

**BROOKLYN COMMUNITY BOARD 6
ECONOMIC/WATERFRONT/COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & HOUSING
COMMITTEE MEETING**

June 19, 2017

Attendance:

R. Bashner	P	C. Dukuly	A	R. Luftglass	P
D. Carcache	A	V. Heramia	P	S. Lonial	P
S. Cialek	A	A. Krasnow	P		
A. Devening	A	J. Li	A		

Guests:

C. Zinnel, Rep. for Hon. Brad Lander, City Council Member
 J. Keller- Department of City Planning
 C. Chan- Department of City Planning
 A. Goldman S. Baluyat D. Congdor
 M. Woloz B. Kwong N. Rojas
 A. Joly F. Lock Lear J. Allen
 J. Bass C. Chan J. Keller
 V. Malriba, Jr.

Presentation by the Department of City Planning to update the committee on the Gowanus PLACES neighborhood study.

1. Review of City Planning’s Neighborhood Study Engagement Approach
<http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/planning/download/pdf/plans-studies/gowanus/engagement-approach.pdf?v=1>
 - a. Listening: (Oct 2016 – Summer 2017)
 - i. Public meetings & Workshops
 - ii. Targeted outreach: NYCHA, stakeholders, CB6
 - iii. Working Groups
 - iv. Interagency Team (NYCHA, HPD, DCP)
 - v. Setting Priorities and Objectives
 - vi. Summit of all groups in July
 - b. Develop Planning Framework: Recommendations – not zoning yet.
 - c. Neighborhood Plan: Based on major topics discussed
 - d. Zoning Framework
2. Questions:
 - a. How is gentrification and increased land values being addressed?
 - b. For affordable housing – what about other incomes; middle income. MIH is very low income.
 - c. DCP Study is being built off of Bridging Gowanus recommendations.

- d. Bridging Gowanus set the stage by engaging elected and resident/stakeholders. By bringing in other city agencies City Planning is making it real.
- e. What about other issues in the planning? 5 Working Groups
 - i. Historic Preservation? (Public Realm)
 - ii. Sustainability (Resiliency)
 - iii. Arts & Culture
 - iv. Industry & Economic Development (Infrastructure)
 - v. Housing

Presentation and review of Department of City Planning's Citywide Self-Storage Text Amendment Proposal (N 170425 ZRY) to introduce a Special Permit under the jurisdiction of the City Planning Commission regarding all new self-storage facilities in newly established Designated Areas.

Proposed Self Storage Zoning Text Amendment.

2015: Mayors Industrial Action Plan: Employment, Growth, Industrial Innovation. Goals include to protect the IBZs and incentive industrial development, and to limit hotels and storage facilities that create real estate competition.

Self-Storage: Do not generate jobs; Serves primarily households not businesses (DCP says 70 -80%, industry basically agrees); Uses sites that are optimal for industrial development.

Text Amendment: Does not ban them, but restricts them in IBZ (there is no restriction in regular M zone).

¼ Self Storage are located in IBZs. In CB 6 50% are in IBZ.

PROPOSAL: Special Permit would be required within a "Designated District". Applicant will have to prove that a site is not useful or appropriate for industrial use. Existing self-storage facilities will be permitted to remain and expand within the original zoning lot. Full ULURP process is required.

Questions:

- What incentives are being made for businesses in these IBZ zones?
- What impact on Self Storage if they are not allowed in IBZ? Will more be built in Residential neighborhoods? *DCP does not anticipate an influx of storage in R zones.*
- IBZ M1-3: Co-working spaces are allowed. This is not necessarily industrial
- What about Hotels? *Different text amendment and timeline, but DCP is working on that too.*
- IBZ is not a zoned district – how does the Self-Storage identify area? *The amendment creates "designated districts" within the IBZ which will be zoned.*
- Ari Goldman: SNL Self-Storage business Owner: City Planning proposal is detrimental to self-storage industry. There is a real demand for storage. This is an arbitrary ban on one use. There is no evidence that banning self-storage will bring in new industrial uses. What evidence that SS has taken valuable industrial sites – we use dilapidated sites that have sat empty for years.
 - Special permits are allowed, but this is not an opportunity for most small S-S businesses. It is a 2-year process and businesses cannot afford that..
 - Small businesses need small warehouses. They rely on them. It will hurt their businesses

- 20-30% of SS use is small businesses that rely on this storage. That is a lot of space in a large storage facility. Their use is daily/weekly
- Chamber of Commerce does not support this proposal.
- Where the proof is that manufacturing is coming back. It is leaving New York, and not because of Self storage.
- This proposal does not ban any use other than Self storage.
- Katherine Zinnel (CM Lander) sited a specific location in Gowanus in which the owner did not proceed with industrial/manufacturing use, but held out and ultimately went with storage.
- What is the SS business model? Why can't they build for commercial storage, since that appears to be an economic need; ie. Small-scale warehouses? Is it not profitable? Do they need the smaller residential storage units to make the business work? (This was not answered by)

Question is raised as to whether CB6 should vote on a resolution. Committee does not have a quorum, and no resolution was generated. Will discuss this issue at Executive Committee. The CPC vote is 60 days from May 22; which is mid-July (7/21/17).