

Valerie S. Mason
Chair

Will Brightbill
District Manager



505 Park Avenue, Suite 620
New York, N.Y. 10022-1106
(212) 758-4340
(212) 758-4616 (Fax)
www.cb8m.com – Website
info@cb8m.com – E-Mail

The City of New York
Community Board 8 Manhattan
Zoning, Development, and Housing Committee
Tuesday, May 27, 2025 - 6:30 PM
Conducted remotely on Zoom

Minutes

Board Members Present: Gayle Baron, Anthony Cohn (co-chair), DJ Falkson, Edward Hartzog (co-chair), Dylan Jeronimo Kennedy (public member), Craig Lader, John McClement, Peggy Price, Kimberly Selway, Marco Tamayo, Adam Wald, and Shari Weiner.

Approximate Number of Public Attendees: 12

1. Proposed NYC Planning and Zoning Initiatives for 2025 – presented by George Janes

The following is a summary of George Janes' presentation to the Committee – his entire presentation can be found here: https://www.cb8m.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Land_use_initiatives_052725.pdf and on the Community Board (www.cb8m.com) and Committee's [homepage](#).

To begin, there are six (6) land use initiatives scheduled for 2025.

“The Manhattan Plan”

A series of zoning and policy changes to add 100,000 housing units to Manhattan – including 10,000 units for Midtown South and 100 Gold Street.

The previous impediment of 12 FAR has mostly be removed, and there are 15 and 18 FAR residential districts that can replace R10 districts. Zoning in R11 and R12 districts will trigger Mandatory Inclusionary Housing in areas where they are uncommon and will require affordable housing in new developments.

Details of the plan are being rolled out by DCP, and public engagement will begin in June.

“City of Yes for Families”

This is a series of zoning changes addressing the needs of families, including: expanding the FRESH program; expanding and changing Privately-Owned Publicly Accessible open spaces (POPS); and expanding the transit bonus.

The changes seek to add more grocery stores, open space, and elevators at subway stops. Like the Manhattan Plan, it will be launched in 2025 with more details to follow.

“Fair Housing”

This is a plan designed to address historical patterns of segregation and housing discrimination in NYC. There are two efforts: The 2025 update “Where We Live NYC” and the City Council’s Fair Housing Framework.

The Fair Housing Framework will set housing targets by Community District and will likely justify future up zonings.

Draft plans are being developed.

“Int 1107: ‘AirBnB for NYC’”

The bill before the City Council would permit short-term rentals in one and two-family homes when the owner is not present. It would also allow up to seven unrelated university students to occupy a single-family home.

The changes would be made to the Building Code and the Administrative Code.

If passed, the bill would provide property owners with a way to create income from their properties using short-term rentals. Short-term stays in residential buildings (e.g., AirBnB) is now very limited in NYC multiple dwellings.

This bill has a significant impact on Community District 8. There are 4,162 tax lots with single and two-family buildings in Manhattan and 1,055 (i.e., 25%) of those lots are in CD8.

“Faith Based Affordable Housing Act”

The Faith Based Affordable Housing Act would add a new section to the General Municipal Law 96-c.

It would suspend local zoning for development sites controlled by religious corporations developing mixed income or affordable housing. Instead of local zoning, it would permit “qualified sites” to use any zoning district within 800 feet. It would not require any environmental review.

The stated purpose is to create more development site for affordable housing. It would exempt all development from any environmental review and mitigation.

The primary sponsor(s) in the Senate is Andrew Gounardes (26th District) but also includes several members from New York City – Tobi Ann Stavisky (11th District); Jessica Ramos (13th District); Julia Salazar (18th District); Zellnor Myrie (20th District); Kevin Parker (21st District); Luis Sepulveda (22nd District); Brian Kavanagh (27th District); Jose Serrano (29th District); Robert Jackson (31st District); Gustavo Rivera (33rd District); Jamaal Bailey (36th District); Shelly Mayer (37th District); and Brad Hoylman-Sigal (47th District).

The Senate bill [S3397B – second print] was amended on May 22nd and recommitted to the Housing, Construction, and Community Development Committee.

The Assembly bill is sponsored by our local member, Alex Bores, as well as Emily Gallagher (Brooklyn); Jenifer Rajkumar (Queens); Linda Rosenthal (Manhattan); Jo Anne Simon (Brooklyn); and Tony Simone (Manhattan).

The Assembly bill [A3647b – second print] was amended on May 23rd and recommitted to the Local Governments Committee.

The last day of the legislative session is June 12.

WHEREAS the State Legislature is considering a proposed “Faith Based Affordable Housing Act” (S3397/A3647); and

WHEREAS the current version of the legislation would allow “qualified” development sites – controlled by religious corporations – developing mixed income or affordable housing, to use any zoning district within 800 feet of those sites; and

WHEREAS those sites would not require any environmental review;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Community Board 8 opposes the passage of the “Faith Based Affordable Housing Act” (“FBAHA”) in its current form.

After discussion, the Committee took no position on the resolution after a vote of 6-4-2 (**Yes** – Gayle Baron, Anthony Cohn*, Edward Hartzog, Peggy Price, Marco Tamayo, Shari Weiner; **No** – DJ Falkson, Dylan Jeronimo Kennedy – [Public Member], John McClement, Adam Wald; **Abstain** – Craig Lader, Kimberly Selway)

As the Committee took no position on the legislation, it was suggested that the co-chairs draft a letter to our local representatives expressing our concern about some of the aspects of the proposed bills and, for clarity as to how the current and/or proposed amendment(s) may impact Community District 8.

The meeting continued at that point with the rest of George Janes’ presentation.

“Charter Revision Commissions”

As noted, the Mayor and the City Council have their own Charter Revision Commission.

The Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP) is one of the topics the commissions are reviewing, as the process is governed by the City Charter.

There is a concern that the current land use process deprioritizes citywide needs over local desires. The real estate and housing interests want to streamline the land use process to make it faster and more predictable.

Draft recommendations for land use have been released.

While not very specific, the land use and housing recommendations can be grouped into several general categories.

Fast-tracking ULURP

The Mayor’s Commission discusses possible changes to ULURP to reduce process costs and to facilitate certain types of development.

It introduces the idea of different levels of review; large projects take one path and small projects take another.

Also suggests streamlining the review of “categorically beneficial projects” like 100% affordable housing.

Create a “zoning administrator” office with the power to review certain defined categories of applications.

In conjunction with Fair Housing targets: create a different review procedure for housing developments in districts that fail to meet Fair Housing targets.

Roles within ULURP

The Commissions are examining amending the roles played within the ULUP process, including:

Enhancing and/or otherwise changing the role of officials like the Borough President and the Speaker of the City Council.

Consolidating the advisory portions of ULURP (from 90 days to 60).

Moving City Office Space Acquisition applications from the City Planning Commission (CPC) to the Comptroller’s Office.

New “zoning administrator” role.

Categories of projects requiring ULURP

Suggests a new process for zoning changes related to climate/infrastructure and another process for public land.

Some city properties are tiny, inches wide. To dispose of them, the City needs to go through ULURP.

There is a recommendation streamline disposition to activate public land for affordable housing and other uses.

“A zoning administrator”

Mayor’s Commission explores the idea of a “zoning administrator” office.

The office would have the power to review certain defined categories of applications.

Smaller developments (up to six units and 35 feet in height).

Small changes, like commercial overlays and similarly small actions.

This would be an entirely new mechanism.

Comprehensive Planning, Fair Housing and the 10-year Capital Plan

The City Council Commission recommendations build upon the new Fair Housing Framework.

Explore new 197-a community planning rules.

Require DCP to create or assist Community Boards (CB) with 197-a plans.

Require agencies, including the Cs, to incorporate fair housing and housing targets into their planning processes.

Explore a Charter amendment to increase the number of votes the CPC needs to approve applications disapproved by the CB and the Borough President (BP).

The Mayor's Commission Preliminary Report includes some vague suggestions on "elevating citywide needs" in land use processes.

Discusses the possibility for a comprehensive plan introduced by Brad Lander and Antonio Reynoso. Doesn't dismiss it but couches it in careful language.

Examines imposing "Fair Share" housing requirements using models from other jurisdictions, such as California, Oregon, and New Jersey.

Examines how capital planning processes set out in the Charter may need to change to ensure investments in infrastructure transportation, and neighborhood amenities are made in concert with new housing.

Member Deference

Mayor's Commission identifies "Member Deference" as a barrier to development in certain areas and balancing citywide versus local priorities.

As member deference is a City Council convention and not a Charter-mandated process, there are no specific recommendations for a Charter amendment.

Nevertheless, there are vague suggestions as to changing the role of the City Council Speaker and Borough President, both of which may impact member deference.

Modernizing the City Map

Recommends centralizing its management from the Borough Presidents to the Department of City Planning.

Considers citywide digitization of the City map.

City map changes, including curb elevations, are ULURP actions. Should they be?

2. Update on the Task Force for Residential Rezoning (TFRR) – presented by Adam Wald

Adam Wald, Co-Chair of the Task Force for Residential Rezoning (TFRR) provided an update on the follow-up from the TFRR's recently approved [unanimously – by the Full Board] proposal – re: to address the need for more affordable housing in CB8M by proposing zoning actions that would trigger MIH – Mandatory Inclusionary Housing.

Specifically, the TFRR met with representatives at the Department of City Planning (DCP) who were pleased to learn of the initiative and the process that was undertaken (i.e., community outreach and input over the course of eight meetings).

However, DCP was cautious about the plan for a couple of reasons, including the impact of the aforementioned "Manhattan Plan" (i.e., to add 100,000 units of affordable housing in Manhattan) and the need for more analysis and detail about the specifics of the TFRR's proposal.

Moreover, DCP noted that there was limited capacity each year for projects of this size – i.e., one per borough. As such, the TFRR was left with a few next steps and asked to wait and see how the Manhattan Plan unfolds and is implemented over the coming months.

To wit, the TFRR initiative might be rolled into the overall Manhattan Plan. In the meantime, the TFRR will set about completing a more detailed site analysis, identifying potential developments, and estimating how many units may be created.

One last point – the issue of money. Adam noted that projects of this size are inherently expensive (i.e., land use planners, attorneys, etc.) and that the potential to be “folded into” the overall Manhattan Plan may be the most practical approach from a resource perspective.

The Committee moved on to old business at this point.

3. Old Business

No items of Old Business were discussed.

4. New Business

No items of New Business were discussed.

There being no Old or New Business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 PM.

Elizabeth Ashby, Anthony Cohn, and Ed Hartzog, Co-Chairs