The Village of Great Neck Plaza

The Village of Great Neck Plaza was incorporated in 1930 as one of nine communities in the Great Neck peninsula. Although small in size, at 1/3 square mile and just under 7,000 people, Great Neck Plaza encompasses one of the busiest and most vibrant downtowns on Long Island, with over 260 retail stores and service establishments, approximately 40 office buildings, three parks, and two four-star hotels. One of the first communities in New York to adopt a local landmarks ordinance, it also has three properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Jean A. Celender, Mayor
Ted Rosen, Deputy Mayor
Lawrence Katz, Trustee
Pamela Marksheid, Trustee
Gerald Schneiderman, Trustee

Village Hall
2 Gussack Plaza
Great Neck, NY 11021
Contents

Executive Summary / 5

Existing Zoning / 7

Rezoning Recommendations / 9

Affordable Housing Production Analysis Summary / 11

Site Analysis One: St. Paul’s Church Complex Site / 12

Site Analysis Two: Great Neck Park District Parking Lot / 16

Site Analysis Three: 23 Bond Street / 19

Appendix: Existing Conditions. / 22
Executive Summary

Background

The Village of Great Neck Plaza is an incorporated village within the Town of North Hempstead, in Nassau County, New York. While development in the area has existed since the New York and Flushing railroad was extended in 1866, the Village of Great Neck Plaza was first incorporated in May of 1930.

While the village is small in area, at just under 1/3 of a square mile, with a population density of 22,009 per square mile as of 2014, it is the densest municipality on Long Island. It is also currently the 11th densest municipality in the entire United States, ahead of such compact metropolises such as San Francisco and Jersey City.

This reflects a long history of supporting multifamily development in the village. As one of Long Island’s most walkable communities, Great Neck Plaza currently has a robust array of different housing options, including rental and homeownership, in a variety of building types ranging from single family homes, to townhouses, to mixed commercial/residential developments, to multistory apartment buildings. Many multifamily buildings in the village also have some degree of affordable housing, either pursuant to zoning regulation in the C-2 district, other government programs, senior housing programs, or due to being subject to the 1974 Emergency Tenant Protection Act.

Rezoning for affordable housing

In 2005 the village enacted a mandatory affordable housing provision for its C-2 district, requiring 7.5% affordable housing in exchange for a 20% density bonus (not subject to the affordable housing requirement) and other incentives, which was later increased to a 10% affordable housing requirement in 2016. In 2008 the Long Island Workforce Housing Act was passed by the New York State legislature, which also requires that multifamily developments throughout Long Island set aside 10% of the development as affordable housing, in exchange for a 10% density bonus. The requirements of the Long Island Workforce Housing Act are uniformly weaker than the village’s C-2 affordable housing program, which mandates deeper affordability, a smaller density bonus, and does not allow for off-site construction or a payment in lieu of providing the mandated affordable housing. As such, developments which conform to the requirements of the C-2 zoning code necessarily also conform to the Long Island Workforce Housing Act of 2008.

The Village of Great Neck Plaza commissioned RPA to make recommendations for changes to its Residence T (RT) and Residence D (RD) zones.

RPA’s recommendations for zoning changes are based on trying to achieve the following outcomes:

1. Promote the provision of affordable housing
2. Retain the financial feasibility of development.
3. Be consistent and contextual with the current architectural fabric of the village.
Soft Site Analysis

In conjunction with the village, RPA identified three potential development sites, two in the RT zone and one in the RD zone. RPA looked to find the best and most feasible route to creating additional units of affordable housing on these three sites by changing the overall RT and RD zoning codes.

The three sites are:

1) **The St. Paul’s Church Complex**, on the south side of Grace Avenue between St. Paul’s Place and Gilchrest Road, in the RT district.

2) **The Great Neck Park District parking lot site**, north of the Long Island Rail Road right-of-way, between Canterbury Road and St. Paul’s Place, in the RT district.

3) **23 Bond Street**, an interior lot on the east side of Bond Street between Grace Avenue and Stoner Avenue currently in use as a medical building, in the RD district.
Residence T Zoning

The Village of Great Neck Plaza’s Residence T (RT) zone allows for multifamily development, and is mapped along major roads on the border of neighboring municipalities where density is less. It is limited to lots along Bond Street on the northern edge of the Village, along the LIRR right-of-way and Shoreward Street on the eastern edge of the village, and one block along Knight’s Bridge Road on the southwestern edge of the Village.

The RT zone was created in 1981, and was revised in 1996 to increase allowed density, going from an allowed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of .367 to an allowed FAR of .642. As part of this revision, a conditional permit system was instituted, in which FAR, height, and lot coverage could be increased, and yard requirements reduced, pursuant to approval by the Board of Trustees if the sites were adjacent to a Business B district, a Residence D district, or an existing building with an FAR greater than 1.5. Both soft sites analyzed in the RT district are eligible for the conditional permit, as the Great Neck Park District site abuts an RD district, and the St. Paul’s Church site abuts a building with an FAR of 2.64. The conditional permit has limitations if the site also abuts or is across a public right-of-way from an existing single-family home, however as neither site analyzed abuts nor sits across a public right-of-way from an existing single family home these conditions would not apply.

The RT zone currently permits an FAR of .642 (28,000 square feet per acre), with a height limit of 40 feet, and yard requirements of at least 25 feet on the front and rear yards, and at least 15 feet on each the side yards, with side yards required to be at least 40 feet in the aggregate.

If the conditional permit is applied, the RT zone allows up to an FAR of .895 (39,000 square feet per acre) with a height limit of 45 feet and yard requirements of at least 20 feet for the front yard, and at least 5 feet for the rear years and each of the side yards.

Without or without the conditional permit, buildings in the RT zone must average at least 1,200 gross square feet per dwelling unit.

RPA found that the constricting factor in the RT zone is the FAR permitted, both with and without the conditional permit. Utilizing the same height and lot coverage requirements, a 40 foot, four story building with an FAR of 1.4, or 1.6 if the conditional permit was granted, could be built. It should be noted that there are no requirements in the RT district as to a
maximum number of stories permitted, however a four-story building of 10 feet per story is the most that could fit into the 40 foot height limit under standard construction practices.

Residence D Zoning

The Village of Great Neck Plaza’s Residence D (RD) zone is a multifamily apartment zone. It is mapped throughout the Village, with large sections in the northeastern and southeastern parts of the Village, and a smaller section in the southwestern section of the Village.

The RD zone permits an FAR of 1.0 (43,560 feet per acre), with a height limit of 45 feet, and yard requirements of 20 feet for the front yard, 15 feet for the rear yard, and 10 feet for each of the side yards. Unlike the RT zone, there is a maximum of three stories permitted. Also unlike the RT zone, there is no specific minimum dwelling unit size requirements.

RPA again found that the constraining factor on the RD zone was the FAR permitted. Utilizing the same height, story, and lot coverage requirements, a three-story building with an FAR of 1.5 could be constructed. If the story limit were eliminated, but the same height and lot coverage requirements were kept, a four-story building with an FAR of 2.0 could be built.

Comparison of Existing RT and RD Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current RT zoning as-of-right</th>
<th>Current RT zoning with conditional permit</th>
<th>Current RD zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Limit</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Limit</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Average Apt. Size</td>
<td>1200 Gross Square Feet</td>
<td>1200 Gross Square Feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard</td>
<td>25 foot minimum</td>
<td>20 foot minimum</td>
<td>20 foot minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>25 foot minimum</td>
<td>5 foot minimum</td>
<td>15 foot minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard</td>
<td>15 foot minimum each</td>
<td>5 foot minimum each</td>
<td>10 foot minimum each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 foot minimum aggregate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RT Recommendations

In the RT district, RPA is recommending that zoning increase to allow for up to a 1.35 FAR and 50% lot coverage, with 20% of units reserved for affordable housing. It is further recommending to cap the number of stories allowed in the RT district as-of-right at three, similar to the RD district, however the existing conditional permit system would be modified to allow for a four-story building with a five-foot setback required for the fourth floor, which would allow for four stories where contextually appropriate. The existing zoning code allows for the granting of the conditional permit only if the building “will conform to the general character of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located,” language that should be retained in order to make sure the fourth story is granted only where it would conform to this neighborhood character. 50% lot coverage is slightly higher than is needed for a three story building at maximum FAR, which allows for some flexibility of design.

RPA also encourages the Village to write the zoning code in such a way that even more FAR could be provided, beyond the 1.35 limit, in exchange for more affordable housing. This proportion of this affordable housing should be greater than the 20%. One possibility is to require that for every 10 square feet of space granted above the 1.35 limit, an additional 3 square feet of affordable housing needs to be created. This additional area should not exceed a total of 1.5 FAR in total, inclusive of additional affordable housing, which would still allow for developments to fit within the proposed height and bulk restrictions below.

RPA is further recommending reducing the average allowable apartment size to 1,000 Gross Square Feet per apartment, in concordance with current construction practices and market
standards. For reference, the most recent building proposal in Great Neck Plaza, 15 Bond Street, has an average of 982 Gross Square Feet per unit. Lowering this requirement would have the effect of increasing the number of units in any RT development by approximately 20%. Because the apartments would be smaller and likely have less bedrooms on average than under the existing scenario requiring 1,200 Gross Square Foot per apartment, parking needs would likely need to be increased by a somewhat smaller proportion than 20%.

**RD Recommendations**

RPA is recommending that in the RD district zoning increase to a 2.0 FAR, 55% lot coverage, and a four-story building with a five-foot setback required for the fourth floor, with 20% of the units reserved for affordable housing. The increase from 50% to 55% lot coverage is necessary to allow for a building to achieve maximum FAR under the height and bulk constraints, specifically to adjust for the 5-foot fourth floor setback.

The village could also put in place a minimum unit size requirement of 1,000 Gross Square Feet per apartment, in order to parallel the zoning change in the RT district. However, unlike the RT district, this would have the effect of requiring slightly larger units than are currently being constructed.

In effecting the affordable housing in both the RD and RT zones, the village has two choices. First, it could choose to pattern the mechanism off of the existing C-2 district making the added FAR as-of-right and requiring affordable housing. Alternatively, the village could institute a conditional permit system for the increased density with affordable housing requirements. By using the conditional permit system, the village can put in place the specific conditions they expect from developers in regards to maximum height, bulk, and density, as well as the affordable housing required, while still retaining the flexibility to grant these adjustments only to the extent that the village determines they are in accordance with the comprehensive zoning and neighborhood character of the area and do not detract from public health safety and welfare. Because of large increase in density – double in the case of the RD district, and slightly more than double in the case of the RT district – developers are very likely to ask for the conditional permit even with the required 20% affordable housing, rather than attempt to develop as-of-right. This is further supported by the fact that current zoning has been in place through several market cycles without producing development on any of the three soft sites.

**Further Considerations for Affordable Housing**

This report focuses on the village’s zoning as it relates to height, bulk, design, and overall production of affordable housing in newly constructed buildings. It does not analyze or make recommendations on the type or conditions of the affordable housing that may be created under these zoning changes.

In the C-2 district, the rules regarding affordable housing produced by the inclusionary zoning program are governed by Article XB of the zoning code. The village could choose to apply the same conditions to affordable housing produced in the RT and RD districts. There are, however, several adjustments from these guidelines that the village may want to consider. These include increasing the length of affordability, adjusting methods of setting initial and subsequent rents, adjusting income requirements, and requiring the affordable housing created to register as rent stabilized with New York State’s Division of Housing and Community Renewal (HCR). RPA recommends that the village consult with HCR on these topics before finalizing the new zoning code.

**RD Zone: Existing vs Proposed Zoning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAR</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage</strong></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height</strong></td>
<td>45 feet</td>
<td>45 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>20% of units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max Stories</strong></td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setback</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Five feet on 4th floor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing Production Analysis

When building housing, developers look for potential income that can support the expense of building and maintaining a property, while also allowing for reasonable profit margin. All other things being equal, affordable housing necessarily decreases the amount of income coming in from a property, as rents or prices are lower than could otherwise be obtained. Because of this, requiring affordable housing can depress the feasibility of development. Although affordable housing is often eligible for preferential property tax treatment, government subsidies, or low-cost financing, it is often not enough to make an affordable or mixed-income development competitive with an all market-rate development, especially in areas with high markets.

RPA’s goal in analyzing any rezoning policy was to increase the allowable size of a building to the extent that it increases both the amount of affordable and market-rate housing. This policy will generally allow a development to maintain financial feasibility, even with the affordable units, through the economy of scale. It is important to note that RPA did not conduct a detailed underwriting analysis of the development feasibility of each site under existing and proposed zoning, and that development feasibility is contingent upon many factors outside of zoning, such as available financing, construction costs, and market conditions. As such, RPA does not guarantee that the proposed zoning changes will necessarily result in feasible development sites.

RPA analyzed three sites, two in the RT district and one in the RD district.

Site Analysis One:
St. Paul’s Church Complex

Existing Conditions

This site is owned by St. Paul’s Episcopal Church, and is located on the south side of Grace Avenue between St. Paul’s Place and Gilchrest Road. Its address is 68 Grace Avenue (although the village map describes the address simply as “Saint Paul’s Church & Rectory”) Block 202 Lots 185-190. It currently houses three historic buildings: a church, a rectory, and a parish house, of which the church is a designated village landmark. It is a slightly irregular trapezoidal lot, and has a lot area of 50,888 square feet. The site was the subject of a 2013 design workshop, which proposed the preservation of the church and the demolition of the parish house and rectory, to be replaced with a three story apartment building and smaller three story community facility space.

St. Paul’s Church Complex site, bordered by St. Paul’s Place, Grace Avenue, and Gilchrest Road.
Potential development under 2013 design study

The site is in the RT zone, and is currently eligible for a conditional permit, as it borders the Grace Plaza Nursing Home on 15 St. Paul’s Place, a multiple dwelling with an FAR of 2.65, greater than 1.5 needed for the conditional permit. Although the development proposed in the 2013 design workshop is .9 FAR, very slightly larger than the FAR of .895 allowed by the special permit, RPA used this proposed development as the basis for what is likely to be built on the site without any RT zoning changes. This results in the preservation of the church, with 6,932 square feet of community facility space, an additional three story community facility building of 9,766 square feet built south of the church, and a separate additional three-story, 24-unit multifamily apartment building of 29,262 square feet built on the east side of the lot, replacing the current rectory and parish house. This building may choose to meet its obligation to the Long Island Workforce Housing Act via a payment or offsite construction, however if it chose to build this affordable housing onsite the building would have 3 affordable units. Again, because the as-of-right zoning is only .642 FAR, the density bonus under the Long Island Workforce Housing Act would amount to only .064 FAR, for a total allowed FAR of .706. This is less than the density of .895 with the conditional permit. As such, we do not believe the building would be eligible for additional density over the .895 FAR, although this is not a legal opinion and counsel should be consulted for a legal opinion on the matter, especially since in this case part of the FAR being used for community facility space is a complicating factor.

Under this zoning, the development cannot build to maximum FAR and max out both its height and lot coverage. As a result, while the FAR and lot coverage are roughly the maximum permitted with the conditional permit, the height is 9 feet – roughly one story – shorter than what could otherwise be built.

Potential development under new zoning and lot split: two alternatives

RPA determined that the most feasible development scenario would involve splitting the lot in two, creating a separate lot for the Church in order to effect its preservation while opening up the rest of the site for development. RPA’s analysis is based on the development site being an L shaped lot of 38,000 Square Feet, as illustrated in the two alternatives.

With the new zoning, the FAR would be increased to 1.35 and the lot coverage would be increased to 50%. This would allow a new development of 51,300 Square Feet, containing 50 total housing units, with 10 of them being affordable housing units. RPA has prepared two possible alternatives for the new lot under this zoning, one a three story building which would be allowed as-of-right, and a second which be a mixed three/four story building, with three stories in the northern section fronting Grace Avenue, and four stories, with a five foot setback for the fourth story, in the southern section. These two alternatives are informed by keeping in context with the three story development across Grace Avenue. The two alternatives both have the same FAR, square footage, number of units, and number of affordable units, and differ only in the shape of the building envelope. The new developments are based on the assumption of both the new 1.35 FAR and reducing the average gross square footage of the apartments to 1,000 Gross Square Feet.
Church Street Site: Three Story Building

- FAR: 1.35
- Coverage: 45%
- Height: 36 (40 allowed)
- Stories: 3
- Parking: 82 (not counting Church usage)
- Apartments: 50
- Affordable Units: 10

View towards the Southeast

Looking west on Grace Avenue

Church Street Site: Mixed Three/Four Story Building

- FAR: 1.35
- Coverage: 38%
- Height: 34 on north section, 45 on south
- Stories: 3 on north section, 4 on south
- Parking: 82 (not counting Church usage)
- Apartments: 50
- Affordable Units: 10

View towards the Southeast

Looking west on Grace Avenue
Proposed building in context

Both alternatives would remain within the context of the surrounding area in terms of density, as the developments to the south and across St. Paul’s Place to the west have FAR’s of 2.64 and 2.58 respectively. Across the street to the north and west are existing three-story cooperative apartment buildings. However, because of the conditional permit mechanism, developments can be limited to three stories on either the entire building, or the parts of the building which are across the street from these three story developments. The five foot setback required on the fourth floor would also help to mitigate some of this potential difference in height on a visual level for the mixed three/four story building.

Possible additional FAR and Affordable Housing

If the village chooses to grant additional FAR up to 1.5 in exchange for more affordable housing, the buildings would cover slightly more of the lot, but would not be any taller, and would likely allow for a 57 unit building with at least 12 affordable housing units, depending on exact requirements and allowances.

Parking

In the 2013 Design Workshop proposal, 88 parking spaces were proposed for all uses on the site. This was in two separate underground garages of two stories each, one directly underneath the footprint of the residential building, the other underneath the yard on the southwest corner, south of the new community facility building and west of the residential building. By splitting the lot, the parking required for the church would be a separate zoning matter, and the parking for the proposed alternatives only takes into account the parking required for the new residential development.
Site Analysis Two: Great Neck Park District Parking Lot

Existing conditions

This site is owned by the Great Neck Park District, and is located north of the Long Island Rail Road right-of-way, between Canterbury Road and St. Paul’s Place. The village map describes the address as 17 Canterbury Street, Block 201 Lots 60, 144-147, & 156-159. It is currently mainly used for parking for the Long Island Railroad. It is a slightly irregular “L” shaped lot with an area of 65,061 square feet and currently contains 181 parking spaces. The southern part of the site is also on a considerable slope with a lower elevation on the southern end near the Long Island Rail Road right-of-way.
Potential development under current zoning

The site is in the RT zone, and is currently eligible for a conditional permit, as it borders an RD district to the north. With this conditional permit, RPA massed out a likely building design, below. The building would be 58,230 square feet. Using the standard of the average apartment size requiring at least 1,200 gross square feet of space, as mandated in the RT zoning, this would likely result in a 47 or 48 unit building. The building may choose to meet its obligation to the Long Island Workforce Housing Act via a payment or offsite construction, however if it chose to build this affordable housing onsite the building would have 5 affordable units. Because the as-of-right zoning is only .642 FAR, the density bonus under the Long Island Workforce Housing Act would amount to only .064 FAR, for a total allowed FAR of .706. This is less than the density of .895 with the conditional permit. As such, we do not believe the building would be eligible for additional density over the .895 FAR, although this is not a legal opinion and counsel should be consulted for a legal opinion on the matter.

Under this zoning, the building cannot build to maximum FAR and max out both its height and lot coverage. As a result, lot coverage is only 22%, under the 35% allowed as-of-right, or the 40% allowed with the current conditional permit.

Potential development under new zoning

With the new zoning, the FAR would be increased to 1.35. This results in a building of 87,832 square feet. The average apartment size would be reduced to 1,000 Gross Square Feet, which would likely produce an 85 unit building with 17 units of affordable housing under the 20% requirement. This building would still fit within the height, yard, and lot coverage requirements of the existing conditional permit. Because most of the surrounding buildings are four stories, we are analyzing the site assuming that the conditional permit for the added fourth story would be granted.

This building would also have the required five-foot setback under the new conditional permit. Below is the massing of the proposed buildings, shown from three different street level views, both with and without the fourth floor setback.
Potential development under new zoning in context

This potential 4-story, 1.35 FAR building would remain within the context of the surrounding area in terms of density. The buildings abutting the site to the north, as well as across St. Paul’s Place and Canterbury road, are all multifamily 4-5 story buildings with FAR’s ranging from 1.7 to 2.8, with an average FAR of 2.3. However, it should be noted that the high FAR is due mainly to the buildings having high lot coverage. The buildings to the north and across the southern edge of Canterbury Street to the west have 3 and 2 stories respectively, although the specific heights of these buildings are unavailable. However, because of the conditional permit mechanism, the building would not be able to build beyond 40 feet or three stories as-of-right. As such, development could be limited to a four story building shorter than 45 feet. The five foot setback required on the fourth floor would also help to mitigate some of this potential difference in height on a visual level, and keep the four-story building contextual with its surroundings.

Possible additional FAR and Affordable Housing

If the village chooses to grant additional FAR up to 1.5 in exchange for proportionally more affordable housing, the buildings would cover slightly more of the lot, but would not be any taller, and would likely allow for a 95 unit building with 20 or more affordable housing units would likely result, depending upon the exact requirements and allowances.
Parking

In analyzing all three soft sites, RPA conducted a parking analysis, in order to determine the depth of any potential parking garage needed. The village requires underground parking in multifamily dwellings based on the number of bedroom per unit, with 1.5 spaces required of studio and one-bedroom apartments, 1.75 spaces required of two-bedroom apartments, and 2 spaces required of three-bedroom or larger apartments. RPA used a standard of 1.675 spaces per apartment, based on an apartment breakdown of 50% studio and one-bedroom apartments, 30% two-bedroom apartments, and 20% three-bedroom apartments. If more apartments are built at larger sizes, parking spaces will need to be adjusted accordingly. RPA also used a standard of 300 square feet of space needed per parking space. For the Great Neck Park district site, replacement of the existing parking was also taken into account.

Because of the need to replace the 181 existing spaces on the Great Neck Park District site in addition to adding new parking, any garage would need to be more than one story deep. However, the existing grade of the site could be utilized and the need for excavation diminished. A possible configuration for the new underground parking garage is below. This would be a 96,900 square foot garage encompassing the 181 existing spaces, as well as 142 more spaces for the building, for a total of 323 spaces. RPA understands that both the Great Neck Park District and the Village of Great Neck Plaza wish to expand parking on the site, and a larger underground garage is also a possibility on the site. If more spaces are desired, the lower level of the parking garage could be expanded northward.

Cross section with parking of potential development
Site Analysis Three: 23 Bond Street

Existing Conditions

This site is owned by Levitt & Panzer LLC, a small real estate management company, and is an interior lot located on the east side of Bond Street between Grace Avenue and Stoner Avenue, closer to Stoner Avenue. The village map identifies its address as 23 Bond Street Block 331 Lots 34-35. It is a regular rectangular lot of 15,000 square feet and currently houses a medical office building of 9,372 square feet. At an FAR of .625, the lot is underbuilt for the current zoning, and significantly underbuilt for the proposed zoning.

The site is in the RD zone, and at 1.0 allowed FAR, can currently build a three story multiple dwelling of 15,000 square feet. This would likely be a simple three story apartment building. Because there are no minimum apartment size requirements in the RD district, the building will likely have apartments smaller than the 1,200 gross square feet per apartment required.
Using the standard of 1,000 gross square feet per apartment, as likely in the RD district, this would result in a 30 unit building, which would support 6 units of affordable housing under the 20% requirement. Again, if market conditions dictated larger apartments, as few as 24 units with 5 units of affordable housing is also a possibility.

The development would still fit within the height and yard requirements of the current RD zone, and need only minimal changes to the lot coverage requirements of the existing conditional permit. The minimal expansion of the lot requirements is necessary to allow for small the reduction of square footage required by the five foot setback on the fourth floor, and still be able to reach the 2.0 FAR.

This building would also have the required five-foot setback under the new conditional permit. Below is a comparison of the massing of the three story building as per the current zoning, and the proposed four story building with a setback, shown from two different street level views.

**Proposed building in context**

The surrounding buildings range between 1.2 to 2.3 FAR, with an average FAR of 1.64. The potential 4-story, 2.0 FAR building would remain within the context of the buildings to the south, and is similar to the proposed 15 Bond Street two lots to the south. To the north, to the east, and across Bond Street to the west, however, the building would generally be denser and likely taller than the existing three story buildings. However, the five foot setback required on the fourth floor would help to mitigate some of this potential difference in height on a visual level, and help keep the four-story building contextual with its surroundings.

**Potential development under new zoning**

With the new zoning, the potential FAR would be increased to 2.0, the story maximum increased to four with a five foot setback on the fourth floor, and the lot coverage maximum increased to 55%. This would allow the apartment building to cover 52% of the lot and add one story with a setback, resulting in a four-story building with a setback on the fourth floor. This is roughly the same massing as the proposed 15 Bond Street development.
23 Bond Street: As Of Right Development

- FAR: 1.0
- Coverage: 33%
- Height: 32'
- Stories: 3
- Parking: 20-25
- Apartments: 12-15
- Affordable Units: 0-2 at 130% AMI (Long Island Workforce Housing Act)

23 Bond Street: 4-Story with Setback over Parking

- FAR: 2.0
- Coverage: 52%
- Height: 42' (45' permitted)
- Stories: 4
- Parking: 40-50
- Apartments: 24-30
- Affordable Units: 5-6 at 50-100% of AMI
Parking

Depending on the exact number and configuration of dwelling units, the building would likely need between 40 and 50 underground parking spaces, necessitating a parking garage of 12,000 – 15,000 square feet. As the lot area is 15,000 square feet, the necessary parking may be able to fit in a one story underground garage, provided the garage was built completely out to the lot line. However, 300 gross square feet needed per parking space is only an approximation, and more space may be needed for the garage. As such, the potential development may necessitate a two-story garage, especially at the higher range of the possible number of dwelling units.
Appendix: Existing Conditions

Population

Between 2000 and 2015, the Village of Great Neck Plaza’s population grew at a rate of 6.9%, over twice the rate of the Town of North Hempstead (2.9%) and over four times the rate of Nassau County (1.5%).

The Village’s population growth has not been evenly split by age group. The youngest residents—those under 19 years—grew from 12.4% of the population in 2000 to 17% in 2015. This youngest cohort also grew proportionately in the Town, but declined slightly in the County. The average household size in Great Neck Plaza also increased from 2.54 persons in 2000 to 2.94 person in 2015, a result of the growth in these households with children. These trends likely reflect Great Neck Plaza’s desirability to young families seeking a more urban and walkable community than found elsewhere on Long Island.

Between 2000 and 2015, the Village saw no change in the size of the senior most cohort—residents 75 years and older continue to make up about 18.5% of the population. This is the second largest cohort in the Village, second only to residents 35 to 54 who make up 25.1% of the population. Proportionally, the Village’s senior cohort is about twice the size of the cohort for the Town of North Hempstead (9.1%) and Nassau County (7.8%). This large senior population is likely a result of the Village’s nursing home, senior independent living facility and senior assisted-care living facility, as well as its easy access to multiple health care facilities and other amenities.

Table 1: Population Change, 2000-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village of Great Neck Plaza</td>
<td>6,433</td>
<td>6,879</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of North Hempstead</td>
<td>222,611</td>
<td>229,105</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau County</td>
<td>1,334,544</td>
<td>1,354,612</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Population by Age Group, 2000-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2000 % of Total</th>
<th>2015 % of Total</th>
<th>2000-2015 % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village of Great Neck Plaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-19 Years</td>
<td>801 (12.4)</td>
<td>997 (14.5)</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34 Years</td>
<td>1,400 (21.7)</td>
<td>1,156 (16.8)</td>
<td>-17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54 Years</td>
<td>1,586 (24.7)</td>
<td>1,727 (25.1)</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 Years</td>
<td>700 (10.9)</td>
<td>853 (12.4)</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 Years</td>
<td>756 (11.8)</td>
<td>887 (12.9)</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ Years</td>
<td>1,190 (18.5)</td>
<td>1,273 (18.5)</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2000 % of Total</th>
<th>2015 % of Total</th>
<th>2000-2015 % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of North Hempstead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-19 Years</td>
<td>57,644 (25.9)</td>
<td>58,651 (25.6)</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34 Years</td>
<td>37,125 (16.7)</td>
<td>34,824 (15.2)</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54 Years</td>
<td>68,007 (30.6)</td>
<td>63,004 (27.5)</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 Years</td>
<td>22,800 (10.2)</td>
<td>30,700 (13.4)</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 Years</td>
<td>18,754 (8.4)</td>
<td>20,849 (9.1)</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ Years</td>
<td>18,281 (8.2)</td>
<td>20,849 (9.1)</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2000 % of Total</th>
<th>2015 % of Total</th>
<th>2000-2015 % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nassau County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-19 Years</td>
<td>358,923 (26.9)</td>
<td>337,298 (24.9)</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34 Years</td>
<td>230,766 (17.3)</td>
<td>235,702 (17.4)</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54 Years</td>
<td>418,057 (31.3)</td>
<td>379,291 (28.0)</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 Years</td>
<td>125,957 (9.4)</td>
<td>182,873 (13.5)</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 Years</td>
<td>105,961 (7.9)</td>
<td>111,078 (8.2)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ Years</td>
<td>94,880 (7.1)</td>
<td>105,660 (7.8)</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing

Great Neck Plaza's growth since 2000, especially among families, is reflected in an increased demand for housing in the Village.

In 2015, the Village had 4,010 housing units, of which 3,636 were occupied as a primary residence. In 2015, the Village experienced a healthy vacancy rates of 3.8% for owned properties and 5% for rentals. While rental vacancy rates were on par with the Town of North Hempstead (5.1%) and Nassau County (4.6%), vacancy rates for owned properties were higher in the
Village than in the Town (1.1%) or County (1.2%). This may be a factor of the margin of error, which is higher for the Village due to its smaller population, or may reflect a higher number of owned properties which are occupied on an occasional or seasonal basis as opposed to primary residences.

It may also be a factor of the additional housing Great Neck Plaza has added overall since 2000. In the Village, the number of occupied housing units grew slightly between 2000 and 2015 at just under 1%, while occupied units declined in both the Town and the County (-.4% and -1.5% respectively.) This increase is due to the growth of owner-occupied housing units from 1,803 to 1,852, while occupied rental units decreased during this period, from 1,800 to 1,784.

Since 2000, median home values have risen in all three geographies. The Village saw over 70% growth, to a 2015 median value to $327,400. However, homes in the Village continue to be more affordable on average than in the Town of North Hempstead or Nassau County overall, where median prices are $623,400 and $446,400 respectively. This is likely due to the higher preponderance of cooperative and condominium ownership in the Village, as opposed to larger detached houses prevalent elsewhere in the Town and County.

Rent values have also grown substantially since 2000. While median rent was just over $1,000 in 2000, in 2015 it has risen 66.1% to $1,756, higher than the Town of North Hempstead ($1,692) and Nassau County overall ($1,578). Clearly, demand is growing in the Village for both rental and ownership housing.

It should be noted that the Village of Great Neck Plaza has adopted the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974. The vacancy rates in the analysis above are unofficial and subject to margins of error, and should not be used in determining applicability of a housing emergency pursuant to the Emergency Tenant Protection Act of 1974.

### Income

While housing values and rents are on the rise, so is median income in Great Neck Plaza. The median family income in 2000 was $54,561 per household but grew to $67,138 in 2015. Median incomes, already historically larger in Town of North Hempstead and Nassau County, grew at slightly faster rates than in the Village. As can be seen in the distribution table below, almost half of the Village’s household earn over $100,000 annually. Still, 440 households, about 1 in 8 in the Village, live on less than $35,000 annually. Both the number of low-income households and the income gap between the Great Neck Plaza and North Hempstead and Nassau County overall are at least partially explained by the significantly higher elderly population of the Village.

All data sourced from the 2000 U.S. Census and 2015 American Community Survey, 5-year estimates.

---

**Table 3: Total Housing Units by Occupancy, 2000-2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village of Great Neck Plaza</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% Change 2000 - 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Units</td>
<td>3,603</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,636</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of North Hempstead</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% Change 2000 - 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Units</td>
<td>76,820</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>76,523</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>60,270</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>59,940</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>16,550</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>16,583</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nassau County</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% Change 2000 - 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Units</td>
<td>447,387</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>440,640</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>359,264</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>353,777</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>88,123</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>86,863</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Housing Vacancy, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Village of Great Neck Plaza</th>
<th>Town of North Hempstead</th>
<th>Nassau County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>81,828</td>
<td>467,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>3,636</td>
<td>76,523</td>
<td>440,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>26,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Median Housing Values and Median Gross Rent, 2000-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median Owner-Occupied Housing Values</th>
<th>Median Renter-Occupied Gross Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Great Neck Plaza</td>
<td>$191,400</td>
<td>$327,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of North Hempstead</td>
<td>$336,500</td>
<td>$623,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau County</td>
<td>$240,200</td>
<td>$446,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village of Great Neck Plaza</td>
<td>$54,561</td>
<td>$67,138</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of North Hempstead</td>
<td>$81,039</td>
<td>$104,698</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau County</td>
<td>$72,030</td>
<td>$99,465</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Great Neck Plaza Household Income by Income Bracket, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th># of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Plan Association is an independent, not-for-profit civic organization that develops and promotes ideas to improve the economic health, environmental resiliency and quality of life of the New York metropolitan area. We conduct research on transportation, land use, housing, good governance and the environment. We advise cities, communities and public agencies. And we advocate for change that will contribute to the prosperity of all residents of the region. Since the 1920s, RPA has produced three landmark plans for the region and is working on a fourth plan due out in 2017. For more information, please visit, www.rpa.org.
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