Present:
Voting CWG Members:
Michael Levine CB#1
Victor Papa Two Bridges Neighborhood Council
David Tieu NMASS
Amelia Aoiles NMASS
Wendy Cheung CSWA
Louise Velez Los Luchadores
MyPhuong Chung CB#3
Wilson Soo CWG
Wah Lee CSWA
Anj Chaudhry CAAAV

Non-CWG Present (See Attachment #1 - Attendance Sheet)

Messrs. Levine and Papa presided as CAPZ WORKING TEAM Co-chair
The meeting convened to discuss Subdistrict C

SUBSECTION C –The meeting was opened and Mr. Levine reminded those present of the alternatives that Anj Chauoth had agreed to present stemming from the November 24th CAPZ meeting regarding Subsection C.

Anj Chaudry mentioned that she had consulted with both the Urban Justice Center and the Association of Neighborhood Housing Development (ANHD), and from which it was determined that a change to Residential Zoning could lead to the displacement of the manufacturing industry. She suggested that it be left as a M1-5 with a height cap, since if residential development there would be no reason it would have to be large scale. Thus the safest course of action would be to leave it as is.

Discussion ensued on various alternatives including how a M1-5 zone would allow for hotel development and that the protection of the manufacturing industry could be done with a “G” designation, requiring that the landlord having to prove non-harassment of a tenant and made good faith efforts in marketing “G” properties. Other variations were discussed including what implications of changing the zoning could result in, including some speculation on what DCP would allow.

With no clear resolution since so many questions were raised, Anj Chaudry agreed to do further research with Eva Handhardt at Pratt and ANHD on some other questions that were raised.

The Chairs suggested that this Subsection could actually be raised at the next convening of the CWG if Ang Chaudry was prepared to present it again.
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**CAPZ Summary 12/15/14**

**Subdistrict A:**

For subdistrict A, the CAPZ committee voted by a majority to support Option 1. Option 1 was preferred because it allows for an increase in residential FAR and a decrease in commercial FAR. CB #3 land use also voted in support of Option 1 with no air rights transfers as they were unsure of the potential impact these transfers would have on surround neighborhoods. They agreed to have continued discussions as progress is made within CWG.

Subdistrict A is currently being reviewed by DCP and will be presented to their chair by the end of the year.

**Subdistrict B:**

For subdistrict B, the CAPZ committee voted in support of Option 2 for all areas within the study area boundaries and Option 1 for all areas outside of the study area boundaries.

CB #3 has not adopted a resolution to vote yet. They only main issue was the wording under Option 2: that “[new] development... will not seriously alter the scenic amenity and environmental quality of each planned community development.” Some CB members thought it was too open to interpretation and one could argue that ANY change however slight or beneficial (i.e. additional affordable housing development) would be rejected under the proposed language. There was no objection to the language around the need for a public process (ULURP) for these areas.

**Subdistrict C:**

Anj Chaudhry of CAAAIV will compose an alternative option to be discussed at the CAPZ committee on 12/15/14.

**Subdistrict D:**

For subdistrict D, the CAPZ committee voted for Option 2 as it is in the Pratt Plan. The vote was 5 in favor, 2 abstentions and 1 against.

**Subdistrict E1 & E2:**

For subdistrict E1 & E2, the CAPZ committee voted to adopt Option 1 for subdistrict E1 and Option 1 for subdistrict E2.