed from R3-2 to R7-1, and my reasons I feel are sensible.

On the map the R7-1 district is just north of us across Sanford Avenue. To the west R7-1 is just west of us across Bowne Street. East, I admit, is R3 on the map but where it touches us it is already built up to apartments, and they get higher further east. Most are brand new and cannot be eliminated for many years.

The two blocks I mention are the last really old streets on the south side of the old Village of Flushing. At the time they were built up the village stopped on the east at Parsons Boulevard, then known as Long Lane. Sanford Avenue and Franklin Avenue are very old streets, dating before 1854.

Their character is the same as 41st Avenue and Barclay Avenue, which streets bound our area on the north and which are classed as R7-1.

The houses on all these streets were built right after the Civil War. They are Victorian with high stoops and gingerbread trim. They are now asked to compete with the Twentieth Century. How can they?

My father was a Civil War veteran, a captain at nineteen.

In 1880 he bought one of these houses to raise a family of ten children. I am the baby and I now own the house on Lot 26, Block 5184. My mother always said to put your hat on and go down and attend to things yourself.

I came to Queens in 1895. I've lived there ever since. So I really know the conditions around my area. Believe me, we are both showing our age.

The truth is that we are out-of-date. We are from sixty to eighty years old and face-lifting won't help. Anyway, not for long.

I work for the City and I believe the City wants to do the right thing by us. But in this matter they do not realize how severe this restriction is.

Since we are blanketed on three sides by an R7 district or its equivalent, I ask that we be classified like our neighbors of the same age to the north, and not like the younger ones to the south.

R7-1 includes the other old streets and the other old houses. It should include us.

Gentlemen, may it please you to make us R7-1.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much.

Mr. Irwin Kruger.

IRWIN J. KRUGER, re: Underhill Avenue between 169th Street and 170th Street, Flushing. Reside at 212-27 16th Ave., Bayside.

MR. KRUGER: Gentlemen, my name is Irwin J. Kruger. I am a small builder of small homes in Queens. I hope eventually to grow.

I have two parcels here. I am co-owner of two parcels here in Queens, one in which I planned eventually to build two-family homes on, another which I eventually planned possibly to build an apartment house on. Under the present zones it is zoned as an apartment house site.

Under the proposed zones both parcels will be upzoned and will therefore not suit my purposes.

COM. BLOUSIEIN: What is it proposed as?

MR. KRUGER: The first parcel, which is in Flushing, on which I propose to build a two-family house is now being upzoned to R-2. It is now C and D zone. It is in regard to that particular piece that I would like to speak. I know you are busy and I don't want to take too much time. I have prepared memorandums here of both pieces which I would like to submit.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Submit them to the clerk, please.

MR. KRUGER: I would like to state one thing in regard to the first parcel. It seems to me that there is a rather inconsistency here. Here is a piece of ground which is directly across the street from a pipe yard. Just earlier this year the zone for this pipe yard was extended from the unrestricted zone into the residential zone. Until now this pipe yard is directly across the street, across the street from my own property which until now has been in C and D zone and there is now a proposal to place this property just to the other extreme, to upzone it to an R-2 zone. I wish to state, also, this particular property requires piling and requires a sewer to be pulled

which is two blocks away.

As things stand now, it would be completely unfeasible to build.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In the statement that you have, Mr. Kruger, is there indicated the fact that the property requires piling?

MR. KRUGER: Yes, I added that because I listened to another gentleman. As I say, I don't wish to take up your time. I would like to submit this.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We will give it careful consideration.

Mr. Sanders?

(No response.)

I assume he has left.

Daniel L. Master.

DANIEL L. MASTER, representing various property owners.

MR. MASTER: Commissioners, my name is Daniel L. Master. I reside at 169-35 24th Road, Flushing. I am a realtor in Flushing. I am President of the North Shore Real Estate Board, past President of the Queens North Shore Chapter of the Long Island Real Estate Board, a member of the Staten Island Real Estate Board and a member of the Flushing Chamber of Commerce.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Mr. Master, so that we will have our records in proper order, I assume that you are going to confine yourself at this time to Queens matters?

MR. MASTER: Yes.

Commissioner Felt, rather than speak on these matters, I, too,

would also just like to leave a memorandum.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We would be very glad to have you do that.

MR. MASTER: Also, on Staten Island?

CHAIRMAN FELT: You can file for Staten Island. You can speak and/or file for Queens.

MR. MASTER: Thank you. I am not speaking in behalf of the organizations that I mentioned.

CHAIRMAN FELT: You say you are not speaking on their behalf?

MR. MASTER: No.

CHAIRMAN FELT: You are speaking as an individual.

MR. MASTER: Yes, sir. I will not go into the merits of the requested classifications at this time.

COM. BLOUSTEIN: You sent us a communication, didn't you?

MR. MASTER: Several, sir, not regarding these, however, but other things. I will not go into the merits of the requested re-classifications at this time. I will submit 12 copies of the request to you for your consideration and ask to meet with you, or one of your committees, to go over the merits of each of these cases.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Very well.

MR. MASTER: After this resolution is adopted and at this point I feel it most definitely will be, will the City Planning Commission be open to other requested map changes, sir?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Certainly. We have mentioned that several times today. During the grace period and even after the grace period we will review map changes. The City is a growing city. We will also

consider town changes. There is nothing finite or definite, or no closure on this as it passes. It continues to change and we will continue to give sympathetic consideration to any appropriate or equitable requests.

MR. MASTER: Thank you, sir. I also would like to ask you the question: After the Board of Estimate approves this resolution, how can an individual property owner make a request for a map change which might have been overlooked prior to the resolution's final adoption?

CHAIRMAN FELT: By communicating with the Planning Commission. Just come up to the Planning Commission and discuss it. You can phone me and I will arrange to see that then you meet the proper party. It will be just the same as you did today.

MR. BLOUSIEIN: There will be no change in the procedure.

MR. MASTER: Thank you. The entire resolution, as a whole, is undoubtedly a healthy change for the city, but there are many map changes that must be considered and granted. I have checked over many of the maps and spot-checked many places which have indicated to me that many map changes will be in order. I only hope and pray that the small property owners will find considerate understanding and just treatment from your Commission.

I would also like to mention this; that I recently witnessed a civic association make a request for a zoning change in a business area and have it changed to residential by your Commission. This property was originally business, then changed to local retail and then

finally residential and to residential G-1 at that. In my opinion -- and I am very close to the situation, as I work in the area -- even though it will not affect me as an individual, I feel that an injustice has been done. I feel that the City Planning Commission should act as a Judge of a Court would regarding such changes, and should not be swayed by the number of the membership of such groups, but should be interested in justice and consider the rights and the interests of the individuals and give them the same consideration as a civic group.

Many associations say such changes are needed for a certain area and the members go along with it, but many times only with a selfish interest at heart, with no consideration for the property owner whose property would be changed and, in most cases, will be devaluated. If the said civic associations and the members were asked to reimburse the individual or the property owners for the financial loss which the said property owners would suffer if the requested changes were adopted by the City, I am sure that 99 per cent of all the requested zone changes would be withdrawn.

There are three sides to such issues; the membership groups side, the property owner's side, that is the fellow who puts his cold cash into a specific property and the just side, which you people should be interested in and see that it is carried out. Your power is very great.

I only hope and pray that the City Planning Commission will always have a sympathetic ear at all times to the little man and the

big man with the same respect and regard.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FELP: Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. McKenzie.

FREDERICK H. POOR, JR., representing National Casket Company, re: 29-76 Northern Boulevard.

MR. POOR: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, my name is Frederick H. Poor, Jr., my partner Frederick McKenzie is present and has asked me to speak in his place.

I am a partner in the law firm of McKenzie, Hyde, Allison, French and Poor, 61 Broadway, and in this instance we represent the National Casket Company, Inc., which owns property on the south side of Northern Boulevard, No. 29-76 Northern Boulevard.

I respectfully refer the Commission to Map 9B. In the center of this map you will observe the Sunnyside Yards of the Pennsylvania Railroad. On this map, along Northern Boulevard, is the dividing line between Zone M-5 and Zone M-1. We think it is possible that this line was placed along this road by a draftsman in the belief that Northern Boulevard forms the northern boundary of the Pennsylvania Railroad Yards. It would be a very easy mistake for such a draftsman to make. That is, in fact, not the northern boundary of the Pennsylvania Railroad property. Between Northern Boulevard and the northernmost set of tracks, as depicted by this map, are a number of substantial business firms occupying buildings which fall into the M-1-5 zone.

COM. BLOUSTEIN: In other words, this property between the most northerly tracks and the Northern Boulevard is not railroad property, but privately owned; is that what you are telling us?

MR. POOR: Yes, that is perfectly right.

CHAIRMAN FELT: The point that you raised has merit. As soon as I heard it I checked with Mr. Smith. We believe that there is a technical error in drafting that is responsible for the situation that you complain of. We shall check into it immediately.

MR. POOR: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You will find in that white zone things like the Ford Instruments Company, the Westinghouse Electric Company, which is under lease from Penn Mutual Life Insurance --

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: The difference would put you in M-1-5.

MR. POOR: That is right, the boundary should follow the railroad track.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I don't think there is any disagreement with that point at all. Is that right, Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: That is right.

MR. POOR: Thank you very much. I will leave my memorandum.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you very much for bringing that to our attention.

David L. Klein.

DAVID L. KLEIN: Vice President, Endo Laboratories, Inc.,
re: Map 14B, Richmond Hill, Queens.

MR. KLEIN: My name is David L. Klein. I am Vice President of Endo Laboratories in Richmond Hill. The specific property that I wish to discuss is on Map 19B. It is a small area there that has now been designated as M-1. This property consists only of the Endo property and the S. M. Frank property.

At the outset, gentlemen, let me say that ever since I have appeared here last March I have been treated most courteously and the problem that I presented received every consideration. I was given the opportunity to meet with Vice Chairman Bloustein and Mr. Friedman to discuss this matter and a change was made from R-5 to M-1. We are completely satisfied with the M-1. The only thing we are disappointed in is the M-1 because we believe that the Commission intended to give us the relief that we sought and yet putting us in M-1 failed to fully accomplish that. I am going to try and show you in a couple of minutes here just why we feel that way.

While I speak, of course, for Endo Laboratories, and I don't pretend to speak unselfishly for the community, nevertheless, I believe that keeping this industry in that particular area is of great benefit to the immediate neighborhood and to the neighbors because between the two companies we employ about 500 people from the immediate neighborhood. Many are within walking distance. Several hundred of these people walk to work and maybe some have a short bus ride or a short car ride.

Gentlemen, why was the change made by you to M-1? I am sure it is not because who we were, but what we were; namely, the

character of our business as manufacturers of prescription drugs, the character of our buildings, the small park in front of us, the isolation from the residential area in that neighborhood.

Now, the only difficulty here, gentlemen, is that as I understand it, the M-I-I limits us to 100 per cent of the land area as far as building area is concerned.

Now, I take it I'm right about that.

CHAIRMAN FELT: That's correct.

MR. KLEIN: Now, at the present time, we are already considerably over our area. We have there about 55,000 square feet of land area, and about 100,000 square feet of building area, consisting of three buildings. We have about 10,000 square feet of vacant land between two of the buildings.

Now, gentlemen, from this point on I can only speak for Endo Laboratories. I believe the next speaker, Mr. Sheridan, can speak for the Frank Company, but as far as Endo Laboratories is concerned, this does not solve our problem.

The drug industry, gentlemen, is a growth industry. If it does not grow, it is going to die. It cannot be a standstill industry.

It's particularly -- I'm talking now of the prescription-drugs, which are promoted to the medical profession. You probably know just from reading the newspapers that the life blood of the drug industry is research. We must have research, proper facilities, proper equipment, proper manpower.

We are today -- right at this point, our 100,000 square feet

is not enough to properly maintain our business. We have an animal colony and a bio-assay laboratory in the basement area where it shouldn't be. We have a library in the manufacturing area where it shouldn't be.

Only yesterday, gentlemen, we had a conference whereby it was pointed out to us by our production staff that we are producing about 15,000,000 tablets per month, and when I speak of these tablets, these are not aspirin tablets I'm talking about -- I'm talking about anti-coagulant tablets for heart condition, pain relieving tablets and other tablets which are prescribed. We produce 15,000,000 a month and we are now selling 15,000,000 a month, and we have absolutely no room to put in there the kind of equipment, the high speed compression equipment which is necessary to produce the number of tablets that we need.

Now, I say this to you, gentlemen --

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: How much do you need to extend your building at this point?

MR. KLEIN: Well, we have room on this vacant lot --

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is it your point that while your present facilities can keep on for years without any disturbance, if you wanted to expand your plant, as most people hope and expect, you would be confronted with a problem if the zoning was M1-1?

MR. KLEIN: Even more than that:

We are confronted with that right now.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Of course you have the problem.

The question is would M-1-2 give you the relief you want?

MR. KLEIN: Well, M-1-2 would give us how much building space?

CHAIRMAN FELT: Twice the area.

MR. KLEIN: Twice the area? I would say, sir, we'd be satisfied with that.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Why don't you call me as you did after the last hearing and let us review your request because we're familiar with it. There's no use burdening us with it at this point.

MR. KLEIN: All right.

We asked for M-1-3, but I dare say another 100,000 square feet would probably satisfy the picture for some years to come.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Will you submit the memorandum from which you were reading to the clerk?

MR. KLEIN: These are just notes, sir. I'll be glad to put it in writing and I'll call you for an appointment.

CHAIRMAN FELT: We know the case.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: You wrote to me.

MR. KLEIN: I did.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: And you called it to my attention. So I am aware of the situation; so why don't we leave it at that? Why don't you call me.

MR. KLEIN: I'll call you next week.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Is that Mr. Sheridan's case, also?

MR. KLEIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Why doesn't he come up and state his name and state that that, too, is the request.

JOHN M. SHERIDAN, representing the S. M. Frank Company.

MR. SHERIDAN: My name is John M. Sheridan, S. M. Frank Company.

CHAIRMAN FELT: What is that; pipe manufacturing?

MR. SHERIDAN: It's pipe manufacturers.

I don't want to take up too much of your time. Our situation is pretty much the same as Mr. Klein and the Endo Laboratories. We have a business that's been there for something like sixty years now, mostly occupied by our concern. It's one where we have a reasonable hope as everyone does who's in business to enlarge and grow as time goes on.

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: You have room to grow?

MR. SHERIDAN: We don't have a terrible amount of room, but we do have some small spare in the back that we might, in the future, be able to add to. With the M-1-1 as Mr. Klein pointed out, we're extremely happy and grateful for that. However, we are already in excess of about 200 per cent of the --

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Of the M-1-1?

MR. SHERIDAN: That's right.

We have something like 34,000 square feet of land and 90,000 square feet of floor --

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Why don't you come up and see me

when Mr. Klein does, when he makes a date with me and let's discuss it?

MR. SHERIDAN: Alright.

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: I would suggest that both of you come together because you've got a mutual problem.

COMMISSIONER SWEENEY: I don't think it is a mutual problem because Mr. Klein's building is quite larger and they are greatly in excess of the coverage that is in M1-1, whereas with the chemical house they have a little area that is between the converted one-family house and their building.

CHAIRMAN FELT: In any event, the problem is one of limited expansion and I would suggest that we follow the recommendation of the Vice-Chairman.

I agree with you that it's not an identical problem.

COMMISSIONER SWEENEY: I wouldn't want Mr. Sheridan to be under the misapprehension that he does have room for expansion, because he doesn't.

VICE-CHAIRMAN BLOUSTEIN: That's why I asked the question, Jim.

MR. SHERIDAN: Our expansion would not be as simplified as Endo's because they have 100,000 square feet of open space. We have to jockey around a little bit to get in there, but I'm afraid we're at a point now where we're overcrowded. We are growing, fortunately.

CHAIRMAN FELT: I think the best manner or the best way of

expediting this -- and this isn't intended to cut you off because I think we know the situation and it will be elaborated on by you when you meet with the Vice Chairman -- but if you give him a ring, both of you, next week -- is that right, Frank?

COMMISSIONER BLOUSTEIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FELT: (Continuing) -- an appointment will be made whereby you might discuss the matter with him.

MR. SHERIDAN: Very good.

Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Is there anyone else here who wishes to speak on the mapping in Queens?

Will you step forward?

BARRY SHANBRON, representing Gruberg, Widder & Connelly, representing Anchor Post Products, Inc. Re: Sutphin Blvd., 120th Avenue to 121st Avenue, objects to change from present "D" to R3-2.

MR. SHANBRON: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission:

My name is Barry Shanbron. I'm with the law firm of Gruberg, Widder & Connelly. We represent Anchor Post Products, Inc., on whose behalf I now want to make a very brief statement of an objection to a portion of the proposed zoning plan.

Our client in February of 1960 purchased at auction from the city certain property on Sutphin Boulevard between 120th and 121st Avenue. This is Tax Block 12,212, Lots 1 and 62. It is on the east side of Sutphin Boulevard.

Our client's intent at the time it purchased this property

was to use it as a small sales office, a storage area for its fencing and for parking of its company vehicles. Now, this is now and has been for some time a business area. Immediately across the street on the west side of Sutphin Boulevard is a gas station. To the south of the gas station is vacant land and then a contractor's equipment yard.

On our side of the street, to the south, is a taxpayer with various stores; that is, tailor, fish market, vegetable store and the like, and in on 120th Avenue right off Sutphin Boulevard, there are also stores including an automobile shop.

Now, the proposed zoning of this area is R3-2, and we respectfully request that this area be changed -- the proposed zoning of this area be changed to a C8 zone, since the R3-2 zone would completely defeat our purpose and the purpose of all business in the area now.

And, I just wish to emphasize once again that this is now and has been a business area. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN FELT: Thank you, Mr. Shanbron.

Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard on mapping in Queens? (no response)

Madame Secretary?

SECRETARY MALTER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That concludes the portion of the hearing devoted to mapping for the Borough of Queens.

- - - - -

(The hearing on the proposed zoning maps for the Borough of Queens concluded at 6:40 P.M., on Tuesday, September 13, 1960)