

**BRONX BOROUGH PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION
ULURP APPLICATION NO: C 220007 ZMX & N 220008 ZRX
BRUCKNER SITES REZONING**

DOCKET DESCRIPTION-C 220007 ZMX:

IN THE MATTER OF an application submitted by Throggs Neck Associates LLC pursuant to Sections 197-c and 201 of the New York City Charter for the amendment of the Zoning Map, Section No. 4b:

1. Eliminating from an existing R4-1 District a C1-2 District bounded by a southerly boundary line of St. Raymonds Cemetery and its easterly prolongation, East Tremont Avenue, Bruckner Expressway, and a line 100 feet easterly of Revere Avenue;
2. Eliminating from an existing R4A District a C1-2 District bounded by Meyers Street, Edison Avenue, a line 150 feet northwesterly of Bruckner Boulevard, Crosby Avenue, Bruckner Expressway and East Tremont Avenue;
3. Eliminating from within an existing R4A District, a C2-2 District bounded by a line 175 feet northwesterly of Bruckner Boulevard, a line 100 feet northeasterly of East Tremont Avenue, Meyers Street, and East Tremont Avenue;
4. Changing from R4-1 District to an R5B District property bounded by a line 100 feet southerly of Gifford Avenue, the northwesterly centerline prolongation of Brinsmade Avenue, Bruckner Boulevard, (southeasterly portion). And a line 100 feet easterly of Balcom Avenue and its southerly prolongation;
5. Changing from an R4-1 District to an R6A District property bounded by a southerly boundary line of St. Raymonds Cemetery and its easterly prolongation, East Tremont Avenue, Bruckner Expressway, and Revere Avenue;
6. Changing from an R4A District to an R6A District property bounded by a line 175 feet northwesterly of Bruckner Boulevard, Edison Avenue, a line 150 feet northwesterly of Bruckner Boulevard, a line 160 feet southwesterly of Crosby Avenue, a line 250 feet northwesterly of Bruckner Boulevard, Crosby Avenue, Bruckner Expressway, and East Tremont Avenue;
7. Establishing within the proposed R5B District a C2-4 District boundary a line 100 feet southerly of Gifford Avenue, the northwesterly centerline prolongation of Brinsmade Avenue, Bruckner Expressway, and a line 100 feet easterly of Balcom Avenue and its southerly prolongation; and

8. Establishing within the proposed R6A District a C2-4 District bounded by a southerly boundary line of St. Raymonds Cemetery and its easterly prolongation, East Tremont Avenue, a line 175 feet northwesterly of Bruckner Boulevard, Edison Avenue, a line 150 feet northwesterly of Bruckner Boulevard, a line 160 feet southwesterly of Crosby Avenue, a line 250 feet northwesterly of Bruckner Boulevard, Crosby Avenue, Bruckner Expressway, and Revere Avenue;

Borough of The Bronx, Community District 10, as shown on a diagram (for illustrative purposes only) dated March 28, 2022, and subject to the conditions of CEQR Declaration E-669.

DOCKET DESCRIPTION-N 220008 ZRX:

IN THE MATTER OF an application submitted by Throggs Neck Associates LLC pursuant to Section 201 of the New York City Charter, for an amendment of the Zoning Resolution of the City of New York, Modifying APPENDIX F for the purpose of establishing a Mandatory Inclusionary Housing (MIH) area. The Bronx, Community District #10.

BACKGROUND

The Project Area this application pertains to includes:

- Block 5312, Lots 1, 10, 19 and p/o 21
- Block 5309, Lots 1, 7, 11, 35, 36, 41, 42, 44, 47, 50 54, and p/o 60
- Block 5306, Lots 8, 18, 19, 22, 23, 28, 30, 31 and 231
- Block 5307, Lots 55, 58, 61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 73, 75 and 76.

In 2004, pursuant to ULURP Application No: C 040479 ZMX, the Department of City Planning amended the Zoning Map by eliminating an existing R4 district and adopting an R4A, R4A/C1-2, R4-1, and an R4-1/C1-2 zoning district. This amendment is known as the Throggs Neck Rezoning did not change the bulk or height of the underlying zoning district within the project area, but changed the permitted housing typologies that were permitted. This rezoning also included adding Bronx Community District 10 as a Lower Density Growth Management Area (LDGMA) which would increase off-street parking requirements for new developments and reduce the height of new buildings in floodplain areas.

PROJECT AREA

Portions of Block 5312, Lots 1, 10, 19 & p/o 21

Fronting on the north side of Bruckner Boulevard, between Crosby Avenue & Edison Avenue:

- R4-A (contextual district permitting only one and two family detached houses plus attic allowance). FAR up to 0.75.
C1-2 (commercial overlay allowing for local retail needs; grocery stores, restaurants, beauty parlors). Max FAR of 1.0

To:

- R6A (contextual district permitting six or seven story apartment buildings FAR 3.0
C2-4 (commercial overlay allowing for local retail needs; grocery stores, restaurants, beauty parlors, funeral homes, etc.). Max FAR 2.0.

Portions of Block 5309, Lots 1, 7, 11, 35, 36, 41, 42, 44, 47, 50, 54 & p/o 60

Fronting on the north side of Bruckner Boulevard, between Edison Avenue & East Tremont Avenues:

- R4-A (contextual district permitting only one and two family detached houses plus attic allowance). FAR up to 0.75.
C1-2 (commercial overlay allowing for local retain needs; grocery stores, restaurants, beauty parlors). Max FAR of 1.0

To:

- R6A (contextual district permitting six or seven story apartment buildings FAR 3.0
C2-4 (commercial overlay allowing for local retail needs; grocery stores, restaurants, beauty parlors, funeral homes, etc.). Max FAR 2.0

Portions of Block 5306, Lots 8, 18, 19, 22, 23, 28, 30, 31 & 231:

Fronting on the north side of Bruckner Boulevard, between East Tremont Avenue and Revere Avenue:

- R4-1 (contextual district permitting only one and two family detached houses-FAR 0.75)
C1-2 (commercial overlay allowing for local retail needs; grocery stores, restaurants, beauty parlors). Max FAR of 1.0.

To:

- R6A (contextual district permitted six or seven story apartment buildings FAR 3.0
C2-4 (commercial overlay allowing for local retail needs; grocery stores, restaurants, beauty parlors, funeral homes, etc.). Max FAR 2.0.

Portions of Block 5307, Lots 55, 58, 61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 73, 75 & 76

Fronting on the north side of Bruckner Boulevard, between Brinsmade Avenue & Balcom Avenue

- R4-1 (contextual district permitting only one and two family detached houses). Floor Area Ratio (FAR) 0.75.

To:

- R5B (contextual district typified by 3-story row-houses). FAR 1.35.
C2-4 (commercial overlay allowing for local retail needs; grocery stores, restaurants, beauty parlors, funeral homes, etc.). Max FAR of 1.0.

Within the Project Area, there are four Development Sites referred to herein as sites A, B, C, and D.

DEVELOPMENT SITES – EXISTING CONTEXT

Site A: Block 5312, Lot 1:

This site includes 39,624 square feet of lot area with 162 feet fronting on the north side of Bruckner Boulevard, with a maximum depth of 250 feet. Existing development on Site A includes a one-story building (approximately 19 feet) consisting of approximately 19,800 square feet. This building accommodates a supermarket (FAR 0.50). An off-street parking area accommodates 52 vehicles. This parking area is accessible via Crosby Avenue. Pending approval of this application the building currently located on Site A will be demolished.

The following Lots are subject to the proposed Zoning Amendment, but not included in the Development Site: Block 5312, Lots: 10, 19 & p/o 21. Development on these lots include a one-story office building, a one story residential building and a two-story residential building.

Site B: Block 5309, Lots 35, 36, 41, 42, 44, 47 & 50:

This site includes 28,242 square feet of lot area with 238 feet fronting on the north side of Bruckner Boulevard, with a maximum depth approximately 175 feet. Existing development on Site B includes one-story and two story buildings (maximum height 25 feet) with retail on street level and residences on the second story. The total square footage of these buildings approximates 7,435 square feet of floor area (FAR 0.26). The retail venues are vacant. Access to these locations is via Bruckner Boulevard and/or Edison Avenue.

The following Lots are subject to the proposed Zoning Amendment, but not included in the Development Site: Block 5309, Lots: 1, 7, 11, 54 & p/o 60. Development on these lots include one-to-three story commercial buildings. Lot 54 is an accessory surface parking lot. Currently Lot 60 is traversed by Meyers Street which is dedicated to public use.

Site C: Block 5306, Lots 8, 18, 19, 22 & 23:

This site includes 17,847 square feet of lot area with 117 feet of frontage on the north side of Bruckner Boulevard, with a maximum depth of approximately 202.6 square feet. This site is vacant.

The following Lots are subject to the proposed Zoning Amendment, but not included in the Development Site: Block 5306, Lots: 28, 30, 31 & 231. Development of these lots include two, two story mixed residential and commercial buildings and an additional two, two story commercial buildings.

Site D: Block 5307, Lots 55, 58, 61, 63, 64, 66 & 67:

This site includes 17,406 square feet of lot area, with approximately 309.67 feet of frontage on the north side of Bruckner Boulevard, with a maximum depth of 100 feet. This site is entirely vacant.

The following Lots are subject to the proposed Zoning Amendment, but not included in the Development Site: Block 5307, Lots: 73, 75 & 76. Development of these lots includes two, two story residential buildings in addition to two, accessory parking garages.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Site A: Block 5312 Lot 1:

As proposed by the applicant, development of Site A requires the demolition of the existing one-story commercial building currently occupied by a supermarket. Redevelopment of this site includes construction of an 8-story, mixed-use, residential and commercial Quality Housing building. This new building will include 126 residential units of which 38 will be permanently affordable pursuant to MIH Option 2. This proposed building will be approximately 142,468 square feet of floor area (FAR 3.6), of which 125,500 square feet will be residential floor area. The remaining floor area will be occupied by a supermarket of approximately 16,968 square feet. The building height would rise a total of 85 feet with 10-foot setbacks above the base eight of 65 feet. Within 25 feet of the R4A district to the north, any building would be required to step down to a maximum building height of 45 feet. Preliminary specifics include:

	Number of Units	Percentage of Units	Avg. Net SF per unit
1 Bedroom:	70	56%	600 square feet
2 Bedrooms:	45	35%	810 square feet
3 Bedrooms:	11	9%	980 square feet
Total: 126 Units			

Building A will include both an enclosed and unenclosed parking area accommodating a total of 190 vehicles.

Site B: Block 5309, Lots 35, 36, 41, 42, 44, 47 & 50:

As proposed by the applicant, development of Site B will require the demolition of the structures now in place on the lots. Redevelopment of this site includes construction of a five-story residential and commercial Quality Housing building. This building will be approximately 101,336 square feet of floor area (FAR 3.6). Residential floor area will approximate 77,663 square feet. The remaining floor area will approximate 23,703 square feet set aside for commercial purposes. This retail space will accommodate venues pursuant to local retail uses (Use Group 6). A total of 102 units of residential housing will be constructed, of which approximately 31 units will be permanently affordable pursuant to MIH Option 2. This building will rise to a maximum of 51 feet. Preliminary specifics include:

	Number of Units	Percentage of Units	Avg. Net SF per unit
Studios:	32	31%	446 square feet
1 Bedroom:	50	49%	626 square feet
2 Bedrooms:	16	16%	857 square feet
3 Bedrooms:	4	4%	1,102 square feet
Total: 102 Units			

Building B will include enclosed parking for 75 vehicles.

A separate land use application for the demapping of Meyers Street, which currently is mapped as Lot 35, has been filed with the Department of City Planning and is planned to enter public review in 2022. The demapping would eliminate the privately-owned paper street portion of Meyers Street.

**Site C: Block 5306, Lots 8, 18, 19, 22 & 23:
(These sites are currently vacant)**

As proposed by the applicant, development of Site C will devote 100 percent of the units constructed to accommodate senior affordable housing in accordance with New York City's SARA term sheet. A total of 99 units will be constructed, of which 30 will permanently affordable pursuant to MIH Option 2. This building will include approximately 63,505 square feet of floor area (FAR 3.6). Approximately 50,069 square feet will be devoted to residential use. The remaining balance of 13,436 square feet will be available for retail purposes pursuant to local retail uses (Use Group 6). This building will rise approximately 84 feet and will include 15 foot setbacks above the base height of 64 feet. Preliminary specifics include:

	Number of Units	Percentage of Units	Avg. Net SF per unit
Studios:	88	89%	360 Square Feet
1 Bedroom:	10	10%	510 Square Feet
Super's Unit	1	1%	
Total: 99 Units			

Building C will include enclosed parking for 29 vehicles.

**Site D: Block 5307 Lots, 55, 58, 61, 63, 64, 66 & 67:
(These sites are currently vacant)**

As proposed by the applicant, development of Site D will devote 100 percent of the units constructed to accommodate veterans. The Tunnel to Towers Foundation will facilitate construction of a three-story residential Quality Housing building. A total of 22 units will be provided. The building will contain approximately 16,773 square feet of residential floor area (FAR 0.96). The building will rise approximately 30 feet. Preliminary specifics include:

	Number of Units	Percentage of Units	Avg. Net SF per unit
Studios:	6	89%	450 Square Feet
1 Bedrooms:	13	10%	625 Square Feet
2 Bedrooms:	3	1%	800 Square Feet
Total: 22 Units			

Building D will include unenclosed parking for 15 vehicles.

Pending approval of this application the full development scope being proposed by the applicant calls for construction of four individual buildings within the Project Area. Taken together as one project the totals include:

- 269,975 square feet of residential floor area
- 54,107 square feet of commercial floor area
- 339 dwelling units, of which 190 are affordable
- 99 units will be permanently affordable pursuant to the MIH program
- 309 off-street parking

Total Development Cost: Estimated between \$80 to \$100 million

As part of the currently proposed application, all commercial overlays currently mapped in the rezoning area would be amended to C2-4. This designation will allow for local retail and service establishments (Use Group 6) home maintenance or repair services (Use Group 7) amusement or service establishments (Use Group 8), retail establishments that serve a larger area (Use Group 9), special services related to boating (Use Group 14) and because of the proximity between the various sites this application pertains to and the Bruckner Expressway, a Hotel use (Use Group 5). Parking requirements includes one space per 1,000 square feet of floor area for general retail or services uses. Food stores exceeding 2,000 square feet of floor area require one space per 1,000 square feet of floor area.

Pursuant to N 220008 ZRX a zoning text amendment of Zoning Resolution Appendix F: Inclusionary Housing Designated Areas and MIH Areas for Community District 10, The Bronx, establishes Blocks 5312, 5309, and 5306 within the Project Area as an MIH Area.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND ULURP CERTIFICATION

This application was reviewed pursuant to CEQR and SEQR requirements and the Environmental Assessment Statement (EAS) received a Negative Declaration on March 28, 2022. The City Planning Commission was the lead agency for the EAS. The City Planning Commission certified this application as complete on March 28, 2022.

BRONX COMMUNITY BOARD PUBLIC HEARING

Bronx Community Board #10 held a public hearing on this application on May 19, 2022. A vote recommending these applications be denied was 23 in favor of denying approval, 1 in favor of recommending approval and 1 recusal.

BRONX BOROUGH PRESIDENT PUBLIC HEARING

The Bronx Borough President convened a public hearing on June 21, 2022. This hearing took place at 851 Grand Concourse, The Bronx, New York beginning at approximately 6pm EST. The applicant was present and spoke in favor of approving this application. There were 36 speakers, with 15 speaking in favor of the proposal and 21 opposed. The public hearing remained open to allow for a virtual public hearing on June 22, 2022.

The Bronx Borough President continued the public hearing as a virtual public hearing, on this application, on June 22, 2022, beginning at approximately 5pm EST. The applicant was present and spoke in favor of approving this application. There were a total of 25 speakers with 6 speakers in favor of the proposal and 19 speakers opposed. After every speaker had an opportunity to testify, the hearing was closed at approximately 6:30pm EST.

There were a total of 61 speakers with 21 in favor and 40 opposed to the proposal. In addition the speakers, there was written testimony that was received.

BRONX BOROUGH PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION

When considering the specifics of the proposal, approving this application would facilitate that the merits of what is being proposed exceed the project's liabilities.

All four proposed development sites are located along the Bruckner Boulevard, which then abuts the Bruckner Expressway, which is a major highway. The Bruckner Boulevard as well as Tremont Avenue and Crosby Avenues are all wide streets and designed to accommodate more traffic than narrow streets. Much of the currently built profile along Bruckner Boulevard includes low- and mid-rise residential and commercial buildings. I am therefore not persuaded that the existing R4A or R4-1 designation for the sites this application is considering is essential in order to preserve the overall low-rise, home-ownership profile that defines the greater Throggs Neck and Schuylerville neighborhoods.

The next point is related to the Lower Density Growth Management Area (LDGMA) that is located in all of Community District 10. LDGMA was expanded to this area with the intent of adding additional protections to the underlying zoning regulations to ensure certain additional protections would be granted where appropriate, such as requiring additional parking and open space. LDGMA was not intended to directly limit housing or to replace the underlying zoning, and it is intended to add an additional layer of balance based to the underlying zoning district requirements.

The LDGMA regulations will continue to apply to these sites and would continue to require a higher parking requirement.

The building scale is then defined by the underlying zoning district and leads to the question of what should the zoning be and should a rezoning be approved.

The Throggs Neck rezoning that occurred along these sites in 2004 changed the zoning district from R4 to R4-1 and R4A. It's worth noting that this zoning change was not a downzoning, but a change in the housing types that were permitted. It also added the LDGMA designation to all of CD 10 to add the additional zoning requirements.

The R4-1 and R4A zoning districts both have a .75 FAR and 35 foot maximum building height. The applicant is seeking the R6A for buildings A, B, and C, which would allow a 3.6 FAR and maximum of 85 feet with MIH. For building D, the R5B would have a 1.35 FAR and a maximum 33-foot building height. All four sites would have a C2-4 commercial overlay to permit ground floor commercial uses. It's also worth noting that any sites where an R6A is abutting an R4-1 or R4A district would have a maximum height of 45 feet as a stepdown requirement within 25 feet of these R4 districts.

While considering this project, I am mindful that what is so urgently needed across our great borough and city is affordable housing and that every community needs to take on some responsibility to achieving this cause. This project has started a discussion on communities that have had relatively little affordable housing and I recognize this includes the neighborhoods of Throggs Neck and Schuylerville. One of the reasons is due to the current zoning not allowing for the density needed to provide affordable housing. This statement does not necessarily skew my opinion on the proposal, it is stated to recognize what is currently built within the community.

When considering the merits of a project, it is very important that a project works not just for the future residents of a community, but it also needs to work for the current residents. When considering this proposal, I will discuss the merits of the four proposed sites individually as well as the proposal as a whole.

I have no direct objection to the proposal for Site C and Site D, based on changes that were made during public review to make the entirety of Site C an affordable senior housing building and Site D being fully dedicated to veteran housing. The Bronx is in crucial need of affordable housing for seniors and veterans and this project helps accommodate those needs. Furthermore, those residing in these buildings will not significantly burden the area's schools, are not likely to prompt additional traffic congestion, and will have minimal impact on the area's essential services such as fire and police. In fact, I would state that the accommodations these two buildings will offer will provide an opportunity for local residents to remain within their community and near their families and friends. The Tunnel to Towers Foundation, which will be the service provider for the veteran's housing, anticipates that all the housing recipients would be from the Bronx with an emphasis on those veterans from the Throggs Neck community. It is my understanding that the veterans housing would be able to advance their mission while asking for no city subsidies.

As I consider the proposed development of Site B, I am mindful that the planned building would rise a maximum of five stories, offering 102 total units, 31 of which will provide permanent affordable housing. This site is located at the corner of Bruckner Boulevard and Tremont Avenue with most of the site split by Meyers Street to the north. There will be an approximately 23,000-square-foot community center and recreational facility that would provide services to the local community, giving youth in the area a much needed recreational option and would include an after-school tutoring center for local youth. I am sympathetic to the issues associated with scale and density, but I find the proposed five-story building along two wide streets appropriate.

When considering Site A, I am inclined to agree that the proposed eight-story residential building in an area where such scale is not found, warrants additional attention. As such, I offer as a condition for my support that this project changes the proposed R6A to an R6B zoning district. This designation allows for the benefits realized through the MIH designation, but has a more modest maximum height from eight-stories (85 feet) to five-stories (55 feet). The FAR would also be reduced from 3.6 to 2.2. I do understand both the applicant and the community will not be satisfied with this compromise, but I believe the reduction of height from eight-stories to five-stories provides a compromise that is essential for both interests.

When further evaluating Site A, I am concerned at the applicant's claims that the rezoning is needed in order for the existing grocery store to remain in the community. While I have not seen the financials to back this statement up, I do believe this grocery store provides an important service to the existing surrounding community, both as a place to purchase groceries and as a source of local employment. Currently the grocery store employs 85-employees and serves approximately 700-2,000 customers per day (~840,000 customers per year) and its departure would be a loss for everyone within the existing local community. The applicant has stated they will continue to provide the 40 on-grade parking spaces for the supermarket, which would also provide a step-down and screening from the proposed building to the single-family homeowners to the north. Assuming the rezoning gets approved and the new building is built, it is a concern that the 85-employees currently working at the grocery store would be displaced for the approximately two-years the store would be closed and rebuilt.

Those are my thoughts on the sites individually. I will now address the proposed rezoning as a whole and provide recommendations for what should be done to address concerns that I heard from the existing local community.

Recognizing the community's concerns that this project is located within a LDGMA and that LDGMA has a higher parking requirement, the applicant is proposing to provide significantly more parking than is required. For the 339 total units between all four buildings, the proposal would provide 309 parking spaces which is nearly one space per unit and far greater than the approximately 50 percent requirement, or 173 spaces that are required. This removes my direct concern that the project isn't providing enough parking, even within a LDGMA.

I am quite pleased that this proposal would generate 476 jobs, more specifically, the 126 permanent jobs, most of which will be located along the Tremont Avenue and Bruckner Boulevard street frontages and will help to further enrich these commercial corridors.

To ensure the jobs would help the local and existing community, I would also need the following commitments to labor in order to provide a recommendation of support. That all 350 temporary construction jobs as well as the 14 permanent building service worker jobs would be union jobs that would use skilled workers from the Bronx with an emphasis on workers living within Community District 10 and that a Bronx based organization is used as the administering agent for the affordable housing. Additionally, that during the approximately two-years the grocery store would be closed for construction, that every current employee would be offered a temporary relocation option until they can be offered a new position when the new grocery store reopens.

In order to get my support for any project, I require that all residential buildings have at least 30 percent of all non-senior units have at least 2-bedrooms and that all units, including senior housing, are built larger than HPD minimums. These two recommendations will help ensure families can grow and not have to move from the community they've established themselves in. Ensuring a higher quality of housing gets built at the tradeoff of fewer units is more important than focusing just on the quantity of housing. This project has 31 percent of all non-senior units as 2-bedroom or 3-bedroom units (79 of the 250 units). I do have a concern with the sizes of some units and would like the architects to reevaluate the sizes to see if they can be larger. While I recommend that all of the buildings be reevaluated, I am particularly concerned for the studio units in the senior building.

I would like to add that the city should reevaluate the minimum size requirements of housing and increase these minimum unit sizes. While there is a trade-off on the size of units versus the number of units that can be built, it is a personal concern and belief that units as small as 360 square feet would start to seriously negatively impact people's quality of life.

To those concerned about the neighborhood context, I believe both the Bruckner and St Raymond's Cemetery creates a break from the larger neighborhood context, and that the proposed scale will be similar to the nearby PS 14. I also believe having these slightly taller buildings abutting the Bruckner may provide a benefit as it would block vehicle emissions and noise from the surrounding local community.

Another recommendation I have is not directed at the applicant team, but for the city. I heard a number of residents speak to concerns surrounding local infrastructure and that there are already existing infrastructure problems, specifically regarding, sanitation, traffic, schools, that there are flooding problems, concerns of a lack of emergency services, and that the adjacent PS 14 has buses that back up traffic during school hours. While I do not believe that the proposed 349 units spread out across four buildings will dramatically impact the local infrastructure, there is clearly an existing problem that needs to be addressed so the existing community can be improved. If the city is going to be the "City of Yes" we need to ensure the infrastructure is capable of handling any increase of density. My recommendation is to ask the Mayor to dedicate resources to fixing the infrastructure problems within the community to ensure that this new development can be built and still provide services at an even better rate than there are today.

Additionally, I would like the Mayor to commit to investing in establishing a multi-agency task force that would work with Community Boards, local stakeholders, and community organizations where they would focus on creating a plan for how to fix existing infrastructure issues so new

developments can occur without impacting current residents. This would allow the city to resolve existing problems before exacerbating them with additional development.

One final recommendation, and one I feel very passionately about, is creating homeownership opportunities within neighborhoods. Homeownership helps to stabilize neighborhoods, helps build generational wealth, creates a pathway to “middle class”, and generally leads to economic prosperity. I heard a number of people state at the public hearing how they have been able to buy a home within the local community for these very reasons and providing additional homeownership options is important. This recommendation is directed both to the applicant team as well as the city who can provide additional support options and pathways to home ownership.

I believe this project can be a model for what a comprehensive neighborhood could look like. A neighborhood that has traditionally been lower density, but can strategically add density when infrastructure improvements are made to accommodate it. A neighborhood that can allow families to have different housing options, from apartments, to homeownership, to senior housing while community services are provided through the youth recreation center and grocery store, all while creating a number of local jobs.

I want to further state that this recommendation is in no way precedent setting and any future applications would be held to the same scrutiny as this one. There are several very important reasons this project has my general support, as it would provide housing for both veterans and seniors, both of which are needed within this existing community. It would create permanent affordable housing for families while not having a significant impact on the local parks, schools, or traffic once infrastructure improvements are made. It would create a youth recreation center that would provide an important local service. The proposal would also create approximately 126 permanent local jobs and 350 temporary construction jobs while ensuring the existing grocery store would be able to be rebuilt and remain in the community.

I have weighed the positive outcomes with the concerns I heard at the two-day public hearing and have concluded that I recommend this application with the modifications I have noted.